

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Cabinet
DATE:	20 th September, 2021
SUBJECT:	Adult Social Care Provider Services
CHIEF OFFICER:	Alan Sinclair
CONTACT OFFICER:	Marc Gadsby
WARDS(S):	All
PORTFOLIO:	Councillor Natasa Pantelic, Cabinet Member for Social Care and Public Health
KEY DECISION:	Yes
EXEMPT:	No
DECISION SUBJECT TO CALL IN:	Yes
APPENDICES:	Consultation Summary

1. Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out recommendations to Cabinet regarding the continued delivery of Adults Social Care, in-house provider services. The report highlights feedback from a recent public consultation and rationale regarding the preferred option. Cabinet decision is required regarding progression of the recommendations.

Recommendations

- 1 To close the following Provider Services currently operated by the Council:
 - Lavender Court
 - Respond (short-term breaks service)
 - Priors Day Service
 - Phoenix Day Service
 - The Pines Day Service

- 2
 - a) To review the needs and aspirations of all people who use the services currently. To identify alternative options, building on people's strengths, across the provider market and through direct payments.
 - b) Deliver flexible and more personalised support, relying less on providing activities or services that are based at the day centres.
 - c) To promote individual choice and independence through accessing services that are being delivered by charities, community groups and other organisations in the voluntary and independent sector.

- 3 To delegate the implementation of these recommendations to the Executive Director of People (Adults), in consultation with the lead member for social care and public health.

2. Rationale

Slough Borough Council (SBC) is committed to ensuring the public money we spend and the resources available, are used in the most efficient and effective way to meet the needs of the most vulnerable people within our community.

As a department, Adult Social Care must balance the statutory duties it has with supporting the council to deliver its financial strategy over the coming months and years. We are proposing a change to our few remaining provider services, as outlined in the recommendations above. The proposed strategy for Adult Social Care is to move away from being the direct provider of services and focus on strategic commissioning to meet the needs of all local people. We are proposing to rely less on day centres and other building based services to meet assessed needs of residents and explore other ways to meet them. These may include:

- accessing activities or services run by other providers including local community groups and charities
- using personal assistants
- using direct payments
- accessing other support networks

This does not mean that the Council will stop meeting the needs of vulnerable people and their families, moreover we will work with people and partners to identify alternatives which may include some new relationships with new and existing providers.

A public consultation ran from Monday 5 July through to Friday 6 August 2021 to ask those with an interest in the services affected, what their views were regarding Slough Borough Council no longer being a direct provider of Adult Social Care Services. As part of this process, we undertook a range of engagement activities to hear from people who access these or similar services delivered by other organisations, as well as families, carers, professionals and wider networks.

The following three options were initially considered as part of this review:

Option 1: Reopen the services that were closed during the pandemic and operating them in the same way as they were pre-pandemic. Continue to provide the services that have not been closed with no changes.

Option 2: Move away from being a direct provider of care for long and short-term residential provision, day care and to commission alternatives to meet peoples needs.

Option 3: Re-model and operate a significantly reduced provider services offer.

Option 1 and 3 were discounted and not progressed as part of the review as the councils ambition of delivering more personalised services to meet peoples needs and delivering value for money would not be achieved.

It is also important to note that upon approval of the recommendations made above, Slough Borough Council will work with other providers to identify other service options.

Slough Borough Council no longer operating a provider service function does not mean that people will not have options to access other services, new or existing.

3. Introduction

The proposed action will support the delivery of Outcome 2 of the Five-Year Plan: *'Our people will be healthier and manage their own care needs'*.

The council is taking steps to transform public health and wellbeing, focusing on intervention and prevention built on a strength-based approach. We work to identify an individual's 'strengths', abilities, skills, knowledge and potential as well as their social and community networks, that will help or enable the individual to deal with challenges in life and meet their needs to achieve their desired outcomes. The Care Act (2014) underpins this approach by requiring our Adult Social Care department to consider the person's own capabilities and support available from their wider network or within the community that would help the person, alongside the provision of care and support, to meet the outcomes they want to achieve.

We believe that all adults should have a good quality of life.

We believe that by listening, understanding, designing services together and working without judgement, we can achieve good outcomes for those that need our support.

We believe that this does not have to be delivered within a council operated building.

4. Backgrounds

We are considering the future of services that are currently run by the Council, for older people and people with learning disabilities. This includes:

- **Day services for people with a learning disability and/or autism**, offering social activities as part of assessed needs (Priors Day Service & Phoenix Day Service)
- **Day services for older People** offering social activities as part of assessed needs (The Pines)
- **Residential service for people with a learning disability/autism** (Lavender Court)
- **Short-term breaks service** (Respond)

There are 107 people currently registered to use these services and 61 posts affected which are a mixture of full and part-time posts.

There has been a lot of disruption to services due to the COVID-19 pandemic: people have changed the way in which they access community activities and have experienced changes in the way that support is received. For Slough Borough Council, in line with government guidelines, this meant we closed our building-based day centres and limited the access to Lavender Court. We also trialed new ways of working, including covid-bubbles and on-line events. The services provided at Respond have been closed pending completion of building works.

Other organisations have been offering similar alternatives, to ensure that people continue to receive support in these challenging times. These changes, alongside the Council's Adult Social Care Transformation Programme, have been a driver for us to reflect on how we meet the needs of people using services, and re-evaluate how we offer these types of services, including to consider if we are best placed to be a direct provider of services.

There are many providers of services relevant to this review across Slough. A key part of this re-evaluation has been to understand where we can improve and offer the best range of options and relevant choices that build on people's strengths.

We undertook a public consultation engagement activity and invited people to tell us their thoughts directly, or through their families, carers or professional support. We also completed a review of the market to understand alternative options available currently and where opportunities may exist for the development of new offers with providers.

5. Consultation

We asked people with a potential interest in SBC Provider Services to share their views regarding the options for provider services. This consultation took place prior to any recommendations being presented to Cabinet for decision. To support people to take part in this process, a consultation page was established, 3 on-line surveys were constructed, and a consultation mailbox set up. Easy read surveys were circulated alongside information about the consultation, to people who use services. Telephone calls at different stages during the consultation period were made to all customers and 4 facilitated focus groups were established supported by advocacy. A staff briefing took place 2 weeks before go live and there has been engagement with trade unions through GMB and Unison.

55 People responded to the Online Surveys
31 people signed up for Focus Groups – 18 attended
2 people used the PSPC mailbox
1 Person telephoned the AD directly

Additionally 803 people responded to an e-petition entitled 'Abandon planned closure of day centres'.

The e-petition makes the following statement:

'The day service and short break service centres are vital for people with learning disabilities and autism. They provide social interactions, fun, learning, safety and stability in a way which cannot be replaced by the alternative arrangements the council proposes. There is no other adequate place in Slough for people with learning disabilities and autism. The parents and carers of service users care for the disadvantaged people with disabilities often for their entire life. Closing down the reliable day care offered by the day centres and replacing it with often inadequate alternatives will simply create massive problems for people who are already on the edge of mental breakdown following the long period of closure due to Covid.'

A total of 892 people have shared a view regarding the proposal to close Adult Social Care Provider Services.

The detail from the consultation is attached as Appendix 1 however some key themes are highlighted below:

- Direct Payments don't work for everyone
- A building base is important for some
- Carers need a break
- A day centre environment provides confidence around safety
- People enjoy socialising
- A range of different activities are enjoyed by different people

- People think that services need to be available now
- Communication needs to be better
- More alternatives are required locally
- There are problems with transport
- Lack of equipment such as hoists
- Limits on Personal Assistant support

Our view is that the above outcomes can be achieved in ways other than SBC directly delivering services. Following a re-assessment of need, each person will be supported to build a support plan. This may involve working with existing providers, or shaping new ideas for service development. It may involve groups of people coming together to combine their resources to design a personalised solution to meet common outcomes. SBC will continue to work with service users and their families to identify ways to meet their needs.

6. Market Analysis – Day Opportunities

To better understand the alternative options available to Slough residents, should any changes be made to Day Services, a review was undertaken to gather knowledge from colleagues, an internet search of various websites as well as contact made with several partners within the voluntary and community sector. Alternatives identified include charities, community interest companies, locally ran groups as well private enterprises, who can provide personalised support for individuals to access community activities that they are interested in alongside other service offers such as supported living or homecare.

Of the alternatives, 14 are building based and provide either sessional activities or are available for a whole day. 2 of these are specifically for people with learning disabilities, 9 for older people, 1 for people with an Acquired Brain Injury, 1 for people with dementia and 2 for adults with additional needs. Many of the buildings being used are existing community assets such as local community centres. Those opportunities that are non-building based involve accessing other community resources, led by individual interests, such as Autism Berkshire who will meet for social events at a range of venues.

Across the different client groups, most opportunities are focused on providing meaningful activities that promote social interaction and positive wellbeing. For all client groups this includes activities such as crafting, physical exercise and trips out into the community. For people with learning disabilities there is a blend of activities that promote wellbeing and support the development of independent living skills, whilst for older people and those with dementia the focus is much more to wellbeing. There are 2 opportunities, Friendly Bombs Theatre Company and South Buckinghamshire Riding for the Disabled that have a very focused offer.

There are 5 services offering support with employment opportunities for people with Mental Health issues or a Learning Disability. This can include practical preparation such as CV writing or searching for volunteering, work experience or paid for roles. Other support can include linking with employers to identify opportunities and to check that an individual is succeeding.

Client Group	Outcomes / Focus	Service Name	Total Services
Learning Disabilities	Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slough Employability • The Light UK • Graft (Thames Valley) • Comfort Care Slough (specialist employment worker) • Compass Slough 	16
	Wellbeing (built around a range of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parvaaz Project • Slough Crossroads • The Light UK • Step Together • Voyage Care - Community Support Hub London West • Mencap • Kharis Care • Promise Inclusion • Jump In • South Buckinghamshire Riding for the Disabled • Friendly Bombs Theatre Company • Autism Berkshire • Compass Slough 	
	Independent living skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parvaaz Project • Mencap • Slough Crossroads • The Light UK • Step Together • Comfort Care Slough • Voyage Care Community Support Hub London West • Kharis Care • Promise Inclusion 	
Older people	Wellbeing (built around a range of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age Concern Windsor (Spencer Denney Centre) • Age Concern Slough and Berkshire East Day Centre • Age Concern Slough and Berkshire Befriending • Age UK Befriending • Age UK Activities • Manor Park Centre • Ascot District Day Centre • All Saints Lunch Club • Ujala Foundation • New Langley Community Association 	20

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slough Senior Citizens Group • Recycled Teenagers • Men's Matter • Rise and Shine • Pakistan Welfare Association Slough • Langley Coffee Group • Slough Crossroads • Kharis Care • Movers and Shakers • Burnham Lodge 	
Dementia	Wellbeing (built around a range of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alzheimers Dementia Support • Alzheimers Society • Age UK Dementia Support • Slough Crossroads 	4
Acquired Brain Injury	Wellbeing (built around a range of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headway South Bucks 	1
	Independent Living Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headway South Bucks 	
Mental Health	Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Light UK • Graft (Thames Valley) • Slough Employability • Comfort Care (specialist employment worker) • Compass Slough 	9
	Wellbeing (built around a range of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends in Need (East Berkshire) • MIND Community Connectors (Registered GP dependent) • Comfort Care Slough • The Light UK • Slough Crossroads • Compass Slough • Voyage Care Community Support Hub London West 	
	Independent Living Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slough Crossroads • The Light UK • Comfort Care Slough • Voyage Care Community Support Hub London West 	

Alongside the opportunities identified above, Slough Borough Council's Community Development Team have a directory of 60 + other local projects, charities and initiatives which are provided either in outdoor spaces or in local settings such as the Windmill Resource Centre, Wexham Bowls Club and the Chinese Oriental Community Association.

Slough Community Transport also offer transport to a range of activities and locations for all client groups.

For those individuals who use a Direct Payment to purchase their own support, there are a number of introductory agencies that will provide a matching service to find a suitable PA, based on the individual's needs and preferences. These include Trust on Tap, Seakr and Curam Care. Slough Borough Council will also provide support to advertise for PAs as well as guidance on becoming an employer. Enham Trust are also available to support individuals who require help in managing their direct payment.

7. Alternative accommodation options

For the 7 residents of Lavender Court a number of options will be explored dependent on the outcome of their Care Act assessment and individual desired outcomes.

Considerations:

1. Find suitable alternative residential placements through brokerage or the Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS)
2. Find suitable supported living placements through the DPS or brokerage
3. Find suitable accommodation or accommodation that can be developed in Slough and tender for the care/support needs separately

8. Alternative replacement care opportunities

Whilst the Respond service building has been under refurbishment and during the Covid-19 pandemic a block contract arrangement was entered into with Kharis Care. This provision included a 3-bed property located in Reading. As part of the analysis of alternative day opportunities, alternatives for replacement care were also identified. 5 services were identified with a local community-based offer, 4 of which offered respite across the different client groups and one which was focused on those individual's living with dementia.

Client group	Service Name	Total Services
Learning Disabilities / Mental Health / Older people and Dementia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slough Crossroads • Kharis Care • Better Life Care • Macademia Support 	5
Dementia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alzheimers Dementia Support 	

9. Covid-19 and the impact on support services

During the pandemic, services and community groups adapted in order to continue providing a source of connection and a range of activities, often using online platforms such as Zoom or Teams. Some organisations and groups completely re-designed their offer to meet the priority need at that time, for example, ensuring that vulnerable residents had access to food and medication. As restrictions are lifting, services and community groups are still adapting to the new ways of working and developing their offer, something which the Community Development Team and members of the Slough Council for Voluntary Services reported.

10. Implications of the Recommendation

10.1 Financial implications

The current cost of the Provider services are as follows:

Service	Service Type	Service Users	Actual Service Cost 20/21 (£000's)	Service Budget 20/21 (£000's)
Lavender Court	Residential (respite)	7 (+19 respite clients – 284 nights per year)	901.3	787.1
Learning Disabilities Day	Day Services	57	970.8	1,090
Older People Day Opportunities	Day Services	24	281.3	452.3
Total		88 (107)	2,150	2,330

In 20/21 the budget for all Provider Services was £2.33m, with a previous project to develop savings within day services only proposed to reduce the budget by £150k in 21/22 and a further £350k in 22/23. Although this proposition will supersede those savings, the £150k has already been removed from the 21/22 budget. Therefore, to estimate total savings, the 20/21 budget will be utilised.

The pandemic has impacted significantly on the way that services have been delivered over the past year, whilst building based day services have been closed. Individuals that were previously accessing the building-based provision have had their needs met through alternative support offers.

It is therefore assumed that following a reassessment several people will continue to be supported in the way that they have been over the past year, and that only 75% will wish to return to some form of day opportunity.

To model this, the current cost of provision purchased from the external market, £160.11 per week for people with a learning disability and £123.06 for older people, has been used, however, consideration could also be given upon undertaking reassessments to the provision of shared lives and Personal Assistants to ensure people are able to have their needs met in the way that provides the greatest choice, control, and independence.

There are 7 people living within residential care with a primary support need of Learning Disabilities. The current service cost of £901k per year gives an individual service cost of £2,476 a week. This is significantly above the cost in the external market both in Slough and surrounding areas. All individuals will require a full reassessment to determine the type of provision that will best meet their needs and whether they have formed natural friendships with other residents and would like to continue to live with them. Until this person-centred planning has been undertaken it is not possible to determine the best provision to meet needs so a prudent figure at £1600 average has

been used which aligns to the average cost of residential care for this client group within RBWM but is below the current Slough external market rate of £1,800 to reflect the ambition of achieving comparable target costs.

In addition to the 7 residential clients, there are also 19 respite clients who received 284 nights per year, prior to the pandemic impacting services. The cost of the total combined weekly cost of respite is £1,976, which equates to £102.8k per year. This money will be utilised to recommission a respite provision to replace the 284 nights per year.

The estimated new cost of delivering services is detailed in the table below.

Service	Number of Service Users	Average Weekly Cost (£)	Total Weekly Cost (£)	Annual Cost (£000's)
LD Residential Care	7	1,600	11,200	582.4
Respite Care	19	104	1,976	102.8
LD Day Opportunities	43	160.11	7,205	374.7
OP Day Opportunities	18	123.06	2,215	115.2
Total	87			1,175.10

The comparison of the 20/21 budget to the new estimated service cost is detailed in the table below. The full year saving is estimated to be £1.153m.

Service	Actual Service Budget 20/21	New Estimated Annual Cost (000's)	Variance (000's)
LD Residential Care & Respite Care	787.10	685.2	101.9
LD Day Opportunities	1,090	374.70	715
OP Day Opportunities	452.30	115.20	337
Total	2,329	1,175.10	1,153.9

The saving is due to impact in January 2022, which would mean that 3 months savings would be achieved in 21/22, with the remainder of the full year saving in 22/23. However, the cost of transport services has not been included in the 21/22 saving, as the contract can't be amended until the new financial year.

Therefore, the savings profile is shown below:

Savings Profile	21/22 (£000's)	22/23 (£000's)
Provider Services	250,975	902,925

An additional one off cost will be required to support the delivery of the care assessments for all current users. This approximate cost of £67,000 will be provided by the transformation fund allocated to the Adult Social Care Transformation Programme.

10.2 Legal implications

The Council has a statutory duty to meet eligible needs assessed under the Care Act 2014, and whilst day care provision provided directly by the council has been used to meet needs, it is not in itself a prescribed statutory service. Where a person has identified eligible care needs and provision of day services is assessed as necessary to meet that eligible need, the Council will calculate a personal budget that will meet the market rate for provision of that service and can offer a direct payment where appropriate, but can be commissioned on the service user's behalf where a direct payment is not appropriate.

Current service users of SBC's Provider Services will each have an individual reassessment to ascertain their eligible needs. The resource required to undertake these reassessments is currently going through the procurement process with a view to undertaking this work as soon as possible.

In Section 10.27 of the Care Act, the guidance states that in determining how to meet needs, the local authority may also take into reasonable consideration its own finances and budgetary position and must comply with its related public law duties. This includes the importance of ensuring that the funding available to the local authority is sufficient to meet the needs of the entire local population. The local authority may reasonably consider how to balance that requirement with the duty to meet the eligible needs of an individual in determining how an individual's needs should be met (but not whether those needs are met). However, the local authority should not set arbitrary upper limits on the costs it is willing to pay to meet needs through certain routes – doing so would not deliver an approach that is person-centred or compatible with public law principles. The authority may take decisions on a case-by-case basis which weigh up the total costs of different potential options for meeting needs and include the cost as a relevant factor in deciding between suitable alternative options for meeting needs. This does not mean choosing the cheapest option; but the one which delivers the outcomes desired for the best value.

The Council has a duty under s149 of the Equality Act 2010 to in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

10.3 Risk management implications

Risk Item	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation	Impact	Likelihood	Notes
Failure to achieve savings	4	3	The timeline of the programme has been carefully planned to line up with Cabinet approval dates. Savings forecast has been calculated by P2, who reviewed market prices for comparable offers.	4	2	Regular project meetings have included representation from LA Commissioners who have undertaken recent market analysis
Alternative options fail to meet need	4	3	Market analysis identified 40 potential alternatives and the LA is keen to support the development of further offers that are co-produced with users	4	2	Re-assessment of need for all customers affected by this change will be undertaken so that we understand the most up to date needs presentation
Challenge of Council's decision prevents service closure	4	2	There are a group of people who are unhappy with the proposal to close Provider Services however there is no duty to provide services directly. The LA must provide sufficient resource to meet assessed need that this can be achieved in a range of ways	4	1	People affected by the proposal have been advised at a formative stage via a number of communication methods
Appointment of Commissioners changes proposal	3	2	Should Commissioners be appointed to manage SBC expenditure, it is understood that this proposal represents a significant efficiency based on a model utilised by a number of other Local Authorities previously. Current risk score reflects assumption that Commissioners would view this as an appropriate action to take given current financial circumstances	3	1	Continued work with P2 and recently appointed S151 Officer and team to demonstrate value and feasibility of this proposal
Insufficient resource to meet future demand	4	3	There is a risk that there will be insufficient capacity in the market to support Slough well into the future. This is not limited to Provider Services. This workstream has undertaken market analysis which has already prompted some providers to want to commence service development conversations	4	3	Development of more joined up Transitions process helps the authority to forecast future demand
Safeguarding alerts rise in number	3	2	Many customers have not been accessing services referenced here for over a year so this is unlikely	3	2	Working together to meet need going forward should reduce the probability of need not being met. Consultation feedback suggests that in some circumstances interim Direct Payment arrangements have not enabled all outcomes to be met.
Removal of Provider Services destabilises market	4	2	The opposite is likely to happen. More demand represents more opportunity for service development. There exists good opportunity for alternative providers to obtain a market share	4	2	Engagement with providers and wider market continues through our commissioning relationships
Reduction in Commissioning Team capacity limits market development activity	3	3	There is a risk associated with a key member of the team moving on however other colleagues are cited	3	2	We have the benefit of Peopletoo's continued engagement through the implementation of the ASC Transformation Programme

10.4 Environmental implications

None apart from potential carbon reduction by ceasing use of these buildings.

10.5 Equality implications

Assessing the impact on Service Users of not delivering Provider Services

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Considering the above information and evidence, describe the impact this proposal will have on the following groups?
Age (All age groups)	Opportunity to personalise support offer and focus on outcomes with Older People	<p>Some older service users who have used a Council Services for a number of years may not want change.</p> <p>Risk of less opportunity for people of the same age to come together and share experiences.</p>	Proportionately less older people are impacted by the proposal.	<p>The age profile across Provider Services differs on the basis of service type</p> <p>24 People 65+ – OP Day Care 57 People 18+ – LD Day Care 7 People 18+ – Residential 19 People – 18+ Respite</p> <p>Whilst representing only a small section of the total number of people supported by SBC, the proposal has implications for commissioned day support and the future redesign of support services across the wider market.</p> <p>More people with Learning Disability will be impacted by the change, given the profile described above. Changing the model will mean potential change to how services are arranged for everyone going forward</p> <p>The current model enables people of a similar age to spend time together. This may shift as a more outcome focused approach is introduced.</p> <p>The National picture suggests that a traditional day centre model is an increasingly less attractive option for adults of working age coming into adult social care for the first time.</p> <p>Older members may have a preference for traditional building-based day services and could find not re-opening the centre difficult.</p>

				<p>Co-production of future outcome focus is an important feature when planning options with users of all Provider Services impacted by this proposal.</p>
<p>Disability (Physical, learning difficulties, mental health and medical conditions)</p>	<p>Opportunity to personalise support offer and focus on outcomes with People with Learning Disability</p> <p>Opportunity to reduce disability discrimination and increase accessibility.</p>	<p>Risk of less opportunity for people with disabilities to come together and share experiences.</p> <p>Risk that a lack of accessible community facilities, disability discrimination and stigma will prevent people with disabilities making full use wider community offers</p> <p>Some service users who have lived in a Council Services for a number of years may not want change.</p> <p>Risk that people with communication needs</p>	<p>The proposed changes may have a greater impact on the cohort of working age people with disabilities on the basis that this group is larger</p>	<p>There is a mixture of people who use SBC Provider Services. Some people are over the age of 65 and may have some age related needs. Others have Learning and/or Physical disabilities.</p> <p>The proposal could have an impact on people with a disability in the following ways:</p> <p>Not operating Provider Services will mean change to how services are arranged for people with a disability. The current model enables people with similar experiences based on disability or mental health issue to spend time together. Moving to a model that offers a variety of alternative providers, may impact who people spend time with.</p> <p>There is a risk that older people and people with a disability struggle to identify alternative, accessible facilities and transport. This includes a lack of accessible toilets and accessibility issues on public transport.</p> <p>Some people may have communication needs arising from their disability that makes this proposal difficult to engage with. The consultation document includes actions to address this. Advocacy, Focus Groups, Easy Read and proposal that the consultation be discussed at review meetings between adult social care practitioners and service users.</p> <p>The alternatives to Provider Services can be shaped as a result of consultation with people with disabilities and older people, providing an opportunity to shape support around what people with a disability who have social care needs want.</p>

		arising from disability will have difficulty engaging with the proposal.		
Sex		Risk of an increased burden being placed on unpaid carers – a group where women are overrepresented.		<p>There are no sex-specific services. The picture for all in-house and commissioned services is mixed.</p> <p>Carers are more likely to women. Day support often fulfils a dual function of both meeting the needs of a service user and providing carers with a break. There is a risk that the new model might result in changes to care packages that put an increased burden on unpaid carers. This can be mitigated against by offering carer needs assessment at the same time as planned reviews, so that both carer and service users needs can addressed holistically.</p>
Gender reassignment	Opportunity to access a wider range of support that needs individual needs.	Risk that transphobia and stigma will prevent people of different genders making full use of community options		<p>Information on this is collected as part of assessment and care planning.</p> <p>The proposal is intended to provide people with more choice and ability to access community facilities.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership				<p>Information on this is collected as part of assessment and care and support planning.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative or positive impact as it relates to this characteristic.</p>
Religion or philosophical belief	Increased opportunity for people of different faiths to	Risk that alternative provision is not inclusive for people of		<p>Information on this is collected as part of assessment and care and support planning.</p> <p>The proposal could have an impact on people of different religions or beliefs in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is a risk that people with dietary requirements arising from their faith or belief (e.g.Halal) will not be able to identify alternative provision if they do not provide appropriate

	come together.	different faiths.		<p>food choices. Space to practice faith based activities, such as prayer, may also need to be considered</p> <p>ii. Future options should provide people of different faiths and beliefs opportunity to meet needs in this area in a personalised way.</p>
Race	Increased opportunity for people of different ethnicities to come together.	Risk of language barriers being an issue in alternative provision		<p>From what we know about people using Provider Services there is a strong interest from all users to mix with other people. The race of people mixed with, has to date no presented a specific issue. The risk presented by language barriers could be addressed by ensuring that there are staff who speak community languages who can help facilitate communication.</p>
Sexual orientation	Opportunity to access a wider range of support that needs individual needs.	Risk that homophobia could prevent people of different sexual orientations making full use of a community facilities,		<p>Information on this can collected as part of assessment and care planning.</p> <p>The proposal is intended to provide people with more choice and ability to access community facilities. For example, no specific LGBT+ groups are run at day support services at present, and the new proposal may support people who want to, to access this elsewhere.</p>
Pregnancy and maternity				<p>No service users of Providers Services are pregnant or on maternity leave. Given the age profile described earlier and nature of disability, this is unlikely to change for the majority of service users.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative or positive impact on this characteristic.</p>

Other				
Socio-economic				<p>It is not anticipated that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative or positive impact on this. All community provision for adults with support needs under the Care Act (2014) is subject to financial assessment, in line with the Charging Policy in adult social care.</p>

Parents/ Carers				<p>Closing some Provider Services, and not opening others does potentially have an impact on unpaid carers and it will be essential to ensure that individuals needs continue to be met and continued support provided to carers to enable them to continue in their role.</p>
People with different Gender Identities e.g. Gender fluid, Non-Binary etc				<p>It is not anticipated that the proposal will have a disproportionately negative or positive impact as it relates to gender identities.</p>

10.6 Procurement implications

After the care assessments have been completed any procurement activity required will follow all appropriate procurement regulations.

10.7 Workforce implications

The recommendations proposed will have an impact on the current workforce.

The current workforce includes a mixture of full time and part time contracts, across a structure of 61 posts, ranging from level 3 to 8.

If the recommendations are accepted it is possible that up to 61 posts will be redundant, in which case, the proposed considerations for any subsequent workforce implications are:

- First point of consideration would be to redeploy staff through a skills analysis to ascertain transferable skills to roles where skills are considered to be similar. This could then be utilised to review the existing range of relevant vacant posts across the council. For example, Early Years have high vacancies and turnover of staff. This could be explored to ascertain if day centre staff could fulfil these vacant roles; supporting with training and education where this transfer of skills is feasible. Any new posts introduced to manage a new way of operating will also be included in this skills review.
- Second point of consideration, for those staff for whom training is not feasible, would be to review all vacant posts across the council and consider trials in suitable alternative roles, in line with council redeployment guidance.
- Final consideration would be to consider redundancy in line with the council management of organisational change. There may also be some staff who may be eligible to access their pension, if the above options are exhausted.

TUPE considerations:

If the council received proposals or a bid via Commissioning arrangements, this is an option, however at this early stage the council does not have this option to duplicate the kind of provision currently operated by SBC. As the alternative options for clients begin to scope, this as a potential consideration. At present, SBC is not looking for an alternative provider to run the services. The current proposals mean we are keen to move away from a more traditional day centre model.

10.8 Property implications

If the recommendations are agreed the buildings being used by these services will close and will be available for disposal or alternative use by the councils property services.

11. Background Papers

None