

Appendix 1: specific feedback about options for directly provided services for adults with complex needs

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Option 1: Maintain the status quo. The Council would continue to own and operate the complex needs service as is, without significant change.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of stakeholders commented that they felt this was a viable / highly desirable option as it would enable the continued delivery of a high-quality service to individuals with complex needs, with minimal disruption. A number of key stakeholder said “if it isn’t broke, then don’t fix it”. • The majority of key stakeholders commented the most critical factor is to maintain the current skilled and knowledgeable staff cohort. Subsequently, a number of respondents noted whilst this option granted job security, it was recognised there is an ageing staff cohort and there are currently recruitment and retention issues across the frontline of health and social care, with the cost for the provision of training is significantly increasing. • The majority of staff commented that they did not feel this service was used in a consistent manner across the county, noting they did not appear to have an equitable footing in the marketplace and visibility / awareness of the services was low, which made some ‘worry about the future’. In addition, a number went on to comment about the current ‘service charter’ not being accurate or representative of their services. • A number of key stakeholders commented that not all current buildings, equipment and resources were in a ‘fit state’ and would likely require significant financial investment. • A few key stakeholders commented that they felt not all current attendees were compatible in terms of communication and / or need – this could be impacted upon further by the design / layout of the building. • The majority of key stakeholders felt it would be positive for the Council to sustain a position in the marketplace. |
| <p>Option 2: increase capacity. The Council would continue to own and operate complex needs services and would increase capacity to accommodate up to 90 people who have complex needs.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of key stakeholders commented that they felt this would be a viable / desirable option as it would enable the continued delivery of a high-quality service to those who currently attend the service, and an increased number of individuals. • A number of key stakeholders commented that small services offer a more personalised experience and thus are concerned about services growing too large. The priority is to maintain the current quality of service and ensure compatibility of attendees. • A number of staff suggested either the operation of a number of ‘smaller services’ or using buildings that enabled smaller groups to operate independently of one another would be beneficial. A few carers noted that they would be concerned about the impact any level of change could have on their relative. • A number of key stakeholders commented this option would be positive in terms of future needs and demand. • As per option 1, the majority of key stakeholders commented on the current staff cohort and need to maintain them. This option would offer job security and increased employment opportunities, however the previous comments about recruitment and retention of appropriately skilled and trained staff remains prevalent when considering this option. A few key stakeholders queried if SCC has the desire and financial capacity to invest in increased staffing resources. • As per Option 1, there were concerns from staff about the visibility, utilisation and equity of the service in the marketplace remain prevalent – it would be critical to address this issue and revise of the current Service Charter for this option to be successful. • A number of key stakeholders commented that not all current buildings, including equipment and resources, were fit for purpose / would be able to accommodate increased number of attendees, thus potentially requiring a level of change. As |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>per Option 1, a few key stakeholders questioned whether the Council had alternative buildings that could be used and the financial capacity to invest further, as required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of key stakeholders felt it would be positive for SCC to both sustain and strengthen their position in the marketplace, particularly in respect of complex needs and in cases of crisis (including individual crisis and provider failure). |
| <p>Option 3: redesign and/or explore alternative delivery model. The Council would redesign the current complex needs services and consider alternative ways to deliver the service including Local Authority Trading Company, Community Interest Company, or Mutual Co-operative.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of key stakeholders commented that they felt this would be a viable option as it would enable the continued delivery of a high-quality service to people who currently attend, and potentially an increased number of individuals. A number of key stakeholders commented that small services offer a more personalised experienced and thus they may be concerned about services growing too large, with the priority being maintain the current quality of service and ensuring compatibility of attendees. As per option 2, the same suggestion about the use of smaller or portioned buildings and the impact of change on people who use services was made. A number of key stakeholders commented that this option would be positive in terms of future needs and demand. As per options 1 and 2, the majority of key stakeholders commented on the current staff cohort and need to maintain them; noting the positive impact on job security but concerns about recruitment and retention of skilled and trained staff. In addition, a number of staff queried the impact this would have their existing terms and conditions, noting that changes could impact negatively on staff morale. A number of key stakeholders commented that this option would likely effectively address previously iterated concerns about visibility and equity within the marketplace. If an LATC, the service might be able to join any contractual arrangement operated by the Council and 'bid' for new business. A number of key stakeholders commented that this option could consider a change in the operating hours, generating income, using alternative contractors for the provision of support services, development of a new service charter and give the service / staff greater autonomy, which would likely have a positive impact for users and carers. A number of key stakeholders commented that not all current buildings, including equipment and resources, were 'fit for purpose' / would be able to accommodate increased number of attendees, thus potentially requiring a level of change. There were questions about the availability of alternative buildings and the financial resources to invest, with some staff asking how the provision of buildings would work within an alternative delivery model. The majority of key stakeholders felt it would be positive for the Council to both sustain and strengthen their position in the market, particularly in respect of complex needs and in cases of a crisis (including individual crisis and provider failure). A few key stakeholders commented an alternative delivery model could generate further competition in the marketplace. A number of key stakeholders asked what a different way of delivering the services would mean for them i.e. LATC? So they could make a better informed decision. |
| <p>Option 4: decrease Capacity. The Council would continue to own and operate the complex needs services and decrease capacity to</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of key stakeholders commented they did not feel this option was viable / desirable, with a number noting they would actively challenge this option if implemented. A number of key stakeholders commented whilst this option would be beneficial for those who continued to receive the quality support from the current trained and skilled staff cohort, it would be highly detrimental to those who no longer continued to receive this support and 'short-sighted' in respect of future need. The majority of key stakeholders commented this would only provide job security for a number of staff and would likely |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>current staffing and attendee levels, as a minimum.</p> | <p>negatively impact on staff morale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of key stakeholders commented they felt this option would lead to the eventual closure of these services. • The majority of key stakeholders commented this option would likely lead to an increased number of crises, resulting in increased dependency on costly services. • A number of key stakeholders commented that whilst this may result in an immediate saving, it is likely expenditure would increase in the future in terms of individual care and support needs and a number of the existing 'overheads' would remain, including buildings and equipment. • A few key stakeholders commented this option would work well for people who prefer small settings; this could result in an increased personalised service offer. • A number of key stakeholders commented this would weaken SCC's position in the marketplace and increase reliance on the independent marketplace. |
| <p>Option 5: cease direct provision. The Council would cease to directly provide complex needs day services and would instead source these services from the independent market.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of key stakeholders commented this was their least favoured option, as it was neither viable or desirable, with the majority noting they would seek to challenge the implementation of this option. • The majority of key stakeholders commented this would negatively impact on both the health and wellbeing of the people attending services and their carers, with a few noting loss of these services would likely result in their relative being able to remain in the family home. • A number of key stakeholders commented should we undertake a 'like for like' exercise as per the previous Modernisation Programme, as per previous Cabinet papers submitted, SCC will likely incur increased expenditure. • A few key stakeholders noted when they had previously explored the independent marketplace to provide care and support to a person with complex needs, they had been unsuccessfully in finding a suitable option (due to complexity of need) and feared this would be experienced once again, with the independent marketplace not having the sufficient skillset and training. Some key stakeholders commented on their distrust of the independent marketplace. • A majority of key stakeholders commented this was 'short-sighted' both in respect of current and future needs / demand. • The majority of key stakeholder commented this would result in job losses, impacting on staff morale regardless of the 'reprovision' option explored. • A number of key stakeholders commented, SCC would no longer have a position in the marketplace which may negatively impact during times of crisis (both individual and in terms of the marketplace) due to a reduced number of options for consideration. |

