

## **Executive Summary**

---

A review of the sheltered housing schemes managed by Waverley Borough Council has identified various gaps in the quality and consistency of service.

The majority of the schemes are pleasant, and generous staffing levels are appreciated by the residents. There is a reasonable demand for all but one of the services, Rolston House, which suffers from poor maintenance and unpopular shared bathing facilities. The voids at Rolston House and empty former manager's accommodation are losing Waverley Borough Council significant income in lost rent.

Residents are generally satisfied with the service they receive, but this has to be judged on an out-dated level of expectation. The schemes are comparable to a service provided in the mid to late 1990's. Against the Quality Assessment Framework used by Supporting People, the services key commissioner, the service struggles to achieve many performance criteria.

Residents are not involved in the preparation and monitoring of services. There is a disquiet about the quality of some service contracts which are generally regarded as poor or provided in the spirit of 'keeping costs to an absolute minimum'.

Quality control needs to be improved in many areas to achieve a truly Flagship status service. The training records indicate little or no investment in staff, which may explain the lack of understanding around the performance criteria used to benchmark the service.

There is very little service user empowerment, low understanding of Safeguarding and Complaints and an apathy or misunderstanding of Health and Safety. Staff are not supervised properly, and most residents are unaware of whom senior management are.

Having said that, the Scheme Managers, Assistant Manager and domestic staff all genuinely believe they are going a good job, and while somewhat nervous of this review, have all cooperated and demonstrated an eagerness and willingness to contribute as fully as possible, and demonstrated their determine to develop and provide a Flagship quality service that Waverley Borough Council can be proud.

## **REPORT**

### **1.0 Brief**

On 27 February 2012, Angela Smithers, Head of Housing, ordered a full review of the Sheltered Housing Services provided by Waverley Borough Council, over an eight week period. The review looked at the quality of service, model of funding options, models of support offered, the voids and attractiveness of the services and appropriateness of the schemes in relation to their locality. In addition, the appearance of the schemes, maintenance issues and the empty manager's flats were also to be addressed.

Previous internal, external reports and reviews about the service and strategic direction of the commissioners, were collated and read as well as an informal tour of all eight schemes undertaken, meeting Scheme Managers and explaining the purpose of the review. Meetings

were held with both internal and external partners, commissioners and other key stakeholders including Surrey County Council, Supporting People (SP).

A mini review against the Quality Assessment Framework used by SP was undertaken at 5 schemes. Schemes were identified following initial observations and concerns raised by the Senior Housing Manager, Jane Mellard. The reviews identified a consistent series of strengths and areas for further development across the service. Domestic staff were interviewed and their views on the service taken into account. Residents were invited to meetings in the communal lounges and in some cases residents requested individual meetings.

A Risk and Issue Register has been created for the benefit of the review and to provide guidance and quality control to guide post review monitoring.

## **2.0 Supporting People Grant**

The purpose of the support provided through this grant is to provide 'housing related support' to those that need additional help to maintain a tenancy, while trying to prevent problems that can cause vulnerable people to become homeless, build up debts or rent arrears, prevent social isolation and exclusion, need hospital treatment or move into care and to help them to have a better quality of life; independent in their community

Surrey Supporting People need to reduce the budget by £2m over the next 5 years. In a Budget Announcement dated February 2012 Andrea Cannon, Senior Commissioning Manager for Adult Social Care confirmed the County Council's commitment to retaining a meaningful Supporting People Programme over the next 5 years.

WBC received a grant of £193,377 specifically for Sheltered Housing. Despite this the service still records a £98,462 loss. SP last reviewed WBC services against the Quality Assessment Framework (QAF) in 2008. The current contracts expire in March 2013. There will be a full QAF and value for money review in the autumn ahead of any new contracts being issued in 2013/14.

## **3.0 Residents Meetings**

Each resident meeting covered 7 key areas:

- What do you like about living at your scheme?
- Activities and Social Inclusion
- Estate Inspections and management
- Support Planning and Assessments
- Safeguarding
- Complaints
- Improvements, what would make your scheme better?

On the whole residents were very positive about their scheme with several schemes stating that theirs was the best one in Waverley. However, they reported low levels of service user

participation and understanding of complaints, safeguarding and other essential issues. Very few residents knew about Supporting People, or the purpose of their Support Plans.

#### **4.0 Surrey County Council, Extra Care Services**

Surrey County Council Extra Care Services (SECS), currently provide 14 units of care delivered across two schemes in Farnham, Riverside Court and Falkner Court through their own staff. The team offer 24 hour support based at the Riverside Court scheme in addition to the housing related support provided by the WBC staff.

#### **5.0 Chichester Careline**

Chichester Care line provide a 24 hour community alarm monitoring service in the schemes, for times when staff are not on site. However, it was apparent that neither staff nor residents had a clear understanding of what the Out of Hours procedures process was. No quality control or monitoring meetings have taken place.

#### **6.0 Quality Assessment Framework**

The Quality Assessment Framework (QAF) is regarded as one of the key successes of the Supporting People programme. Designed as a contract management monitoring tool by SP, it provides a standard to measure services against. It is the conclusion of this review, that WBC schemes would struggle to achieve a comfortable level C in any area.

##### **6.1 Assessment and Support Planning (C1.1)**

*All clients receive an assessment of their support needs and any associated risks. All clients have an up-to-date support and risk management plan. Assessment and support planning procedures place clients' views at the centre, are managed by skilled staff and involve other professionals and/or carers as appropriate*

There are no written Eligibility criteria for Sheltered Housing. Thus, accepting or declining applications has been difficult and prevent Sheltered Housing simply being used as general needs accommodation for older people. Needs and risk assessments are not covered in staff induction. Training and quality control measures have not identified that Support Plans do not demonstrate robust SMART objectives, or that these documents would benefit from a fundamental overhaul. Staff do not always have a rounded understanding of the purpose of the plans nor do they evidence what support is actually provided. Support Plans do not always take account of or respond to the changing needs of the residents involved.

##### **6.2 Security, Health and Safety (C1.2)**

*The security, health and safety of all individual clients, staff and the wider community are protected.*

The WBC corporate Health & Safety Induction would enable WBC to partly achieve this level, however staff understanding is generally weak and resident understanding is minimal. Residents overwhelmingly believe the Council uses health and safety to prevent or stop activities or change things.

The vast majority of the risk assessments seen on site are in need of a robust audit, and review of purpose. Most assessments are dated 5 June 1998. The Lone Worker Risk

Assessment is particularly poor and takes no account of the individual staff, unique scheme layout and issues, nature of the work or the wider environment. The residents were not all clear about what would happen out of hours in the event of an emergency

### **6.3 Safeguarding and Protection from Abuse (C1.3)**

*There is a commitment to safeguarding the welfare of adults and children using the service and to working in partnership to protect vulnerable groups from abuse.*

The Child Protection and Safeguarding Children Policy Statement dated June 2011 that was provided is still marked 'Draft'. It would appear that this has not been ratified and can **not** therefore be considered as agreed policy. Nor is it suitably robust or does it take account of modern definitions. The Social Care Institute for Excellence defines Abuse as physical, sexual, emotional, psychological, financial, material, neglect, acts of omission, discriminatory and institutional abuse. There is no reference to the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Lone Working risk assessments do not address the risks staff pose to residents

Two potential safeguarding incidents were identified during this review and passed to senior management to address. A third incident involving the Police was already identified by a Scheme Manager but not reported to WBC. It is not uncommon to raise a Safeguarding alert and rather than seeing this as a weakness in service, it should be seen as observant and vigilant, to ensure residents remain safe and secure in their homes.

Working with perpetrators is not mentioned within the policy. Staff Induction, training, supervision and staff management practices do not adequately cover Safeguarding. The Corporate Code of Conduct does include hospitality and gifts at a corporate level, but not specifically working with vulnerable adults.

Schemes had the same door entry code which all contractors were given, as well as the code to the key safe, providing access to the master key, which in turn provided access to all individual residents flats. This has been raised immediately and rectified.

### **6.4 Fair Access, Diversity and Inclusion**

*There is a demonstrable commitment to fair access, fair exit, diversity and inclusion. The service acts within the law and ensures clients are well-informed about their rights and responsibilities.*

The Equality of Opportunity Policy was reviewed in 2010. The policy refers to various legislation that has since been replaced by the Equality Act 2010. The Equality Act replaced previous anti-discrimination laws with a single act. However, there are examples where the service has not been sensitive to the needs of residents. For example:

- Blanket Bans on mobility scooters and electric chairs
- Access to appropriate Occupational Therapy assessments according to need
- Not providing translation services for people who cannot speak English
- Denying people the right to do gardening, promoting movement and mental stimulation

Information is gathered on equalities and stored on Civica, it is unclear how this information is then used by WBC to set targets, review and develop services or address gaps and

weaknesses in. Both staff and residents expressed concern that without Eligibility criteria, new residents are accepted onto the scheme with needs that either cannot be met, or indeed have no need for support whatsoever.

## **6.5 Client Involvement and Empowerment**

*There is a commitment to empowering clients and support their independence. Clients are well informed so that they can communicate their needs and views and make informed choices. Clients are consulted about the service provided and are offered opportunities to be involved in their running. Clients are empowered in their engagement in the wider community and the development of social networks.*

There was no evidence that staff or residents had a clear understanding of what the wider community or Council services can do to meet the clients needs. A common response from residents stated they only saw someone from WBC “when they were going to make changes or take something away”. There were examples of very active schemes, with diverse activities at Shepherds Court and residents managing social funds at Blunden Court, In most other schemes this needs to be developed further.

Many residents expressed the view that complaints got lost in bureaucracy or passed from pillar to post. WBC’s complaints log shows only one complaint registered in April 2010.

Anecdotal evidence suggests some real anger generated by the perception that despite Scheme Managers best efforts WBC do not acknowledge, feedback or explain their decisions. The Council is missing an opportunity to use the complaint to learn by, develop services accordingly, or indeed defend its position.

## **7.0 Maintenance & Contracts**

On the surface, the residents are pleased with the overall ‘look’ of their schemes. However, the quality of service and flexibility of some contractors is considered very poor and several scheme’s internal and external decoration is dated and tired.

The residents are not consulted about service contracts and do not feel valued in any aspect of service delivery or quality of service. Good practice would suggest residents are not only involved in reviewing the quality of the service, but also generating the schedule of planned works for their scheme and explaining what they would like to see the contracts achieve.

Quality control measures by senior management to monitor repairs identified at each scheme are weak, although repairs are logged and monitored by some Scheme Managers.

There are inconsistent and missing records of maintenance and monitoring on site. Evidence of up to date Gas Certificate, and PAT asset register are not consistent and demonstrate poor quality control management.

In schemes where the parker bath is not used, or rooms left empty/void Domestic staff in most cases are flushing the system through and records kept to prevent Legionnaires Disease. In one scheme where there are a significant number of long term voids (from October 2007), the Scheme Manager reports being told not to flush through the water in these voids to save time. This has been rectified with immediate effect.

## **8.0 Strengths of Service**

Overwhelmingly, the residents were very supportive of and appreciate the Scheme Managers, Assistants and Domestic staff. Despite some aspects of service delivery, the majority of residents also agreed that Waverley Borough Council is a good landlord. Comments such as “I wouldn’t want to live anywhere else” were not uncommon.

8.1 Scheme staff demonstrated a willingness to take part in the review and stated they are looking forward to hearing the recommendations, although they are naturally nervous.

8.2 Domestic staff are held in high regard by the residents and provide a useful and additional pair of eyes and ears to help monitor the ever-changing health needs of residents.

8.3 The Tenants Panel is valued by most residents and seen as an integral part of policy and procedure review service within the Council.

8.4 Stakeholders and relatives report confidence in their clients’ and family members’ security and safety.

8.5 There are examples of good practice, for example Shepherds Court, where there are consistent and frequent activities throughout the week, coordinated by residents and supported by staff. In addition, the wider community is bought into the scheme throughout the year for raffles and fundraising.

8.6 Bowring House and Blunden Court have ‘day centre’ and ‘community lounges’ attached, providing good opportunities for residents to integrate with the wider community.

## **9.0 Weakness and Gaps in Service**

9.1 Residents believe they are getting a good service, however, bench-marked evidence against other supported housing services does not robustly support this view.

9.1 Staff did not consistently understand the QAF, and in some cases had not seen the document, and were not clear of their obligations under the SP Steady State Contract, therefore were unable to put into context the importance of what they are doing.

9.2 There has generally been poor quality management, creating gaps in quality of service. A ‘one size fits all’ approach at all schemes has been applied across the service.

9.3 Training has not always been transferred into day to day routines and working practice. There is little or no supervision of staff. Minutes of meetings are not recorded. There is no induction of staff pertinent to older people services or individual schemes.

9.4 Residents were generally not aware of any senior management, who they were or even if they visited the scheme or there was an impression they were only there to see the staff.

9.5 Corporate Emergency Planning in place for Council-wide services does not extend to individual schemes. The Community Alarm monitoring service reports having no contact or plans for an out of hours emergency, other than the repairs 24 hour number.

9.6 Parking signage, maintenance of buildings and general repairs have been either sporadic or neglected over many years resulting in a tired and dated appearance. In many cases rotten windows and doors detract from the good work and image of the scheme.

9.7 Complaints from residents are not reflected in the official numbers held on the WBC log.

9.8 There are no induction loops, or training in supporting people with hearing impairments.

9.9 Costs of ordering domestic supplies vary greatly for no reason from scheme to scheme.

9.10 The Community Alarm equipment requires updating for modern needs.

9.11 Former Managers' flats currently void at Falkner House, Moat Lodge, Bowring House and Rolston are a lost income to the Council. Assistant Managers of other schemes currently occupy former managers' flats in other schemes. There is concern by residents in those schemes that the schemes will be let to people who do not fit the sheltered criteria. This would not be appropriate given the location of the flats within the scheme.

9.12 Rolston House is currently operating with ten void bedsits mainly due to the shared bathroom facilities, representing a considerable loss of income and generating additional Council Tax payments to cover long term voids. There are 21 applicants registered for sheltered accommodation on the waiting list in Shottermill.

## **10.0 Funding**

The current overspend of sheltered housing in Waverley Borough Council is £98,462 per year. Assuming the 'Careline' costs in the budget is miscoded, and following a general review of the management of this grant, this figure may reduce. Finance also allocate general costs, for example across schemes, rather than divided by the number of schemes rather than number of units per scheme.

Service Charges are not assessed on a scheme-by-scheme basis. In most modern services, residents pay a variable service charge, which breaks down exactly what each scheme has spent and forecasts the charge for the coming year based on what was actually spent in the previous year. Good practice would show that a residents' consultation meeting happens on an annual basis to explain fluctuations in actual money spent, short falls and over spends.

## **11.0 Risk and Issues Register**

A Risk and Issues Register has been created to assist the Council during and post review, to ensure that the project is kept under control throughout its cycle. The purpose of the issue register is to capture and maintain information on all of the issues that are being formally managed and demonstrate quality control measures in place on all outstanding issues.

## **12.0 Recommendations**

12.1 A Support Plan, training, implementation and monitoring through Supervision is required.

12.2 Specific-training on older people specific issues should be identified by a needs audit.

12.3 Scheme specific Emergency Plans should be developed for each scheme to complement the corporate plan.

12.4 Residents should be trained and used in the recruitment process

12.5 Supervision must be established and recorded with all staff, incorporating standard agenda items such as complaints, health and safety, safeguarding, support plans, estate inspections and management of the Assistants and Domestic staff.

12.6 Recording and assessing 'informal complaints' should be developed and monitored.

12.7 Policies should be date-stamped or version-marked. A central record may or may not exist for central quality control monitoring of policies.

12.8 Estate Inspections should be established on a monthly basis encompassing all communal areas including the grounds. These should be attended by at least one resident and occasionally senior staff as well.

12.9 A service description and set of eligibility criteria should be prepared. Residents and stakeholders should be asked to participate in writing this document.

12.10 Residents meetings should be initiated on a four to six weekly rolling programme.

12.11 The Council should consider installing induction loops in the community lounges.

12.12 Procurement of supplies should be reviewed and opportunities identified to achieve savings.

12.13 Scheme staff should be issued with *Identicom* or *Skyguard* Lone Worker alarms.

12.14 Job descriptions should be reviewed, particularly to included safeguarding, complaints, resident involvement, support planning, community awareness and supervision.

## **13.0 Recommendations**

### **13.1 Option 1**

Residents and their families will clearly state one of the key reasons of moving into sheltered housing was the security associated with on-site Scheme Managers, the added value of retaining Assistant Scheme Managers will also add to the sense of security. They will be reluctant to see any further reduction in staffing levels.

Option 1 would retain the current level of staffing with one full time Scheme Manager working a 37 hour standard week and part time Assistant Manager.

#### **13.1 .1 Benefits of Option 1**

- Residents and families will remain happy with known staff and staffing levels. Anxiety levels will not increase



- Staff will have a better opportunity to deliver the quality of services, policies and practices required within the time constraints of the Supporting People contract and forthcoming reviews
- The Council will receive a defined grant income for a further 3 – 5 years when the new Supporting People contracts are let in 2012/13
- WBC services will benefit from the monitoring and accountability of an external commissioning body providing guidance to ensure the essential improvements required are delivered and embedded in the service
- Generous staffing numbers mean that the need to employ Agency staff remains at a minimum, as current levels should adequately cover annual leave.
- The deficit will also be addressed if the apparent double-counting of community alarms costs is addressed, and reinstating Rolston House voids, empty managers flats, rehousing Assistant Managers off-site, and this provides an opportunity to reduce overall running costs against the Housing Benefit and SP budgets.

### **13.1.2 Risks of Option 1**

- Staff levels remain high, and the inevitable reductions in SP funding will worsen the already existing funding deficit.
- Supporting People funding cuts in grant from 2013/14 may be greater than anticipated
- Staff do not perceive any change is required and do not engage long term in the changes required and staff continue in the same vein
- The Council (General Fund) will need to subsidise the sheltered housing as a result of the reduction of SP grant. It is not reasonable to expect general council housing tenants to subsidise this- not all sheltered applicants are existing council tenants.

### **Recommendation**

This option is recommended, to enable the service to improve and achieve long term commercial viability and stability for the service. This is subject to achieving the minimum standards required by Supporting People , however any subsequent reductions in Supporting People funding may require further consideration.

## **13. 2 Option 2**

### **Reduced Staffing , retain Supporting People**

The staffing levels are currently generous within WBC sheltered schemes. The quality of service does not currently reflect this benefit. Most other housing associations and housing related support providers provide a single Scheme Manager per scheme.

Removing all Assistant Scheme Managers completely may be a step too far in terms of staff morale and for the residents. The Scheme Managers have a significant amount of work to do to regain lost ground since the previous SP review in 2008, and develop services accordingly.

Option 2 would retain a full-time Scheme Manager at each scheme and lose both the role of Sheltered Housing Manager and the scheme based Assistant Managers. In their place, two full time Senior Scheme Managers would be appointed to provide line management to the scheme based staff, cover for annual leave and sick leave, but essentially coordinate the QAF improvements. In addition, they would encourage other value-added activities including quality control, encompass better resident involvement & empowerment and promote better equality and social inclusion. By creating a senior role this would provide career development for existing staff including possible promotion, and redeployment opportunities for Assistant Managers. This structure will remove the necessity for a Sheltered Housing Manager.

### **13.2 .1 Benefits of Option 2**

- Decreasing the staff will significantly reduce the loss currently generated
- Creates career development opportunities for two Scheme Managers to move into Senior posts, while Assistant Managers can then apply for Managers positions
- Residents will retain a head of service in each scheme, and to increase the levels of service user engagement, although their perception will be of a cut in services.
- The long term 'sheltered service', service and security that residents thought they had signed up for remains intact
- The sheltered scheme remains compliant with the sheltered housing ethos, and will fit the SP criteria to remain compliant for future SP funding, whilst simultaneously addressing the present or potential deficit.
- General Fund and other Council service charges will no longer need to subsidise the sheltered housing schemes

### **13.2.2 Risks of Option 2**

- Demotivation and resistance of scheme staff over the removal of both Assistant Managers posts and the Sheltered Housing Manager.
- Removing the Assistant Managers immediately at a time when the schemes need to significantly increase their productivity and quality may prove to be challenging.
- Residents will see a loss of key staff, and raise anxiety levels, this may also create a barrier to their participation to improve schemes. Residents will see this as a cut
- Unsuccessful Assistant Scheme Managers will need redeployment or redundancy

### **Recommendation**

In view of the amount of work required to bring the service up to speed, and to reduce negative impact on the residents and reputation of WBC, while this initially appears as a long term more financially viable option, the service may not survive the significant changes required in service delivery at the same time as loss of staff.

### **13.3 Option 3**

## **Housing Benefit funded service, exit Supporting People**

Many housing associations have opted to fund their staff entirely through housing benefit. This allows services struggling to maintain the pressure of good quality services against the QAF to fall out of a regulated regime that safeguards residents and prevents pockets of good and bad practise developing. Support Plans could be dropped, which would not impact on residents as they are not currently robust. For this to be a viable option the post of Assistant Scheme Managers would most likely need to be deleted.

It is worth considering that the criteria for Universal Credit are not yet defined, and there is still a commitment to the SP programme, albeit subsumed in to the wider Adult Social Services. Concern about the suitability of sheltered services sitting in SP budgets has faded although similar debates may reignite when the new criteria are agreed.

### **13.3.2. Benefits of Option 3**

- Staff are free to provide a model and level of service that WBC chooses
- WBC are free from contractual obligation to SP and in the long term autonomous to direct their staff accordingly
- Reduced financial costs to running the service and establishment posts

### **13.3.3 Risks of Option 3**

- Vulnerable residents will loose the support aspect, and access to care services and other assessments that fall outside of the housing benefit remit
- Services fail to improve, and bad practise further develops in an already inconsistently performing services
- The introduction of Universal Credit is not defined, and therefore there is a significant risk that the eligibility criteria may exclude sheltered services in future.
- Reduced opportunity for encouraging social activities and communal support.
- Case Conferences on care and support will probably not be attended by WBC staff

## **Recommendation**

In the interests of development and improving the service to an acceptable standard, this option does not offer long term viability for the sheltered housing service.

## **18.0 Conclusion**

The majority of residents within Waverley Borough Council sheltered schemes are happy and believe they are getting a good service, however their expectations are not high. The service has not developed, and potentially exposes residents, staff, and Council to unnecessary risks.

It has been very apparent through the course of this review that the front line staff have clearly not been adequately supported. The lack of guidance, training, supervision and quality control measures have led to pockets of good practice being watered down and a general loss of direction for the team. There are good examples where scheme-based staff have clearly made decisions and an effort to retain a sense of pride in the service they delivered that have not been backed up by previous senior housing management. In

addition, without a working knowledge of the grant conditions of the supporting people, the staff have been denied the opportunity to grow and manage the service accordingly.

Despite this, the enthusiasm of most staff to engage in this process and learn from the experience is a credit to them and valuable resource to Waverley Borough Council.

Quality control measures need improving. Safeguarding, complaints, health and safety, equality and diversity awareness are poor across the service, and residents express frustration at the lack of support and feedback generally from the Council. There is no training for issues specific to older people i.e. Dementia, mental health, hearing loss, coping with grief.

With no clear eligibility for sheltered housing, contradictions in policy and process were also apparent, exposing inconsistencies in knowledge and quality of service delivery.

Domestic staff are well thought of by the residents and provide an 'added value'. Residents feel secure knowing the staff, and in turn they provide an additional set of eyes and ears. Providing sheltered housing is more than just providing housing stock. Waverley needs to be clear on what this involves, and requires training of staff based on site and at The Burys with scheme-based staff better integrated into housing services.

Supporting People will be reviewing the Waverley service later in the year. There is a significant amount of work required to protect this funding stream, and minimise any further reductions. Several staff are clearly keen to develop themselves and their services. Others will require more structured support and guidance to achieve a shared goal.

The level of work should not represent an insurmountable barrier that cannot be overcome.

The priorities for Waverley Borough Council are

- Quality Assessment Framework – training, and implementation
- Training in Safeguarding, Complaints, Equality & Diversity. Existing reporting and lines of accountability are not working
- Lone Worker Risk Assessments and alarms
- Support Plans - review documents and train staff and service users to use
- Encourage better Tenant Participation
- Create better ways to monitor repairs and maintenance issues and feedback to residents the results
- Refurbish Rolston House and remodel former management flats to generate income
- Repair windows and doors at Shepherds Court, Bowring House and Blunden Court

## **Action Plan**

Option one provides the safest option for Waverley to develop a flagship sheltered housing service for older people in the area. Reducing staffing levels in the immediate future will seriously hamper that developmental opportunity.

Significantly, by retaining Scheme Managers, and Assistant Scheme Managers, while upgrading the physical and environmental aspects of the service, the staff team and

residents will see a commitment by Waverley to developing the service and investing in them.

In terms of moving forward, there are four key areas that need planning and resolution.

### Staffing

1. Prepare briefing on options and review to staff, heads of department and councillors
2. Job descriptions for the Sheltered Housing Manager should be reviewed
3. Assistant Scheme Manager for Rolston House posts advertised and vacancies filled
4. Induction for all new staff drafted and delivered
5. Staff Supervision needs to be implemented and a skills audit to identify champions for older person specific issues developed,

### Resident Engagement

1. Residents will need to be re-educated regarding the role of the Scheme Manager
2. Residents to be encouraged and supported to report their own repairs if they wish. Staff will need to support the more vulnerable.
3. Supported Residents to establish a sheltered residents panel with Terms of Reference and plan and prepare their own spending of social funds and activities

### Service Delivery

1. Training and implementation of all key QAF performance criteria
2. Establish frequent Managers meetings with minutes and other quality control measures to develop and support staff to improve consistency and service delivery.
3. Risk Assessments of scheme and staff need reviewing
4. Eligibility Criteria for Sheltered schemes written and promoted throughout the Council
5. Council policies and corporate plans need reviewing for quality and compliance
6. Create Variable service charge information on scheme by scheme basis

### **Buildings, Maintenance and Repairs:**

1. Prioritise list of outstanding repairs and essential adaptations for all schemes
2. Refurbish Rolston House, and undertake general upgrading to other schemes as appropriate.
3. Estate Inspections, Risk assessment and quality control monitoring established
4. Review unused rooms for potential re-use
5. Assess carpets and curtains in communal areas as appropriate
6. Update Community Alarm and door entry systems
7. Review windows and doors in schemes with identified problems
8. Assess and prepare for construction of Buggy store facilities with power points and security measures and access
9. Consider planning options for additional parking at schemes where this is an issue.