

# Minutes



## Performance Scrutiny Committee - People

---

Date: 23 January 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors D Williams (Chair), J Cleverly, J Guy, H Thomas, K Thomas, C Townsend, J Watkins and T Watkins

In Attendance: Owen James (Assistant Head of Finance), James Harris (Strategic Director – People) Sarah Morgan (Head of Education), Sally Jenkins (Head of Children & Young People Services), Chris Humphrey (Head of Adult & Community Services)

Apologies: Councillors T Holyoake

---

### 1 Declarations of Interest

None

### 2 Minutes of the Meeting held 12 December 2017

Minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.

### 3 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2018-19: Draft Proposals

Invitees;

- Owen James – Assistant Head of Finance
- James Harris – Strategic Director – People
- Sarah Morgan – Head of Education
- Sally Jenkins – Head of Children & Young People Services
- Chris Humphrey – Head of Adult & Community Services

The Assistant Head of Finance gave an overview of the budget proposal under the Committee's portfolio. It was advised that since the Draft Budget had been published, the final settlement from Welsh Government had been received, which was slightly better than anticipated. However, due to in year pressures and the Local Government Pay Award, it has not left the Authority in a better position overall.

### **EDU181902 - Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'**

Members queried the difference between Advisory Teachers and Educational Psychologist roles, the difference in their skillset and asked if there was a way to increase or share skill levels between individuals. Members were advised that

Educational Psychologists are a more strategic level than Advisory Teacher, and Advisory Teacher operate more face to face. It was explained that a lot of the core set of skills are matched and that the starting point would be for seven professionals to be split up into clusters, where the advisors can become more multi-skilled. Members were advised that there was confidence that this will happen quickly.

Members discussed the focus on improving mental health for children, and asked how the service would improve, and how many schools would the Teaching Assistants be assigned to. Members were told that the department were successful getting a grant from Welsh Government for mental health support for schools, which was readily available and advised that Welsh Government are focussed on supporting mental health. An additional benefit being that as this is not core funded the school are able to apply for grant funding.

The Committee asked for further explanation of the cluster approach mentioned with the business case. The Strategic Director advised that there was not sufficient funding to support all the school so the conclusion was to restructure to make sure there is more co-ordinated work which was far more efficient than having multiple teams. The Officer explained that there would be two Teaching Assistants working over 58 schools.

Members queried whether this proposal would increase pressure on schools to provide support to these pupils, and impact on the schools capacity to other pressures. They were advised that there would be an increase in the level of support the school was providing, supported by the cluster.

It was asked if any other authorities had also tried a clusters approach and if it benefitted the students. Members were advised that there is a strong drive by the Welsh Government to standardise across all subjects, so every authority can maintain a focussed approach, while developing capacity and resilience. Members were told that Newport were very much key players in cluster developments and the officers praised the group of highly skilled professionals. The example provided was the Education Achievement Service. Members were advised that the intention was to provide support and training to the teachers to support pupils in their own learning environment.

Query was made about a proposed £117,000 saving in the first year. Members were advised a lot of the implied costs, such as redundancies, are one off costs will come out of the Invest to Save reserve cost fund which has been set aside.

Members wanted to ascertain that the proposal met the linkage with Future Generations Act requirements, as there are concerns that Members were told that the risk was mitigated as much as possible and was satisfactory, and mentioned the proposal does also affect women and the older age group.

Members felt that the risk score matrix within the business cases were not clear enough in explaining the actual likelihood of impact, and requested in future proposals that the impacts are better understood. Members were told that this would be noted as the risk score matrix is used by officers and may not be transparent to Members.

Members asked for clarification on the Well – Being of Future Generations Act requirements as it states repeatedly that the proposal continues to support targets, or improve outcome of service yet reduced capacities in schools have been identified. The Strategic Director advised the Committee that the proposal would practical support the wellbeing in schools, with the proposal for the single inclusion team to provide skills, and to collaborate with schools to develop their skills. It was advised that benefits would occur, and the goal would be to manage it to ensure the benefits would happen for schools as well.

Members voiced concerns that without any additional resources or funding, the proposal would like have a negative impact on impact on the young people needing to use the support, who may end up becoming NEET (Not in Education, Employment of Training).

Following a discussion with Members on the levels of face to face contact that the team would have with the children, the Chief Education Officer explained that the level face to face contact between pupils and the team would decrease, but that the proposal looks to empower the school based staff to take over this role. Members were concerned that this would lead to a reduction in the service in the through the transition period, and that this could present a risk to young people. The Committee were advised that the intention of the proposal would be that the same service would be provided in a different way – in supporting the teaching staff to undertake this role. The Committee were also advised that this would require careful monitoring and to come back to Scrutiny to see how it is working.

### **EDU181904 - Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit**

A query was made on the length of time a pupil stays in the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), and Members spoke of their ‘revolving door’ concerns, where the school are being burdened with the responsibility of pupils who they have already been unable to manage in the past. Members were advised that the length of stay is normally six weeks, which then turns into a term depending on whether the child is successful. The model that is currently in use shows too many long term pupils are not being re-integrated into main stream education and not giving them the best opportunity to thrive. Members were advised that pupils in the PRU for long term, who have Special Education Needs, are not being catered for sufficiently. The Officer informed the Committee of the high costs to place these pupils out of county.

Members voiced concerns that without any additional resources or funding, the proposal would likely have a negative impact on the young people needing to access the PRU, and those who would currently receive additional support may lose out and end up becoming NEET.

Members were then advised of the use of PRU satellite provisions for pupils needing a longer period but not yet ready for Special Educational School. The Aspire program that ran in the Pill Millennium Centre was presented to the Committee, and how currently there were 6 additional spaces where young people can learn core skills and gain access to college courses. Concerns which overarch all of this is when young people aged 14-16 are unable to access apprenticeships at local level, although they could be placed in Penarth which is positive. Query was made

regarding the details of the satellite provision were missing from the business case, as well as their impact on the communities where they are based.

Members expressed concerns were raised for children that go back into mainstream and continue to misbehave, causing disruption to other pupils learning and impacting on the health and wellbeing of the teachers. As well as the effect it has on the pupils attendance.

Members asked who had accountability for outcomes of those on the Aspire programme, if there was any additional funding available and have schools. Members were informed that the Head of Education would be held accountable for the Aspire programme. All Heads have been consulted who clearly understand the reasons for the change in service and supported the change. It was also explained that during the consultation period, ESTYN and Welsh Government held a series of drop in session to help stimulate the consultation process. It was advised that there is no additional funding, but we are co-creating an Exclusion and Behaviour Strategy with schools to ensure the impact was minimal. Members were also advised that across Newport there has been a great success at improving attendance, and there will be targeted work with schools not reaching targets as exclusion rates are already unsatisfactory.

Members queried if parents had been consulted on the use of Aspire programme if not they felt that it would be important to parents, pupils and staff would all need to be consulted and fully engaged in the budget process.

Members enquired if there were any pupils from the PRU in out of county placements and about their transport. Members also asked if the Council have to pay anything additional for out of county placements. Members were happy to hear that there are no pupils currently out of county, and they would be given tokens for independent transport.

The Officer set out how all young people would be given Individual Development Plans, and centre management staff would manage attendance. It was explained that placements in close neighbouring authorities are not highly expensive and offer good value for money.

A Member asked about engagement with parents and carers. Members were told that there had been engagement with a number of agencies, which had delivered a one stop shop approach. This approach would save families having to call a number of agencies, and would give the PRU greater ability to engage with parents. The Committee explained that they would like more to be done with parent and carer engagement when there are proposed changes to service delivery.

Members asked if there was a requirement for pupils to study Maths and English. It was confirmed that pupils must do core subjects in the PRU.

The Members raised the point of more preventative work with the young people at an earlier age. If the young people are disruptive and show signs of poor behaviour then interventions should be used in primary school, so the disruption does not extend to secondary school. The Members continued with their concerns about how much time the teachers will spend with the young people who are disruptive.

Members were advised that satellite provisions could extend the capacity for young people, as well as increasing the places in the new SEBD building to 48. The Officers stated that they needed to be mindful that the building does not become overcrowded. It was also advised of the risk that the building needs to be an adequate size so additional satellite provision may be needed. The Members expressed their concerns on the satellite provisions impact on the communities where they are placed.

### **CFS181901 - Review of Oakland Short Break Service**

Members briefly discussed recent Councillor visits to Oakland and voiced concerns of the venue being short staffed with no manager there to see them at the time. They continued, saying staff mentioning a recruitment freeze was the reason for short staffing and they had recently had to cancel a child visiting because they had difficulty finding staff to cover a shift. At the visit there were no children there, but staff were doing the cleaning and cooking. The Head of Children's Services advised that there is no freeze on recruitment, but mentioned recent difficulties in other authorities has affected Newport. Members were told that there are 3 managers in post at Oakland, and because there were no children at the venue at the time of visit may explain why a manager was not present. It was also advised that Oakland had recently been inspected by the CSSIW and no concerns were brought up in the report.

Members were advised that the number of nights care a family were entitled to was assessed as part of the package of care between a Social Worker and Oakland. It is then reviewed every 6 months. It was brought to the Committees attention that Oakland offered a strong service and have received great feedback. It was explained that there are a number of things now available to the families which were not available when Oaklands were first established over 20 years ago. The Officer brought the Members attention to Sparkle, who offer more packages to the families. Members were also told that visits were made to other authorities to see what services were offered, such as evening services rather than overnight or doing visits to the families' homes instead of having the child visiting the centre.

Members discussed the mitigations in place for the reduction in Oakland's service and understand that the young people could go elsewhere, but families like the service that is currently available at Oaklands, and the loss of which will have an impact on families. The Members were concerned that issues may arise because of this reduction. The Committee were informed that there are two meetings with parents planned to discuss the reduction in provision. There is currently a consultation with future services possibly being held at the Serennau Centre. The Committee enquired if there was a statutory duty to provide short breaks and if families can pay for short breaks with Direct Payments. Members were advised that there is a duty for short breaks however there is no statutory duty to say what the short break can be. It was advised that it is illegal to charge for Children's Services with Direct Payments.

Members wanted to know if the proposal would affect staffing. Members were advised that there is no major changes planned in staffing and there would be no redundancies as a result of this saving.

The Members felt that there was insufficient evidence in the proposal around the actual impact on the young people and families that use the service. They would like to have seen more information here about what was in place to protect the families from negative effects of the savings.

### **CFS181904 - Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services**

Members enquired what would be the impact on wider Council services with this proposal, and what the impact would be on young people and families as there were no mitigation measures in the business case. Members were advised that the key risks would be a greater number of referrals to Children's Services and a reduced capacity in schools for support. The Members also felt that this proposal goes against the intention of the Well-Being of Future Generations Act.

Queries were raised with the evaluation from the Institute of Public Care and asked if it was a sound proposal. Members were told there was no reason to believe it was not sound. Families First funding provides the funds for Preventative Services for Children. NCC's service was identified as a complimentary service not statutory, the restructure of Families First will support those in need of preventative action.

Concerns were voiced at the possible safeguarding risks that the reduction in service could bring to children and families resulting in more children being referred to Children's Services. Members were told that Prevention Services were below the threshold of safeguarding and any safeguarding concerns would come through via the Duty Social Work team.

Members queried the risk of an increased demand for other services, in particular statutory ones, and how would the other services cope with workload capacity and budget wise. It was also discussed that if individual children were dealt with at the early stages it would mitigate further involvement from the Council and more costly services. The Strategic Director advised that this was a choice between taking funding from a statutory service and those which were not, and as Preventions Service is not a statutory service it was chosen. Members were then told that there is already a significant pressure on statutory services.

Members asked whether there was a waiting list for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and how are young carers paid for. Members were advised that there is a waiting list for CAMHS, and young carers are funded by Families First.

### **CFS181902 - Integrated Family Support Team Restructure**

A query was made about the current resourcing arraignment with three staff seconded from Aneurin Bevan Health Board, it was explained that these three staff will return to the health board if the proposal is carried out. The Head of Service advised that there would be no redundancies, and that there had been significant changes to the proposal since it has been issued for consultation.

Members asked if all five authorities in the Regional Partnership were paying equal amounts. The Officer guaranteed that all five authorities were paying equal amounts.

The Committee queried if in the proposal it stated there was no positive linkage with the Well-Being of Future Generations Act and this might not be the case as it directly impacts on families and young people. The Officer set out how the savings here helped implement the Well-Being of Future Generations Acts goals and the Council would be in a better position with the FASS and FST provisions.

### **CFS181913 - Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children**

Members commented on why they felt that the Kinship payments should not be reduced. The Officer advised the Committee that the department were looking to see how money can better spent, as well as looking to enhance the Council's own provisions and residential provisions. This, the Officer stated, was because residential care meets the child's needs better than other provisions. Models will be looked at to see what changes can be made to provide better options for meeting the needs of the service users.

Members queried the how the proposed savings have been calculated, and stated it was unclear how a figure for savings can be estimated before the review has taken place. Members were informed that in house care would cost less, so the savings would be achieved with in the future spend, not reduction of expenditure.

Members stated that there was no further information on the extent of the impact an increase in pressure for out of authority placements in Education would bring. The Officer advised that if a child was placed out of authority, then their education would be too. It could be a possibility to look at alternatives, but they were not doing so. Members were advised that the department is working with Education which should show improvements however this will still have an impact.

### **ACS181903 - Review of the Domiciliary Care Service**

Members asked if a number of providers have been in looked into or just one. Members were informed that a number of domiciliary, independent and voluntary care providers will be invited to bid for the tender.

Members enquired what savings are the Officers expecting to make and if the staff had been consulted. The Members let the Officers know that some of the residents had been in contact with them and were very unhappy with the proposal, some of which are very vulnerable. Members were told that the proposed savings would be £150,000 for both 2018/19 and 2019/2020, and that if proposal was agreed the arrangements would hopefully be completed by October. It was advised that both staff and residents had been consulted as this would be the third time that the proposal has been put forward, and that the savings will come from efficiencies in management costs.

Members asked how often do the CSSIW inspect. They were instructed that the number of inspections vary; the last inspection was last year which came back very positive. The department has been looking at the service to ensure that it is fit for purpose.

A comment was made about the difficulty to find staff to provide domiciliary care outside of the private sector, as well as the increasing costs for private sector contracts. The Officer introduced a carer's virtual academy which is now Gwent wide. The role of the academy is to try and encourage people to get into Health and Social Care jobs. It was explained that one of the challenges was retention of staff, so it is important to try and attract people to work in this sector.

Members asked if there are any measures in place in case a care provider pulls out or goes into administration. Members were advised that there would be negotiation with other providers to cover the service with minimal disruption to the service users during the transfer. Members were also told that only a very small percentage of residents would be affected. It was noted that the Council does have experience of making sure provision is continued as sometimes a provider pulls out with little notice.

### **ACS181904 - Re-provision of Supported Living Service**

Members enquired who the properties belonged to, they also spoke of the need to sensitively manage the re-provision to limit the impact on the service users and their families. Members were advised that two of the properties are Newport City Homes owned, and two belong to Charter. Both the tenants and their families have been consulted and had schemes shown.

Members enquired if the Council have looked at larger properties to accommodate, and have properties from other housing organisations been looked at. Members were told of the importance of matching people based on their needs to ensure successful and positive living environments. It was advised that work would be undertaken with partners in the Housing sector to find suitable properties that can be purchased then be converted, and partners in other housing associations have also been in discussions to increase the number of beds.

Members asked which two of the four homes in the proposals were likely to be closed down. It was explained that it would likely be the two older properties, as they have become more difficult to adapt for specific disabilities.

### **ACS181907 - Reduction in Adult Budget**

Members commented that the business case for the proposal does not provide sufficient information on the impact it would have on service users, or what mitigations have been established. The Committee also commented on the proposal not being in the spirit of the Well-Being of Future Generations Act.

### **Fees and Charges – Social Services**

Members were advised that there had been work undertaken with the Finance Team to benchmark against other authorities. Members felt that there was an ongoing issue of fees and charges not being reviewed annually, which is reflected in the significant jump in prices this year.



The Chair thanked the Officers for their input into the meeting and excused them from the table.

### **The conclusions and comments made to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee**

#### Comments to Cabinet on following Proposals:

##### **EDU181902 - Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'**

The Committee felt that there was insufficient evidence in this business case to fully understand how the savings would be achieved. The Committee received explanation from the Head of Service as to how this would work in practice; however this level of detail should have been included within the business case, so that the public have an understanding of the potential impact of the proposal.

Highlight the risk of this proposal:

- This proposal will increase the pressure placed on schools without any additional funding or resources, and will likely have a negative impact on the young people needing to use this support.
- Move to a cluster approach - unclear how the clusters will operate, and how the resources will be allocated to each cluster, which makes it difficult to fully understand the impact of the proposal.
- Indication from the officers was that the face to face contact with pupils will decrease and the proposal looks to empower the school based staff to take over this role. There is a risk that too much is being expected of the teaching staff to provide effective oversight of all of the potentially complex issues for that individual child, whilst managing the needs of the whole class.
- This presents a risk to young people who could potentially be missed if the impact of this proposal is a reduction in service. This would have an impact on their opportunity to engage within work and training.

The Committee acknowledges the mitigation outlined to provide training to support the teachers and schools to enable school based staff can support their pupils in their own learning environments. However, the Committee concerned that this mitigation may not fully address the risk for the following reasons:

- Concerned about the capacity of the remaining staff within the clusters to provide training for schools on a large scale;
- As its unclear how the cluster approach will operate – therefore it's also unclear whether there is capacity within these clusters to deliver this training.
- Unclear who within the new team will be responsible for training, and the timescale of when the training will be provided to the schools.
- The time that this will take to roll out the training could mean that there is a substantial gap in provision in the short term.

The Committee recommends that if this proposal is approved, that the implementation of this is carefully monitored, and that this is reported to the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People on a regular basis, with detailed information in the impact on these young people.

##### **CFS181901 - Review of Oakland Short Break Service**

The Committee had concerns about the impact of this proposal on disabled children

and their families, based on the information presented in the business case. The Head of Service provided context to the review and additional information on alternative provision that would be explored to ensure that the needs of the children and their families are met. Information on this alternative private and third sector provision should be included within the business case to enable the public to fully understand the impact of this proposal as it gives a context to the proposed review.

Within the 'Impact on Citizens' section of the business case, the impact on service users was not sufficiently stated, simply stating that '*support for families with disabled child will be reduced.*' This does not give a full picture of what the impact will be. Within the options considered section of the business case it stated '*for some children there would be a reduction in the offer within their package of care.*' This again does not give a full explanation of what this reduction would be and how the impact will be mitigated.

The Committee received assurances that the families and the children currently using these services would be consulted and their views used to shape the reformed service. This was to happen should the Cabinet adopt this proposal. It was noted that this could be misleading as the decision to reduce this service from 7 days to 5 days service would have already been taken, therefore limiting scope of the input from the families.

#### CFS181904 - Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services

Preventative services is not an area that the Council should be reducing. It is fundamentally against the intention of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act to act to prevent problems occurring or getting worse, and balancing the short term needs with the need to safeguard against the ability to meet long term needs. The Committee understands the rationale behind this proposal, in that it is not a statutory service and there are limited options to making the necessary savings whilst protecting statutory services.

However, the full impact of reducing this service should be fully understood if the proposal is to be adopted.

The Committee had specific concerns regarding the following:

- Unclear how the savings of £311,000 will be made, other than a direct reduction of staff by 4 FTE. As such, there are concerns about how achievable this proposal will be as there is insufficient information in the business case to assess this.
- Title of the proposal does not accurately cover the nature of the proposal, as the recommended option (option 3) directly reduces the services offered.
- The savings made here will directly increase the other costs in other parts of the Council, most acutely Education and Children's Services. The cost of this has not been factored into the potential savings.
- Although this is not a statutory service, making reductions in this service will impact upon the statutory services budgets, as it will increase the demand for statutory services in the longer term.
- The prevention service is a core element of working with families in such a way to prevent future problems. Concern that reducing this may increase the risk for Children who would previously accessed preventative services, in that they could miss out on early interventions before issues escalate to the level for a children's services referral. Some of the Committee felt that this presented a safeguarding risk.
- No mitigations were outlined for this proposal – the explanation for this was that there was nothing that could be done to mitigate as it was a direct reduction in service.

- Very concerned about the impact that has been outlined in the business case, in particular:
  - *‘...a potential restructuring of the Families First Grant could lead to a reduction in opportunities for third sector organisations’* – direct impact on the alternative / complimentary provision from the third sector.
  - *‘Preventions, CANs and young Carers all have waiting lists for service so any decrease in funding would increase the gap in provision’* – there is gap in provision already, this proposal would exacerbate this issue.
  - *‘Greater number of referrals to children’s services’* – direct impact on future budgets of statutory services within Children’s Services.
  - *‘Reduced capacity in schools for support’* – direct impact on pressures of schools staff.

**The combined effect of these would significantly impact upon the lives of the children involved.**

Comments to Cabinet Members for following proposals

CFS181902 - Integrated Family Support Team Restructure

There had been significant changes to this proposal since it had been issued for consultation in December. The progress made had caused a dramatic decrease in the number of staff impacted on by the proposal and also the implementation costs that are required to carry out the proposal.

The Committee commented on how the business case was not fit for consultation in its current form and any recommendations made might not accurately represent reality.

It was noted by Members that that no linkage with the Well-being of Future Generations act were included in the business case and this might not be the case as it directly impacts on families and young people.

CFS181913 - Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children

The Committee felt that there was not enough information or detail in this business case including:

- Increase in pressure for out of Authority placements in Education. No further information on the extent of this impact.
- *‘This proposal will need to link to an invest to save proposal to crease a small amount of capacity within Children’s services to first undertake a concentrated review of the current provision’*. The investment required section is then left blank so no further details about the required investment.
- The Proposal states it will reduce the spend on placements – but it doesn’t explain how this will be achieved other than through reviewing the service. It is unclear how a figure for savings can be estimated before the review has taken place.
- Proposed savings – how have these been calculated, what number of placements would this reduction represent, and how are you sure this specific number of placements can be reduced before the review has been undertaken.
- In the Risk information – states that *‘The risk is simply that because of external demands and increasing complexity in the children being cared for that we will be unable to achieve this saving.’* – no mitigations to explain how this risk will be managed and what the likelihood of this happening.

- Insufficient evidence of the Well-being of Future Generations act being taken into consideration.

The Head of Service provided some explanation on how the savings would be made. To achieve meaningful consultation the additional information should have been included in the business case to give the public access to all of the information.

#### ACS181903 - Review of the Domiciliary Care Service

The Committees greatest concern was around the lack of mitigations for the contract failing and the impact that this would have on the people who are receiving care. They felt that other mitigations needed were not set out in the business case.

Not enough information and detail was provided in the business case, most importantly included the number of residents that the proposed saving would affect.

Another risk the Members highlighted that was not adequately mitigated in the business case was the continuity to care of the service users and their families.

With all of the missing information the Members agreed that it would be hard for the public to be fairly consulted on this in a productive manner as their responses would not be fully informed and would lack the depth of understanding needed for such a delicate subject.

#### ACS181904 - Re-provision of Supported Living Service

The Committee supported his proposal but feels that the implementation needs to be sensitively managed to limit the impact on the service users and their families.

#### ACS181907 - Reduction in Adult Budget

The business case does not provide sufficient information on the impact it will have on service users or what mitigations have been established.

The Committee discussed the lack of Well-being of Future Generation act information in the business case simply stating '*...the Future Generations Act 2014 requires that the City Council makes the right services available at the right time*'. This does not state how this proposal fits in with this, or mention any of the other aspects of the act.

#### Fees and Charges – Social Services

The Committee commented that the issue of fees and charges not being reviewed or increased for a number of years appears to be an ongoing issue.

The Committee recommends that the Cabinet ensure that each year the service areas undertake a review of the charges to ensure they are accurate each year. This would ensure that the costs area accurate, that the authority is in line with other Authorities and to stop large increases in subsequent years.

#### Comments upon the Budget process or public engagement to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:

The Committee agreed to raise the following overarching issues with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for further exploration and discussion:

#### Business Case Template:

- Not consistent information within the business cases. Most of the business cases needed explanation and further information from officers to fully understanding of the impact of the proposal.
- Concern that this is what is being consulted with the public and the public will not have the benefit of discussing the proposals with lead officers to gain a full understanding. The Council needs to be more transparent and ensure all the relevant information is contained within the Business Cases to ensure robust and meaningful consultation.
- If the public are to be meaningfully engaged they must be provided with clear and understandable information which sets out budget proposals, what they aim to achieve, who and how many it will effect, what the main impacts are, financial implications, if there is a reduction in service – detail as to how that would work in practise, staffing implications and other figures, detailed mitigations for any risk, detail of alternative provision (such as third sector) to indicate how a reduction in service could be compensated for.
- Level of detail inconsistent between the proposals.
- Risk scores – unclear in the business cases how these are scored – need to be broken down further not just the number but an indication of that this number means.
- Wellbeing of Future Generations box in the Business Plan – not consistently completed. The linkages between the act and the proposals were not always clear.

#### Wellbeing of Future Generations Act

- It is not clear how these proposals fit into a long term plan – they seem to still be reactive.
- Unclear what the Long term budget strategic direction is for the Council.

#### 4 Forward Work Programme Update

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented the report to Members and outlined the purpose of the report in seeking the Committees approval for items on its work programme for the next two meetings.

The Committee **approved** the report and the items to be considered during the next two meetings.

The meeting terminated at 13:00.