

**Extra Care Services Review**

**90 Day Consultation Report**

**1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 – 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013**

Appendix to Extra Care Services Review, report to  
Council Executive, 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013

**Contents**

1. Background
2. Methodology
3. Engagement and Response Rates
4. Key Themes
5. Survey Findings
6. Findings from Discussions and Other Written Submissions

## **1. Background**

On 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 Council Executive agreed to conduct a 90 day consultation on the future of Extra Care Services in Luton.

The proposal being consulted upon was to draw up a new agreement for Extra Care based on residents' views on their care and support needs and to go out to tender for the onsite care contracts at all five sites.

At Abigail Court, Applegrove and Colwell Courts the proposal would involve the movement of the management of onsite care from the Council to a third party provider. Under the proposal, the Council would have a contract with the provider and would monitor the care being provided. The Council would seek to transfer care staff who are currently employed by the Council to the new provider under TUPE arrangements.

At Jill Jenkins and Betty Dodd, where the onsite care is delivered by Westminster Care, the proposal would mean that there would potentially be a change to the onsite care provider, or no change, depending on the outcome of the tender process.

Formal consultation closed on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

In a separate consultation held during August and September 2012, residents were asked for their views on the existing service. This separate consultation report is available on request.

## 2. Methodology

The consultation was open to contributions from Extra Care residents, family members, LBC care staff and the public. All residents and LBC staff members were notified about the consultation through a Factsheet and explanatory covering letter, which formed part of a 'consultation pack' that was distributed at the beginning of the consultation. The channels for consultation were the following:

### Surveys

- **A survey for Extra Care Residents** - this was supplied to all residents and consisted of eight questions focussed on the proposal. On the advice of the LBC Consultation & Community Engagement team, the questionnaire was kept as concise as possible, with questions focussing primarily on the proposals rather than incorporating residents' views on their experience of the existing service. To ensure that residents could comment on the existing service if they wished, longer-form surveys with questions about service quality were made available on request from Scheme Managers. As referenced above, residents had been invited to comment on their experience of the service through focus groups held earlier in the year.
- **A survey for relatives/representatives of Extra Care Residents** – this was supplied to all residents in the consultation pack. The survey for family members/representative asked questions both about the existing service and about the proposal.
- **A survey for the Extra Care staff** employed by Luton Borough Council
- In addition to being supplied in paper form, all surveys were made available online via the Council's consultation page
- Help with filling out surveys in the form of an independent advocate from POhWER, who attended the Schemes along with Council Officers on the days of the 'drop in' discussions listed below.

### Meetings, Briefings and Discussions

- Briefing sessions for staff were held on the following days:
  - 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012 – Applegrove Court
  - 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 – Colwell Court
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 – Abigail Court
  - 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 – Briefing for night staff at Abigail Court
  -
- 'Drop in' discussion groups with Council Officers were held for residents on the days listed below. Where residents wished to participate in a discussion group, officers from the Communications and Consultation Team were typically available to facilitate this, with the Project Manager on hand to answer questions. Officers were available to host the 'drop in' discussion groups on the following days:
  - Monday 26<sup>th</sup> November – Colwell Court
  - Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> November – Applegrove Court
  - Friday 30<sup>th</sup> November – Abigail Court
  - Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December – Jill Jenkins
  - Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> December – Betty Dodd Court
- A public consultation meeting was held on Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> November at High Town Sports and Arts Centre on 29 November, 10am-12pm.

### Consultation Inbox and Email Submissions

- A anonymous consultation box was set up ([ecconsultation@luton.gov.uk](mailto:ecconsultation@luton.gov.uk)) and advertised on both on the Extra Care Services Review Factsheet and the Council website, to receive emails from residents, their representatives, staff or the public
- Although not formally advertised as a consultation channel, some residents and their representatives chose to email the lead Project Manager directly with views

### 3. Engagement and Response Rates

**For residents and their families, surveys** proved to be the most popular method of engagement during this consultation. As referenced above, residents had already taken part in focus groups to discuss the quality of their existing service during August and September.

The response rates for the surveys were as follows:

Questionnaire Summary	Abigail	Applegrove	Colwell	Betty Dodd	Jill Jenkins	Total
Properties in the Scheme	59	56	33	47	60	255
Resident questionnaires	13	21	12	10	13	69
<b>Resident Response Rate</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>27%</b>
Relative/Representative questionnaires	12	18	5	11	14	60
<b>Relative/Representative Response Rate</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>Surveys Returned per Residence</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.51</b>

69 surveys were received from residents, representing a 27% response rate. 60 surveys were received from the family members/representatives of residents, representing a 24% response rate. It is not known whether the surveys submitted by these family members were in substitute of or in addition to surveys already supplied by residents – it is likely that some duplication, but that some of the responses from family members were submitted on behalf of residents who did not submit a questionnaire personally. In total, there were 0.51 surveys submitted per Extra Care residence.

The response rates were highest in Applegrove and Colwell Courts, where response reached 38% and 36% respectively.

Participation in discussion groups with Council Officers varied between the schemes. At Applegrove, residents expressed a wish to participate in a larger group meeting, which twenty six residents attended. Subsequent to this a smaller discussion group was held, which six residents participated in.

At Colwell Court, two families of Extra Care residents wished to participate in one-to-one discussions with council officers. A number of residents also received assistance in completing surveys from an independent advocate from POHWER.

At Abigail, three residents wished to meet one-to-one and were by provided with assistance to complete their surveys.

At Betty Dodd, two residents requested one-to-one assistance with completing their surveys and at Jill Jenkins, one resident received such assistance.

The majority of **LBC staff** attended briefings which were held at the end of October/beginning of November. Staff were supplied with responses to the Frequently Asked Questions which were raised in the meetings following the initial briefings. The staff response rate to the surveys was 20% overall. Abigail Court saw the highest response rates, with 22% of staff participating in the survey.

Questionnaire Summary	Abigail	Applegrove	Colwell	All Sites	Total
Staff in the Scheme	18	22	14	NA	55
Questionnaire responses	4	1	2	3	11
<b>Staff Response Rate</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>20%</b>

The **public consultation** was attended by a representative from one voluntary sector organisation, which delivers a range of services to older people. No other members of the public, service users or staff were in attendance. It is likely that the meetings with staff and residents were held within individual schemes provided the most convenient opportunity for key stakeholders to engage in the consultation.

In total, four submissions to the consultation were received via email from residents and family members or representatives.

## 4. Key Themes

### **Satisfaction with the current service was high among residents and their families.**

- 62% of residents who completed the survey said that there were no improvements that could be made to the existing service.
- 44% of staff who completed the survey said that the Extra Care service 'completely' met the needs of residents, and 44% answered that Extra Care 'partially' met their needs
- 62% of family members who completed the survey said that the Extra Care service 'completely' met the needs of residents, and 30% answered that Extra Care 'partially' met their needs
- The areas of improvement that were identified were:
  - By Residents – reduced use of agency staff (who are used to cover the LBC service)
  - By Staff – more time in care plans to complete work, more supervision
  - By Family members – clarifying or making changes to the carers' remit

### **Residents, their families and staff expressed some concern about the proposals**

- 60% of residents who completed the survey said that they had concerns about the proposals
- 56% of family members who completed the survey said that they had concerns about the proposals
- Concerns about the proposals centred on questions of whether the quality of care would be maintained, how this would be monitored and whether familiar staff would leave the service.
- 7 out of 8 staff surveyed could see no advantage in the proposal for them and expressed considerable concern about whether their jobs and Terms & Conditions would be maintained.

### **Staff, residents and some family members suggested ways in which savings could be made through changes to the in-house service**

- 7 out of 9 staff suggested ways in which financial savings could be made within the existing service, though more flexible contracts, alterations to shift patterns and changes to night provision
- In discussion groups and written submissions, residents and family members raised questions about why LBC could not reduce the cost of the in-house service.



## 5. Survey Findings

### Staff

Ten staff members out of a total of fifty five completed the questionnaire. When asked whether the Extra Scheme currently met the needs of residents, 44% of staff answered 'yes completely', whilst 44% answered 'partially' and 11% answered 'no not at all.' Staff raised concerns about the number of agency staff impacting negatively on the continuity and quality of care.

When asked about the care that Extra care residents currently receive, staff suggested that there were occasions where individual care plans did not accurately reflect clients' needs, with the result that carers felt rushed when delivering care to individuals.

*"We really need the care plans to give us enough time to do our work"*

When asked how the service could be improved, some staff reflected that they would wish to have more time with individual clients, as sometimes the care package did not best reflect the needs of the client.

*"Allow more commissioned time where possible."*

Some staff mentioned the opportunity for greater supervision.

*"More staff supervision to ensure consistent care is delivered."*

The questionnaire asked staff to suggest any concerns that they might have about the proposal to go out to tender for the onsite care contract. Care staff raised questions about whether jobs would be protected and whether terms and conditions would be maintained. Staff also raised concerns about whether the quality of care provided or the time spent with individual clients might be negatively impacted, and asked how a commissioned service would be monitored.

Of the eight staff who responded to the question 'what advantages could there be to you and your employment if this proposal went ahead?' seven staff answered that they could not see any advantages to the change.

When asked for suggestions for a different way to deliver the service whilst making savings, nine staff responded, with four of these suggesting changes to rostering arrangements that could reduce downtime:

*"Flexible contracts to get rid of downtime and so eliminate the use for agency – some carers have consistently one call in the morning while agency still working when not needed."*

*"I feel the number of staff per shift could be revised and staff given more work to carry out in the same amount of time they currently work."*

*"If management can cut the cost of agency by reducing the number of agency staff we use and also reducing the hours given to agency staff, if the company needed to use agency and allow staff to do overtime but short hours, e.g. 7-1 can be reduced to 7-11."*

*“Re-organise night shifts to include sleeping hours.”*

## Residents

69 residents completed a questionnaire, representing a 27% response rate. Of those who responded, 33% received planned care from an onsite carer only, 19% received care from another source (i.e. external carers or relatives); 32% received care from a mix of the onsite care team and another source, and 16% were not in receipt of planned care.

When asked if they completely understood the proposal, 49% of respondents answered ‘yes completely’, 41% answered ‘partially’, 6% answered ‘no, not at all’ and 4% answered ‘unsure’.

When asked ‘How do you feel this proposal would impact on you as an Extra Care resident?’, 56 residents responded. Just under 50% of respondents answered that they thought this would impact on negatively, with around 40% unsure as to how it would affect them. Only around 5% of residents thought that this would be a positive change.

When asked if they had any concerns about the proposal, 60% of respondents answered that they had concerns, whilst around 30% said that they did not have concerns. The responses to this question are broken down by scheme in the chart below:

Do you have concerns about the proposal	Abigail	Applegrove	Colwell	Betty Dodd	Jill Jenkins	Total
% questionnaire respondents answering this question	85%	100%	92%	90%	77%	90%
I have concerns about the proposal	64%	76%	73%	22%	60%	63%
I do not have concerns about the proposal	36%	19%	18%	67%	40%	32%
I am unsure of the question	0%	5%	9%	11%	0%	5%

For some residents, concerns were related to negative experiences of care provided by private providers that they have had in the past:

*‘Yes because I have had agency in the past and was continually let down.’*

The concerns expressed by residents primarily centred on the possibility of losing familiar staff through the change and fears about a decline in the quality of care that was provided:

*‘I may lose the regular carers and get ones that do not know me so also lose personal relationships.’*

*‘I wouldn’t like our carers to go. The carers here are trained properly and they do their job properly.’*

*‘We have got to know staff and would prefer them to stay or TUPE over, we trust and get on well with them.’*

Some residents expressed that they were not concerned about the changes, so as long as the quality of the care was maintained:

*‘No – as long as the care remains consistent’*

*‘No – as long as they are being monitored.’*

The level of concern about the proposal was broadly consistent across the different sites, though notably lower among residents of Betty Dodd Court:

When asked about the potential for improvements to be made to the current personal care service, the majority of respondents suggested that they were happy with the existing service.

A few residents touched on the amount of time spent with carers and the social life in the scheme as areas where they would like to see improvements:

*'More carers to be able to move people about – to take them for a walk for example.'*

*'Every night you're in with your telly. We don't have anything going on here.'*

### **Family Members**

60 questionnaires were submitted from family members, which represents a 24% response rate.

When asked 'do you feel the care provided at the Extra Care Scheme currently meets the individual needs of your family member?' 62% of respondents answered 'yes completely' whilst 29% answered 'yes partially.' Although almost 30% of respondents said that the existing care only partially met their family members' needs, the comments identified that any deficiencies in the current service tended to be relatively minor:

*'There are minor issues that could be resolved by clear service level agreements e.g. not being able to change light bulbs. Not clearing plates after lunch.'*

When asked 'Is there anything further that the service could provide to better meet the needs of your family member?' 46% of respondents answered that there was not, whilst 42% provided suggestions of ways in which the service could better meet the needs of their family member. These suggestions centred primarily on small changes to the carers remit or on reducing the number of agency staff who work onsite:

*'I would like the carer to get my mum to take her tablets in the morning. No check is done about her medication.'*

*'taking them for a short walk – just around the building for exercise.'*

*'Provide care from in house and not via external agencies.'*

Family members were asked to comment specifically about the help that the support that their relative received in maintaining a good support network. 72% of respondents felt that there was a good level of social activities in the scheme (with 17% responding that there was an insufficient level, and 10% unsure), but a number of respondents also suggested that carers could provide more help in enabling residents to access social activities:

*'encouraging them to attend occasional social activities – she would need assistance to attend.'*

*'Yes involve my disabled mother in the social activities in [name of scheme] rather than leaving her in her room all day.'*

*'The only activities are bingo and nothing much else. I would like more to be organised.'*

When asked 'Please tell us about any concerns you may have about the proposal for the onsite care at all five Extra Care sites?', 56% of the 41 respondents expressed concerns about the proposal, with 21% stating that they had no concerns and 13% unsure.

The concerns expressed by family members were that this proposed change could be disruptive for residents, particularly if continuity of the care team was affected:

*'Elderly people find change difficult – my mum finds it difficult to remember carers if there are too many.'*

*'Too much change could be difficult for residents to adapt to. Familiar faces are more reassuring. Too many different faces cane be upsetting to some residents.'*

Concerns were also raised about whether the 24/7 service would remain and whether the onsite care team would be consistent:

*'Is 24 hour call out still in operation?'*

*'We are concerned that the carers who are on site now who know what the needs of my father are would be replaced by other carers who are not permanent staff at Applegrove.'*

Respondents were concerned that the quality of care provided would suffer as a result of the proposal, and were concerned that the level of care might be compromised for the sake of cost:

*'From the factsheet, it appears to be a cost cutting exercise. I hope that quality of care is not put below the need to cut costs – don't go for the cheapest option.'*

Some respondents also raised questions about how a tendered service would be monitored:

*'What monitoring of service will be put in place (assuming there could be a change in provider)? Will there be a service level agreement?'*

## 6. Findings from discussions and other written submissions

It was primarily stakeholders from LBC-staffed sites who participated in the consultation through one-to-one discussions and written submissions. The key themes which emerged from these discussions are detailed below.

- The vast majority of residents expressed satisfaction with the personal care currently provided by LBC care staff.
- Any recommendations for improvement centred on clarifying the responsibilities of carers in regard to certain tasks, so that residents were clear about which activities were part of carers' remits and how Health and Safety practices were applied.
- A number of residents or their families/representatives could not understand how cost savings could be achieved by another provider and not by Luton Borough Council.
- Some families/representatives of clients suggest that working practices could be reviewed to deliver savings, particularly with regard to downtime:

*"We can see that there are periods during the day when the in house resource is not fully utilised, but it should not be beyond the capabilities of management to review and resolve this."*

- Some residents/family members raised the issue of agency staff delivering care, in instances where sufficient cover could not be provided by LBC staff. These individuals said that they felt that agency staff delivered a lower quality of care than LBC care staff.
- A number of residents and family members expressed concern that the quality of care might deteriorate with a move to a new provider.
- A number of those who participated in discussion groups raised questions about how a care service provided by a third party provider would be monitored to ensure that quality was maintained.