

# Agenda



## Performance Scrutiny Committee - People

---

Date: Tuesday, 23 January 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

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

---

### Item

- 1 Agenda in Welsh (Pages 3 - 4)
- 2 Apologies for Absence
- 3 Declarations of Interest
- 4 Minutes of the Meeting held 12 December 2017 (Pages 5 - 12)
- 5 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2018-19: Draft Proposals (Pages 13 - 82)
- 6 Forward Work Programme Update (Pages 83 - 90)

Contact: Daniel Cooke - Overview and Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 01633 656656

E-mail: [Scrutiny@newport.gov.uk](mailto:Scrutiny@newport.gov.uk)

Date of Issue: 16 January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda

## Pwyllgor Craffu ar Berfformiad – Pobl

---

Dyddiad: Dydd Mawrth, 23 Ionawr 2018

Amser: 10 y.b.

Lleoliad: Ystafell Bwyllgora 1

Y Cynghorwyr: D Williams (Cadeirydd), J Cleverly, J Guy, T Holyoake, L Lacey, H Thomas, K Thomas, C Townsend, J Watkins and T Watkins

---

### Eitem

1. [Agenda yn Gymraeg](#)
2. [Ymddiheuriadau am Absenoldeb](#)
3. [Datganiadau o Fuddiant](#)
4. [Cofnodion y Cyfarfod a 12 Rhagfyr 2017](#)
5. [2018 – 19 Refeniw Gyllideb a'r Cynllun Ariannol Tymor Canolig: Cynigion Drafft](#)
6. [Diweddariad am y Flaenrahglen Waith](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Minutes



## Performance Scrutiny Committee - People

---

Date: 12 December 2017

Time: 4.00 pm

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

In Attendance: Councillor Paul Cockeram, Councillor Gail Giles, Daniel Cooke (Overview & Scrutiny Officer), Mike Dickie (Business Service Development Manager), Chris Humphrey (Head of Adult & Community Services), Sally Ann Jenkins (Head of Children & Young Peoples Services), Sarah Morgan (Deputy Chief Education Officer) and Eleanor Mulligan (Democratic Services and Communications Manager)

Apologies:

---

### 1 **Declarations of Interest**

None

### 2 **Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 October 2017**

Minutes approved as a true and accurate record

### 3 **Improvement Plan 2016-18 Update - Quarter 2**

#### **IP Objective 1 – Improving Independent Living For Older People**

Invitees;

- Head of Adult and Community Services
- Cabinet Member for Social Services

The Cabinet Member and Officer provided an overview of the service area and all of its measures, all of which are Green. The Cabinet Member spoke of how their work is led by providing the older people with the ability to make an informed choice. The Social Services and Wellbeing Act is also instrumental in the how the service is delivered.

The Committee wanted to know how long the wait time was to see a LA Occupational Therapist (OT). The Officer explained that the average wait time was 4 weeks, but this doesn't include those seen in hospital and those that needs allow them to be prioritised. There are more OTs in hospital which means there is a less of a wait there. The Members also wanted to know if there were many people joining the occupation. The Officers replied that they are currently struggling to get staff to join the occupation. Members had an idea about running a recruitment process similar to the army to improve recruitment levels.

The Members enquired if bringing care back into the community would increase pressure on services and what effect it is already having. The Officer explained that the Integrated Services Manager oversees both community and hospital OTs. If a person is under the care of an OT in the community, the OT would follow them into hospital. The OT and community care package would stay with the individual unless their stay in hospital is for longer than three days. The Step Up Step Down initiative has been a great success in decreasing the delayed transfer of care. The Officer continued to explain how the initiatives were not available in all GP surgeries currently, but the Care Closer to Home Strategy would look at ways to improve and increase this.

The Members of the Committee are concerned about the night staff being cut from the Willowbrook Care Home. The Cabinet Member explained that this was one of the budgetary cuts out for consultation and not set in stone.

The Committee enquired as to how the private sector care providers were monitored to ensure standards were met. The Officer explained to the Committee that the CCISW and Council share overview responsibility for any private sector care provider that we had contracts with. There are regular forums which took place to ensure a dialogue is open for all care providers, carers and people receiving care. There were also escalating procedures for reporting issues and problems with the services to us and CCISW.

Members queried if the Council provided any of the services themselves and how long a person would be allocated for washing and dressing in a morning. The Officer explained that the Council delivered an extra care scheme but other services were contracted out. With regards to how long each person was allocated for washing and dressing the Officers explained that the contract monitoring ensured that a certain level of care was met, made up of quality and time. If this quality of care is not delivered then they can use the escalating procedures to ensure it is in the future.

One of the Members commented that they knew of individual care providers that log in and log out as required by the company they work for, but spend additional time at the recipient's home and are not reimbursed for it.

The Members enquired if the annual measures could be presented in year to ensure progress was being made. The Officer explained that the numbers could be presented in year, but it is currently done at the end of the year not to skew the numbers.

The Committee questioned if the Council could withhold business to companies and organisations that do not pay the national living wage. The Cabinet Member agreed that the carers are not paid enough and recognised that there is a high turnover of staff in the sector.

The Committee were interested in why the Council did not provide the care services themselves. The Cabinet Member explained that following a detailed review of the options, commissioning services from a third party suppliers was by far the most cost effective option. The Officer also added there are also additional costs to bringing the care service back in house.

The Committee asked the Officer and Cabinet Member on their views on the management of the care services. The Committee had heard that some carers were working 11 hours but only getting paid for 6, as travel time was not included. The Officer assured the Committee that this is something that does not happen, the Council have not allowed contracts to go to companies that practiced in this way.

## **Conclusion**

The Members of the Committee acknowledged the demand on resources, capacity and commitments to provide statutory obligations. The Members also commented on the ever

increasing demand on services and how this would put further strain on the delivery of quality care.

The Committee recommended that a survey is offered to carers asking about their employer, delivery methods and practices. This could be extended to a protected whistleblowing process to ensure high quality services are delivered.

## **IP Objective 2 – Ensuring people have the right social services to meet their needs**

Invitees;

- Head of Adult and Community Services
- Cabinet Member for Social Services

The Officer provided an overview of the IP Objective and the first Red measure, concerning delayed transfer of care. The Officer expressed importance of understanding the difficulties of getting a care package in place to allow a person to leave hospital are a national issue not just local one. These difficulties impact directly on the delayed transfer of care measure in the objective.

The Members and Officers discussed the Integrated Pathway and the relationship with GPs across Newport. The Care Closer to Home Strategy would shed further light on the subject when it is brought to the committee in the New Year as an information report.

The Officers informed the Committee about the In Reach programme which takes Community OTs onto wards to conduct consultations and hold conversations with the individual and NHS staff prior to referrals being made. The In Reach programme was only on 7 wards initially but the ABHB has asked that we roll it out to all hospitals.

## **Conclusions**

The major discussions here were around delayed transfer of care and this is something that the Committee have stated that they will keep their eye on in the next meeting to ensure performance is increasing. The Committee are happy to receive the Care Closer to Home Strategy for more information in the New Year.

## **IP Objective 8 – Improving outcomes for youth justice**

Invitees;

- Head of Children and Young Peoples Services
- Cabinet Member for Social Services

The Officer and Cabinet Member introduced the overall performance as Amber. There are a number of Red measures. The Officer explained that the first Red concerns the number of first time entrants into the youth justice system. The Officer explained that there was no way the Council can control the entrants. There was ongoing work with the Police and education establishments to educate young people about their choices. September also saw the lowest number of first time entrants in the year to date. The second Red measure looks at the percentage of young people who reoffend within 12 months. The Officer informed the Committee that the young people who reoffended had been small. As the numbers of young people offending comes down those who reoffend were more likely to be complex individuals. The last measure, an Amber, the Officer introduced related to the access to timely assessment and treatment in relation to substance misuse. The measure is Amber because one young person missed the targeted time. The Officer reminded the Committee

that during the last quarter the Police conducted two major operations which had an impact on the number of first time entrants and also on those reoffenders.

The Committee and Officers held a broad discussion around levels of substance misuse in YOS young people. The Officers explained that substance misuse was not a primary factor with the YOS young people but the trafficking of substances for older adults. The Officer agreed to provide the Committee with a report from the YOS Substance Misuse Officer on the levels of substance misuse in the YOS.

Members enquired about how partnerships were working in the YOS. The Officers responded by explaining that the partnerships were working well and all relationships were positive, especially with the Police.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion the Committee understood the difficulties faced by the service area to report on performance measures that they had little or no control over and were happy to receive information reports focusing on substance misuse in YOS young people.

## **IP Objective 6 – Ensuring the best educational outcomes for children**

Invitees;

- Head of Education
- Chair of Education and Skills

The Officer and Cabinet Member introduced the overall performance of the Objective as Green Star – Excellent. The Key Stage three figure is currently 0.5% over target. This measure is still under the Welsh average but the Council was working to reach this. Newport was ranked 16<sup>th</sup> in Wales for this performance measure three places higher than its place on the deprivation index. Newport was currently improving performance at a faster rate than any other LA in Wales. The difference in the Key Stage 3 performance and the Welsh average was around 30 pupils. The Officer also informed the Committee that there would be a Key Stage 3 leadership review. This review would be conducted by EAS and Peers from other Newport schools.

Members on the Committee wanted to know if the Pupil Referral Unit was a school and the outcomes facing those children who are excluded from schools. The Officer explained that pupil exclusions was going down year on year, there were no permanent exclusions only 6 week fixed term exclusions. The 6 week programme was a revolving door and not all young people stayed for the entire time, all work completed with the young people was tailored to their specific needs. The young people who were referred into the PRU were individuals with complex issues. To overcome the issues the young people have access to an Educational Psychologist, who would look at the mental health and wellbeing of the young people. This WG funded project was in two schools, Bassaleg and Newport High, and has halved the amount of days lost in the previous year. All young people in these schools had access to a counselling service.

A member queried about Smooth Start and what checks are conducted on the Therapists. The Officer assured the Member that Smooth Start did not deliver in Newport. The Officer continued to explain that if it did, the checks would be the same as other positions working with young people. The checks would normally be DBS, quality assurance, safeguarding and monitoring of young people's progression.

The Committee questioned whether the attendance figures and what else could be done to improve them. The Officer explained that the schools have seen great rises in attendance with good practice sharing at an attendance forum. The next report that comes to scrutiny will outline the figures. There will also be a social media and local radio campaign to further



increase the attendance rates. There are some schools that have not seen an increase in attendance and these schools are being targeted.

The Committee enquired whether the 21st century school funding had been announced. The Officer explained that Newport City Council would have a total budget of 70 million pounds for the Band B project. 35 million pounds was provided by the Council, this was match funded by Welsh Government. The Officer informed the Committee that the LA have until 2021 currently to spend the money but this might be extended. Further information from Welsh Government is expected shortly.

### **Conclusion**

The Committee commended the Officers and Cabinet Member on the success of the service area and the progress made for the young people of Newport. The Committee was also impressed by the 70 million pounds for the improvement of schools. The Members thanked the Officers for the insight into the workings of the PRU and how it is supporting those children who need additional support outside of formal education.

## **4 Mid Year Performance Update**

### **Business Service Development Manager Introduction**

The Head of People and Business Change informed the Committee that the information presented in the report related to the second quarter of the year. The new process used is the report comes to Scrutiny before Cabinet. This allows the Committees to provide comment for the Cabinet Members.

### **Education**

Invitees;

- Head of Education
- Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

The Officer provided an overview of the performance of the service area working through the general comments and then the individual comments. All of the measures are Green. The Committee were happy with the performance and the comments of the Officer.

### **Children and Young People**

Invitees;

- Head of Children and Young Peoples Services
- Cabinet Member for Social Services

The Officer and Cabinet Member provided an overview of the Red and Amber measures. The Red measure was discussed in the IP Objective 8, the details of which are recorded above on page 3. The four Amber measures were discussed; the first of which looked at the percentage of looked after children returned home from care. This it was explained was a view of the courts and not something the service area can control. There was also an influx of young people who have had repeated interventions to improve conditions, but the long term care of the children is important and they were unable to return home. The Officer added that the performance shortfall was also due to the financial implication of austerity and the cuts made to Social Services.

The second Amber measure was the percentage of children seen by a dentist within 3 months of becoming looked after. There were problems with how this information was collected and it does not take into a number of different factors such as when was the last time the young person saw the dentist. The Officers were working on getting more accurate information for this measure.

The third Amber measure was the percentage of looked after children who have had three or more placements. The Officer explained that this measure has been difficult to achieve over the last couple of years. They continued to state that this measure was made difficult because the number of siblings in the system who they try and place together. Older children are also more difficult to place long term.

One of the Members enquired if the Council were still able to find emergency placements and whether or not the growing complexity of young person's history and issues make it more difficult. The Officer explained that the staff were always able to secure placements for a young person, including emergency ones. Placements are decreasing for young people on a whole. The proposal to develop fostering services on a regional basis has been to Scrutiny to try new initiatives. The Officer added that the having a better understanding of the young people and their history and problems allows you to create better and longer lasting placements.

The Committee commented on the fact that the Council had decreased the number of beds in Forest Lodge house, but were still paying large amounts of money to send young people out of area. The Officer responded that the needs of the young people come first and it is known that young people do not do well in houses with high numbers of beds. The larger the number of high risk young people the more likely there are to be breakdowns and issues within the house. Numbers had been reviewed at Forest Lodge and this was an appropriate number of beds for this facility at the present time.

One of the Members questioned the additional grant funding and how it was used. The Officer stated that the Council had received 8 million pounds in grant funding. This additional money has been used to employ Social Work Assistants who can complete targeted work on the areas of work that need it the most.

Another Member enquired whether the Council had looked at providing a high rate of pay to Foster Carers to home high risk young people. The Officer explained that fostering was not financially motivated. Foster Carers receive higher amounts for young people with physical needs. This was because the payments are now related to the needs of the young person and not the needs of the carer.

The Officer assured the Committee that the run up to Christmas had been completed and that all of the looked after young people and those children who were known to Social Services would be provided with a Christmas.

## **Conclusion**

The Committee made it clear that they were happy to hear about how Christmas was being provided for the looked after children and those known to social services

The Committee were happy to accept the previous answers to the Red measures given during IP Objective 8 page 3. The answers to the Amber measures and the questions asked by the Members were accepted by the Committee.

## **Adult and Community Services**

Invitees;

- Head of Adult and Community Services
- Cabinet Member for Social Services

The Head of Service introduced the service area and its measures. The area had two Red measures. The first of which was the delayed transfers of care, this was discussed as part of the IP Objective 2 in the previous agenda item (reported above on page 3).

The second Red measure reported on the number of people receiving a service from the Rehabilitation Officer (Visual Impairment). The number of people seen was lower than expected but as this was a new target for the year the Officers were estimating the amount of people who would be seen. The good news was that there was no waiting list to see the Rehabilitation Officer, which was a first for Newport. The Rehabilitation Officer had been able to directly address the complaints that had come in from people with visual impairments and no further complaints have been received. The Rehabilitation Officer also referred individuals onto services which are better suited to support the individual, which had again impacted on the numbers receiving a service from the Rehabilitation Officer. The Officer explained that the service was currently working in partnership with GPs and others in the health board, and this was impacting number also.

A Member of the Committee wanted to know how many staff were working on the Communities Connectors programme. The Officer explained that the Manager was currently off but the programme had 6 full time staff currently working.

### **Conclusion**

The Committee were happy with the responses gained from the Officers regarding the Red measures and answers to the questions the Members asked in addition. The Members were happy to refer back to the previous agenda items to provide clarity to other Red measures.

### **5 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 6.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



# Scrutiny Report

## Performance Scrutiny Committee – People

### Part 1

Date: 23 January 2018

### Subject 2018/19 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan

**Author** Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer

The following officers have been invited to attend for this item:

Role / Areas of responsibility	Lead Officer
Budget Overview and Process	Meirion Rushworth, Head of Finance
Overall Budget for People Directorate	James Harris – Strategic Director - People
<b>Service Specific Proposals:</b>	
Education	Sarah Morgan – Chief Education Officer
Children and Young People	Sally Jenkins – Head of Children and Young People
Adult and Community Services	Chris Humphreys – Head of Adults and Community Services

### Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

#### 1. Recommendations to the Committee

The Committee is asked to:

- (i) Consider and the budget proposals relevant to the People Directorate;
- (ii) Determine if it wishes to make recommendations or comments to the Cabinet on the Proposals within the People Directorate;
- (iii) Determine if it wishes to make any comments on the budget process or the public engagement (to be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for consideration).

## 2. Context

- 2.1 In accordance with the constitution, the Cabinet is required to consult on the proposals before recommending an overall budget and required council tax to the Council for approval in March. Scrutiny Committees must be consulted as part of this process. The timetable for the consultation on the budget is as follows:

Cabinet agrees budget proposals as a basis for consultation	20 December 2017
Consultation period	21 December 2017 to 31 January 2018
Cabinet considers feedback from consultation and agrees final budget proposals for recommendation to Council	14 February 2018
Council approves the 2018/19 budget and council tax level	27 February 2018

### Structure of Scrutiny of the Budget Proposals

- 2.2 Each Committee will meet to discuss the budget proposals in detail and formulate comments relating to their portfolio:

Committee	Date	Role
Performance Scrutiny Committee - Place and Corporate	22 January 2018	Savings proposals within the Place Directorate and Corporate.
Performance Scrutiny Committee - People	23 January 2018	Savings proposal within the People Directorate
Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	1 February 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coordination of comments from all Scrutiny Committees</li><li>• Comments on the budget process</li><li>• Comments on public engagement</li></ul>

- 2.3 Recommendations will be agreed verbally at the Committee meetings, the final wording will be approved by the Chairperson after the meeting. These recommendations will then be sent to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) at its meeting on 1 February 2018 to confirm the list of comments that will be submitted from Scrutiny to the Cabinet. The Chair of this Committee will be invited to attend the meeting of the OSMC where the Committees recommendations are discussed.
- 2.4 The role of the Overview and Scrutiny is to coordinate the comments from Scrutiny to ensure that there are no overlaps in what is being recommended and ensure that scrutiny as a whole provides a cohesive and consistent response to Cabinet. It also has overall responsibility for comments on the budget process, and public engagement, which it will be focusing on at its meeting.

### 3. Information Submitted to the Committee

3.1 The following information is attached:

*(For ease of reference, the appendices numbers have been kept the same as the Cabinet Report.)*

**Appendix A** Cabinet Report

**Appendix 2** Budget Savings for Consultations

**Appendix 6** Detailed Business Cases relevant to the People directorate:

- EDU181902 - Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'
- EDU181904 - Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit
- CFS181901 - Review of Oakland Short Break Service
- CFS181904 - Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services
- CFS181902 - Integrated Family Support Team Restructure
- CFS181913 - Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children
- ACS181903 - Review of the Domiciliary Care Service
- ACS181904 - Re-provision of Supported Living Service
- ACS181907 - Reduction in Adult Budget

**Appendix 7** Fees and Charges (People Directorate)

3.2 The draft 2017-18 Budget proposals and Medium Term Financial Plan were confirmed by Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December 2017. The full cabinet report is available on the Council's Website ([Cabinet Report](#)):

3.3 At this meeting, the Cabinet agreed the following proposals for public consultation:

- The budget savings proposals in **Appendix 2** (summary table) and **Appendix 6** (detailed business cases).
- The proposed increases to fees and charges in **Appendix 7**
- The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in section 5.

3.4 Under the constitution and our scheme of delegation, some budget decisions have to be taken by the Cabinet collectively or individual Cabinet Members. These proposals, totalling £2,393k for 2018/19 and £2,919k over the life of the MTFP, will form the basis of the public consultation on the budget this year (summary at **Appendix 2**).

3.5 Some lower level, more operational and efficiency type budget proposals are delegated to senior officers for decision and implementation. These proposals, totalling £2,947k for 2018/19 and £3,049k over the life of the MTFP are listed for reference. There are also savings that have been agreed in the previous years or are due to be implemented in 2018/19.

Reference to these is contained within the [Cabinet papers](#) and will be implemented separately from the public consultation. As these do not form part of the consultation, they are not being considered by the Scrutiny Committees, and are referenced for information only.

3.6 The Cabinet report (**Appendix A**) contains background information in the budget setting process, financial planning assumptions as well as outlining the budget process and planned consultation.

- 3.7 Within the report, paragraph 5 outlines the position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.6 which also forms part of the public consultation. These are replicated below for ease of reference:

### Extract from Cabinet Report on Schools funding:

#### School funding

- 5.1 The current position assumes there is no reduction to school's funding, unlike other parts of the Council's budget where significant savings are being made. Cabinet are asked to consider the level of funding that will be delegated to schools for 2018/19. The current draft budget proposals for schools include funding for the following items:

**Table 2: School budget pressures 2018-22**

School Pressures	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	Total (£'000)
Inflation	-	1,163	1,181	1,199	3,543
Demographic Growth	-	539	826	807	2,172
Schools Reorganisation	1,028	1,307	1,006	1,050	4,391
Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school	285	200	-	-	485
Teaching Staff Increments	-	736	612	484	1,832
Continuation of one off funding	1,100	-	-	-	1,100
<b>Total Pressures</b>	<b>2,413</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>3,540</b>	<b>13,523</b>
Savings	(240)	0	0	0	(240)
<b>Net Budget Pressure</b>	<b>2,173</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>3,540</b>	<b>13,283</b>

- 5.2 This report proposes that the schools budget is kept at the current level for 2018/19, with the exception of:
- funding to cover the running costs of new schools; including a new Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school
  - continuation of the £1.1m one-off funding which was made available in 2016/17 from revenue budget underspends.
- 5.3 Overall, the total existing schools budget will be 'cash-flat' and schools will need to absorb cost pressures such as inflationary pay awards / pay increments etc. The existing budget will not be expected to absorb the cost of new schools as new, additional funding is included for this.
- 5.4 This is undoubtedly a challenging position for schools and is further compounded by reduced funding from their external grant. Although final allocations are yet to be determined across the Education Achievement Service (EAS) region, there is a headline cut to the Education Improvement Grant (EIG) of £3m (11.2%). We are yet to receive figures for the Post-16 grant, however projections of close to £0.5m reduction have been tentatively acknowledged by Welsh Government as being broadly accurate.



## Extract from Cabinet Report on Schools funding:

- 5.5 In recognising the challenges the draft budget assumptions give, school funding in overall terms is better than other parts of the Council, and has increased, on average, over the last few years. The table below sets out the proposed percentage change to cash limits in 2018/19 for both schools and other areas of the Council. This excludes the impact of specific grants that have transferred into the RSG (£3,985k) but includes new responsibilities (£321k).

**Table 3: Budget changes for schools and other areas of the council**

	2017/18 Base Budget (Apr '17)	Inflation	Other Pressures	Savings	2018/19 Est Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) in Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) as % of net budget
Schools	90,297	-	1,313	- 240	91,370	1,073	1%
Other	176,075	2,273	4,940	- 7,168	176,120	45	0%
	<b>266,372</b>	<b>2,273</b>	<b>6,253</b>	<b>- 7,408</b>	<b>267,490</b>	<b>1,118</b>	

- 5.6 The table below shows how the overall schools budget has increased by over 7% over the last 4 years.

**Table 4: School budget changes 2013-18**

Year	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total
2013/14	656	50,193	46,152	2,959	99,960
2014/15	585	52,234	47,165	2,894	102,878
2015/16	519	52,924	47,480	3,724	104,647
2016/17	494	54,627	48,619	4,040	107,780
2017/18	512	54,959	47,505	4,247	107,223
Increase in funding over 5 year period (incl specific grants)					7.3%
Increase in funding (excl specific grants & delegations)					7.7%

- 3.9 Below is a summary of the proposals relevant for this Committee to consider:

**Relevant Proposals for this Committee - Appendix 2 and 6- Decisions with the People Directorate**

	Service Group	Unique ID	Page Number	Proposal Title	Invitees	Decision Maker
1	Education	EDU181902	41 – 45	Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'	James Harris – Strategic Director – People	Cabinet
2		EDU181904	47 – 50	Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit	Sarah Morgan – Chief Education Officer	
3	Children & Family Services	CFS181901	51 – 53	Review of Oakland Short Break Service	James Harris – Strategic Director – People  Sally Jenkins – Head of Children and Young People	Cabinet Member
4		CFS181904	55 – 57	Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services		
5		CFS181902	59 – 61	Integrated Family Support Team Restructure		
6		CFS181913	63 – 65	Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children		
7	Adult & Community Services	ACS181903	67 – 69	Review of the Domiciliary Care Service	James Harris – Strategic Director – People	Cabinet Member
8		ACS181904	71 – 74	Re-provision of Supported Living Service	Chris Humphreys – Head of Adults and Community Services	
9		ACS181907	75 – 77	Reduction in Adult Budget		

Page 18

**Appendix 7 – Fees and Charges**

	Service Area	Page Numbers	Invitees
10	Social Services	79 - 81	James Harris – Strategic Director – People Sally Jenkins – Head of Children and Young People Chris Humphreys – Head of Adults and Community Services



#### 4. Suggested Areas of Focus

##### Role of the Committee

<p><b>The role of the Committee in considering the report is to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Assess and make comment</b> on the proposals relevant to the People Directorate in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How <b>reliable</b> the savings forecasts are;</li> <li>○ How <b>achievable</b> the proposals are;</li> <li>○ Have <b>risks</b> / impact on service users been appropriately mitigated;</li> <li>○ Is there sufficient and consistent information within the Business cases to enable Cabinet to make an informed decision;</li> <li>○ How does it fit into the <b>longer term strategic planning</b> and vision of the Council;</li> <li>○ Has the <b>FEIA</b> have been completed and used to develop the proposal;</li> <li>○ The extent to which the <b>Wellbeing of Future Generations Act</b> has been considered;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Conclusions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feedback the Committees assessments of the proposals and highlight what the Cabinet need to be mindful of when taking the decision on the proposals.</li> <li>○ Feedback to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee in the process and public engagement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---

##### Suggested Lines of Enquiry

- 4.1 Councillors have a fundamental democratic right to commission financial information and provide challenge to executives and officers about finances. Scrutiny councillors are not expected to be financial experts, but they have a key role in ensuring **accountability** and **value for money** are demonstrated to the public.
- 4.2 The following has been adapted from Section 3.1-3.4: Source: Grant Thornton – Local Government Financial Resilience Review 2012 (“Towards a tipping point?”) to provide examples of the questioning and lines of enquiry that the Committee may wish to consider:

<b>Individual Proposals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How reliable are the proposed savings?</li> <li>• Is there sufficient evidence within the business cases to have confidence that the proposals are achievable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how this proposal will be delivered and how the savings will be achieved?</li> <li>• Timing of the implementation – will this achieve a full year’s savings? Will anything delay implementation (such as the consultation process for any redundancies)</li> </ul>
<b>Links to Strategic Planning</b>	How does the proposal contribute to the achieving corporate priorities?
	How do these proposals fit into an overall budget strategy / what is the long term approach to budget at the Council?

<b>Assessing Impact</b>	What is the anticipated impact of the budget proposal on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Services</li> <li>○ Performance (including performance indicators and standards)</li> <li>○ Clients / services users</li> </ul>
	If there is a risk identified, has this been appropriately mitigated? Is this clear within the business case, and is it achievable?
	How will we measure the success / impact of this proposal?
<b>Fairness and Equalities Impact Assessments</b>	Have these been completed?
	Have any impact identified within the FEIA been considered within the business case?

4.4 All plans / decisions / policy changes now need to be made in line with the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act, and this should be considered in Scrutiny's consideration of budget proposals.

<b>Wellbeing of Future Generations</b>	How will this decision / policy / proposal impact upon future generations? What is the long term impact?
	What evidence is provided to demonstrate WFGA has been / is being considered?
	How are the Wellbeing goals reflected in the policy / proposal / action? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A prosperous Wales</i></li> <li>• <i>A resilient Wales</i></li> <li>• <i>A healthier Wales</i></li> <li>• <i>A more equal Wales</i></li> <li>• <i>A Wales of cohesive communities</i></li> <li>• <i>A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language</i></li> <li>• <i>A globally responsible Wales</i></li> </ul>
	Does the report / proposal demonstrate how as an authority we are working in accordance with the sustainable development principles from the act when planning services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Long Term</b> <i>The importance of balancing short-term needs with the need to safeguard the ability to also meet long-term needs</i></li> <li>• <b>Prevention</b> <i>How acting to prevent problems occurring or getting worse may help public bodies meet their objectives</i></li> <li>• <b>Integration</b> <i>Considering how the public body's well-being objectives may impact upon each of the well-being goals, on their other objectives, or on the objectives of other public bodies</i></li> <li>• <b>Collaboration</b> <i>Acting in collaboration with any other person (or different parts of the body itself) that could help the body to meet its well-being objectives</i></li> <li>• <b>Involvement</b> <i>The importance of involving people with an interest in achieving the</i></li> </ul>

*well-being goals, and ensuring that those people reflect the diversity of the area which the body serves.*

## Section B – Supporting Information

### 5. Further Guidance on the Scrutiny Role

- 5.1 The information in the following section has been taken and adapted from the CfPS / Grant Thornton Finance Scrutiny Guide (pdf) published in June 2014. The extracts reproduced here focus predominantly on Councillors' role in the annual budget setting process.
- 5.2 For further information, Members are invited to read the original publication which includes more detail about scrutiny's role in financial planning and management, as well as case studies and best practice examples.

### Understanding Roles and Responsibilities

- 5.4 Councillors and officers have a collective and individual responsibility for ensuring that a council's finances are effectively managed. Within the Annual Budget process:

<b>Council</b>	Agrees the policy and budget framework.
<b>Cabinet/Executive</b>	Cabinet agrees a series of proposals for public consultation, which form the draft budget proposals. Scrutiny must be consulted as part of this process. Responsible for proposing the policy and budget framework and key strategies, including the MTFP and annual budget. It has power to take all executive decisions within the policy and budget framework agreed by the Council.
<b>Scrutiny Chairs</b>	The Chair should encourage all scrutiny councillors to take a full part in scrutiny, including taking part in any agreed work outside of the formal meetings. Focus the Committee on their role in providing constructive challenge as a consultee in the budget process.
<b>Scrutiny Councillors</b>	The role of scrutiny councillors is to review policy and challenge whether the executive is making the right decisions to deliver policy goals and achieve Council's agreed objectives. Their role comprises <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Providing constructive challenge on the draft budget proposals and ensure that properly costed policy and budget proposals are implemented.</li> <li>○ Monitoring the service and financial performance of the council and its partners and examining the impact and implementation of cabinet decisions and policies</li> <li>○ Holding the council leader, cabinet and senior officers to account in how effectively they deliver a balanced budget.</li> </ul>
<b>Heads of Service</b>	Within the policy and budget framework and decisions taken by executives, Chief Executives, Chief Finance Officers and Monitoring Officers have key responsibilities for the way Councils are run in terms of compliance with

	<p>legal duties.</p> <p>Section 151 of the Local Government Act sets out requirements to prepare a prudent and balanced annual budget including maintaining reasonable levels of reserves and the role of the Head of Finance (as the designated 151 Officer) within this. Other members of the corporate management team are responsible for administering annual service budgets.</p>
<b>Finance Professionals</b>	<p>Such as auditors and accountants, should identify how financial planning and management processes can ensure time and space for scrutiny to add value and make a difference.</p>

### **Fairness and Equalities Impact Assessment (FEIAs)**

- 5.5 Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments (FEIA) are a systematic approach to ensure that the Council takes decisions that balances the needs of people, local culture, the economy and the environment over time. FEIAs assist the Council in ensuring that our decision-making process is inclusive. They are used to look at the effect of any change to Council services or employment from everybody's viewpoint, to make sure that changes are fair and do not discriminate.
- 5.6 Officers have a responsibility to inform decision makers of all the relevant implications of any proposal and provide evidence on which they will base their decisions. FEIAs help decision makers understand service users, employees and other stakeholders' perspectives, and provide evidence that citizens have shaped the council's work. There is legal requirement to publish FEIAs.
- 5.7 Within the Budget proposal Business Cases, there is an indication as to whether or not an assessment is necessary for a proposal and.

Savings Proposal	FEIA necessary? (taken from the Business cases)
EDU181902 - Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'	Yes
EDU181904 - Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit	Yes
CFS181901 - Review of Oakland Short Break Service	Yes
CFS181904 - Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services	Yes
CFS181902 - Integrated Family Support Team Restructure	Yes
CFS181913 - Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children	No
ACS181903 - Review of the Domiciliary Care Service	Yes – a FEIA will be completed once we fully understand details of the transfer arrangements
ACS181904 - Re-provision of Supported Living Service	Yes
ACS181907 - Reduction in Adult Budget	Yes

- 5.8 These are published on the Council's Equalities page on the website ([link](#)).

## Links to Council Policies and Priorities

6. The overall aim of the budget and MTFP is to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities, supports the delivery of the Council's change programme and saving proposals and protects the financial health of the Council. Scrutiny should seek to ensure that the MTFP and Draft budget proposals contribute to this aim.

## Financial Implications

7. The financial implications are contained within the report to the Cabinet on the draft budget proposals 2017/18. Scrutiny is being asked to make recommendations and comments to the Cabinet for consideration on these proposals

## 8. Background Papers

Cabinet Report – Draft Budget Proposals (21 December 2017)

Grant Thornton – Local Government Financial Resilience Review 2012 (“Towards a tipping point?”)

The full cabinet report is available on the Council's Website ([Cabinet Report](#)):

Report Appendices:

- Appendix 1 [Budget investments](#)
- Appendix 2 [New budget savings for consultation](#)
- Appendix 3 [New budget savings implemented under delegated authority \(Head of Service\)](#)
- Appendix 4 [Budget savings previously approved](#)
- Appendix 5 [Savings summary](#)
- Appendix 6 [Budget savings for consultation – Business Cases](#)
- Appendix 7 [Fees & Charges for consultation](#)



# Report

## Cabinet

---

### Part 1

Date: 20 December 2017

### **Subject 2018/19 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)**

**Purpose** To present the draft proposals for the 2018/19 budget. Cabinet are asked to agree the draft proposals to start the budget consultation process for this year. Consultation results and final proposals will be presented back to Cabinet in February, when Cabinet will be asked to recommend a final budget and council tax level to full Council.

**Author** Head of Finance

**Ward** All

**Summary** Further reductions in resources have been confirmed in the Council's indicative grant notification for 2018/19 which could, potentially, worsen again when the final grant settlement is known on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2017. Alongside pressures on the Council's budget which require new investment, these require savings to be considered to produce a balanced budget in 2018/19.

The draft 2018/19 budget proposals are explained and detailed in this report and its appendices.

#### Section:

- 1 Our financial challenge
- 2 Setting the budget
- 3 Financial planning assumptions
- 4 Budget savings
- 5 School budgets
- 6 Budget process and consultation
- 7 Report review and statutory comments

#### Appendix:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| Appendix 1 | Budget investments   |
| Appendix 2 | New budget savings for consultation                            |
| Appendix 3 | New budget savings implemented under delegated authority (HoS) |
| Appendix 4 | Budget savings previously approved                             |
| Appendix 5 | Savings summary  |
| Appendix 6 | Budget savings for consultation – business cases               |
| Appendix 7 | Fees & Charges for consultation                                |

## Proposal

1. **Cabinet is asked to agree the following draft proposals for public consultation:**
  - i) Budget savings proposals in Appendix 2 (summary table) and Appendix 6 (detailed business cases).
  - ii) Proposed increases to fees and charges in Appendix 7
  - iii) The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in paragraphs 5.1– 5.6
2. **Cabinet is asked to note:**
  - i) The position on developing a balanced budget for 2018/19, acknowledging that the position will be subject to ongoing review and updates,
  - ii) and agree that the Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 will be implemented with immediate effect.
  - iii) That Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments have been completed for all proposals requiring one.

**Action by** Directors / Heads of Service

**Timetable** Immediate:

1. Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 to be implemented with immediate effect.
2. Cabinet / Cabinet Members budget savings proposals, fees and charges, and schools funding position to form the basis of the budget consultation process.

This report was prepared after consultation with:

- Directors
- Head of Law and Regulation
- Head of People and Business Change

# 1 Our financial challenge

- 1.1 The Council provides over 800 services, for over 147,800 people, living in over 65,000 households. Newport's population is growing, with the largest growth for children under five, and people aged over 65. The Council also provides employment for over 6,000 people.
- 1.2 Financial pressures and demands on our services are increasing due to:
- Ageing population
  - Increases in demand led services
  - Care for the elderly and children
  - Schools funding
  - National Minimum Wage
  - Inflationary costs
- 1.3 Over the last five years, the council has made savings of £41m. To achieve this we have
- reduced the number of staff we employ by around one quarter
  - sold land, buildings and property we no longer use or need
  - set up a property services joint venture
  - set up a charitable trust for leisure services
  - reviewed our services to become more efficient
  - developed shared services such as IT
  - helped people to live independently

But ongoing public sector austerity measures, coupled with continuing financial pressures and demands mean that even more savings must still be found – at least £30m by 2022.

## Implementing the new Corporate Plan

- 1.4 Following the elections in May 2017, the council has developed a new Corporate Plan which sets out a clear set of aspirations and plans for the future. This is the first budget setting period within this strategic plan. There is work ongoing to develop our new change programme and ensure that the necessary investment (revenue and capital) is available to achieve the priorities set out in the corporate plan.
- 1.5 The Council's future plans and its change programme will need to ensure a strategic approach is taken on the future direction of Council services. This means that it will need to meet the medium term financial sustainability challenge, meet key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and our duties under the Well-Being of Future Generations Act in terms of sustainability and well-being objectives. The new Corporate Plan is rightly ambitious and whilst this presents significant financial challenges within the current climate of austerity, the Authority has made a commitment to address key priorities over the plan's lifespan.
- 1.6 Of particular importance is the need to bring forward plans to stabilise and manage the current areas of significant in year budget overspending – Community Care, Special Education Needs and Children's Placements, whilst managing the budget risks they represent in the shorter term before those plans can be implemented. The costs and investments in doing these will need to be factored into the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) when known.
- 1.7 Factoring in any cost implications of the new Corporate Plan over and above existing revenue and capital budgets, as well as any costs required to deal with stabilising the three areas of significant demand/cost overspending shown above, will need to be factored into the MTFP when there is more information available on these and this will need to be completed as soon as possible. Clearly, in the current financial climate, the Council will need to minimise the cost implications wherever possible.

## 2 Setting the budget

2.1 There are two main elements to the council's financial planning:

- strategic planning: the MTFP
- within that, the annual council budget.

2.2 The Council is required by law to set a balanced budget every year. At the same time, we review and update our MTFP, to help plan our savings and investments across the next four years. For a number of years now we have faced continued financial pressures together with reducing funding allocations from central government, so we have had to find savings to meet the funding gap between the income we receive through our grants and council tax collection, and our expenditure on the wide variety of services we provide.

2.3 To meet this gap, in putting together the budget proposals each year we review:

- i) budget commitments (both investments and savings) agreed in the MTFP last year
- ii) new areas in need of investment and growth
- iii) new proposals for savings and efficiencies
- iv) new proposals on our fees and charges

2.4 As in previous years, Cabinet will be asked to keep the medium term position in mind, and in February will agree the full package of new medium term savings and investments, to be added to what has already been approved within the MTFP.

### **National budget position**

2.5 The Chancellor's Autumn UK budget in November continued the significant reductions to public services funding over a number of years, and local government in particular. Lower GDP growth and productivity means UK borrowing is now forecast to be considerably higher over the next few years than was the case in the March 2017 budget, and the fiscal target to eliminate the deficit by the middle of the next decade looks much more difficult to meet. Brexit, of course, provides another layer of uncertainty at this time.

2.6 In this context, the downward pressure on public services funding continues. Crucially, no new funding for Social Care was announced, an area which is very challenging, in particular Children's services. In addition, the Green Paper review of the future funding for Adult Social Care services has been delayed. It provided no prospects for change to the Council's indicative grant settlement for 2018/19, which was announced on 10 October and is discussed below.

2.7 The Chancellor's UK Autumn budget provided an additional c£1.2bn funding to the Welsh Government budget over the next 3 years, which is all capital funding apart from around £350m allocated for revenue funding. No decisions have been announced yet on how this additional funding will be used.

### **Welsh Government funding settlement**

2.8 Welsh Government funding accounts for the largest part of the council's budget, equating to around 80 per cent of its total net revenue budget funding. This funding is provided through non-hypothecated grants – the Revenue Support Grant (RSG). In addition to this, other grants provide funding for specific purposes.

2.9 The council received its [provisional RSG settlement from Welsh Government](#) (weblink) on 10 October 2017. Overall, it confirmed that the council would receive £211,682k for 2018/19. After allowing for net specific grant transfers into the RSG, and new responsibilities being funded, this is a 'cash decrease' of £873k (-0.4%) from current funding. Our final settlement from Welsh

Government is due on 20 December 2017, and we are waiting for further information on the receipt of specific grant income.

- 2.10 In terms of the final settlement, the main cause of changes from the draft settlement is in relation to changes to a council's tax-base, i.e. its ability to raise its own council tax income. If a council's tax-base changes by more or less than the Welsh average, their final grant settlement will be increased or decreased accordingly. This 'equalisation' is a key feature of the Local Government grant settlement process, but provides some challenges to those Councils, like Newport, who have significant cost pressures resulting from housing and population growth.
- 2.11 The Head of Finance has set the tax-base for 2018/19 and it will increase by almost 1.5%, significantly higher than the all Wales average of 0.5%-0.8% over the last few years. We do not know what impact this will have until we receive the final budget settlement, but it is likely that the council could suffer a further decrease in its grant settlement, with the possibility of this being significant.
- 2.12 The current budget assumptions have not been adjusted for this increase in the tax-base in Newport and the increased council tax income it brings, on the assumption, at this point, that we'll lose at least the equivalent in Welsh Government grant. The Head of Finance will provide a verbal update on this in the Cabinet meeting, when the final settlement will be known.
- 2.13 The outcome of the draft settlement, along with extensive work by officers to develop robust savings proposals since July, has seen the budget gap in 2018/19 reduce to a position where the budget for 2018/19 is finely balanced. The position can only be confirmed with confidence after receipt of the final settlement, on 20 December.

### **3 Financial planning assumptions**

#### **Revenue Support Grant (RSG)**

- 3.1 The draft grant settlement for 2018/19 is currently known at a -0.4% reduction, which may change at final settlement stage. An average -1.5% reduction has been indicated by WG for the following year 2019/20 but this may decrease slightly following the UK budget announcement in November. The MTFP will be updated for the February 2018 Cabinet when details are known with more certainty.

#### **Inflation**

- 3.2 Pay, contract and income inflation has been included within the MTFP based on specific inflationary factors:
- National pay award inflation is included at 1%, in line with the 'public sector pay cap', but the Cabinet will know that this pay cap is under intense scrutiny and pressure across the UK public sector and therefore represents a risk in terms of the budget.
  - Lower pay grades and external contracts affected by the Minimum and Living wage increases have been uplifted by increases in these rates, which in percentage terms, are significant and provide a relatively large, and unfunded, pressure on budgets.
  - Unavoidable inflation pressures equate to £2,273k in 2018/19 and £13,074k over the four year period to 2021/22.

#### **Investments**

- 3.3 In addition to the unavoidable inflationary increase, the Council has to also consider and fund unavoidable budget pressures from increasing demand, unfunded UK/ Welsh policy changes and

other issues resulting in significant savings being required from in the base budget in order to balance the budget.

3.4 For 2018/19 specifically, the Council is currently planning on investing around £11.3m in the draft budget over and above an allowance for inflation on pay and prices. Around £4m of these pressures relate to specific grants that have been transferred into RSG. More details on proposed investments are included in Appendix 1 and some of the key items include:

- £3,985k grants transferred into the RSG
- £1,313k costs associated with new schools
- £1,135k for pension deficit
- £1,100k permanent transfer of funds to schools
- £800k for increasing number of children in out of County placements
- £427k reduction in external funding in respect of Supporting People (Adult & Community Services) and Sustainable Waste grant (Streetscene & City Services)
- £350k of pressure from implementing national policy of increasing 'capital limit' before any contributing is payable for residential care charges.

### **Council tax**

3.5 It is well documented that Newport's council tax is low compared to others in Wales, generating approximately 20 per cent of our income, compared to around 25 per cent for most Welsh councils. The Welsh Government uses the standard spending assessment (SSA) to calculate the level of spending required to deliver a 'standard level' of service in each council area. However, our actual spend is well below our SSA (around £8.3m in 2017-18), which is mainly due to our low level of council tax funding.

3.6 A base 4% increase is already included in our MTFP each year. This year, the budget proposals include an additional 1% increase to council tax in 2018/19 (Appendix 2) bringing the proposed increase to 5%. This is subject to consultation, and a final recommendation to Council on the council tax level will be confirmed in the Cabinet's February meeting.

## **4 Budget savings**

4.1 The savings identified for 2018/19 total £7,408k. Table 1 below provides a summary of the savings for 2018/19.

4.2 Under the constitution and our scheme of delegation, some budget decisions have to be taken by the Cabinet collectively or individual Cabinet Members. These proposals, totalling £2,393k for 2018/19 and £2,919k over the life of the MTFP, will form the basis of the public consultation on the budget this year.

4.3 Some lower level, more operational and efficiency type budget proposals are delegated to senior officers for decision and implementation. These proposals, totalling £2,947k for 2018/19 and £3,049k over the life of the MTFP are listed in Appendix 3. These Head of Service decisions are listed for reference and will be implemented separately from the public consultation. Regardless of their categorisation, the normal protocols for staff, unions and any other required consultation are being adhered to in respect of all savings.

4.4 The savings already agreed last year are either in progress or due to be implemented in 2018/19. Links to their business cases are provided in the appendix. No further details are shown for these savings, as they have already been approved, although it should be noted that in some cases the timings or value of savings have been updated in light of experience gained in their implementation. The net impact of these adjustments for 2018/19 is £12k fewer savings.

**Table 1: 2018/19 summary of savings**

Savings Decision Type	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
Budget savings for full Cabinet decision (Appendix 2 & 6)	1,548	269	0	0	-11.5
Budget savings for Cabinet Member decision (Appendix 2 & 6)	845	257	0	0	-65.2
Budget savings delegated to officers (Appendix 3)	2,947	76	26	0	-7.1
<b>Total new budget savings</b>	<b>5,340</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-83.8</b>
Previously agreed budget savings (Appendix 4)	2,068	1,580	20	0	-35.1
<b>TOTAL BUDGET SAVINGS</b>	<b>7,408</b>	<b>2,182</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-118.9</b>

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments (FEIAs)**

4.5 All budget proposals have been reviewed, where needed, to ensure the Council understands and mitigates, where possible, fairness and equality issues. FEIAs seek to identify whether proposals will have a positive or negative impact in relation to the protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act. Within Newport, they also include an assessment against the principles of fairness, as presented by Newport's Fairness Commission. Where required, proposals include mitigating measures needed to ensure we meet our equalities responsibilities. Officers have identified those specific proposals where an FEIA would be required and these have been completed. Compliance with the Equalities Impact Assessment and the Equalities Act 2010 is a legal obligation and is intended to result in better informed decision-making and policy development and services that are more effective for users.

## 5 School funding

- 5.1 The current position assumes there is no reduction to school's funding, unlike other parts of the Council's budget where significant savings are being made. Cabinet are asked to consider the level of funding that will be delegated to schools for 2018/19. The current draft budget proposals for schools include funding for the following items:

**Table 2: School budget pressures 2018-22**

School Pressures	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	Total (£'000)
Inflation	-	1,163	1,181	1,199	<b>3,543</b>
Demographic Growth	-	539	826	807	<b>2,172</b>
Schools Reorganisation	1,028	1,307	1,006	1,050	<b>4,391</b>
Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school	285	200	-	-	<b>485</b>
Teaching Staff Increments	-	736	612	484	<b>1,832</b>
Continuation of one off funding	1,100	-	-	-	<b>1,100</b>
<b>Total Pressures</b>	<b>2,413</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>3,540</b>	<b>13,523</b>
Savings	(240)	0	0	0	<b>(240)</b>
<b>Net Budget Pressure</b>	<b>2,173</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>3,540</b>	<b>13,283</b>

- 5.2 This report proposes that the schools budget is kept at the current level for 2018/19, with the exception of:
- funding to cover the running costs of new schools; including a new Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school
  - continuation of the £1.1m one-off funding which was made available in 2016/17 from revenue budget underspends.
- 5.3 Overall, the total existing schools budget will be 'cash-flat' and schools will need to absorb cost pressures such as inflationary pay awards / pay increments etc. The existing budget will not be expected to absorb the cost of new schools as new, additional funding is included for this.
- 5.4 This is undoubtedly a challenging position for schools and is further compounded by reduced funding from their external grant. Although final allocations are yet to be determined across the Education Achievement Service (EAS) region, there is a headline cut to the Education Improvement Grant (EIG) of £3m (11.2%). We are yet to receive figures for the Post-16 grant, however projections of close to £0.5m reduction have been tentatively acknowledged by Welsh Government as being broadly accurate.
- 5.5 In recognising the challenges the draft budget assumptions give, school funding in overall terms is better than other parts of the Council, and has increased, on average, over the last few years. The table below sets out the proposed percentage change to cash limits in 2018/19 for both schools and other areas of the Council. This excludes the impact of specific grants that have transferred into the RSG (£3,985k) but includes new responsibilities (£321k).



**Table 3: Budget changes for schools and other areas of the council**

	2017/18 Base Budget (Apr '17)	Inflation	Other Pressures	Savings	2018/19 Est Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) in Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) as % of net budget
Schools	90,297	-	1,313	- 240	91,370	1,073	1%
Other	176,075	2,273	4,940	- 7,168	176,120	45	0%
	<b>266,372</b>	<b>2,273</b>	<b>6,253</b>	<b>- 7,408</b>	<b>267,490</b>	<b>1,118</b>	

5.6 The table below shows how the overall schools budget has increased by over 7% over the last 4 years.

**Table 4: School budget changes 2013-18**

Year	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total
2013/14	656	50,193	46,152	2,959	99,960
2014/15	585	52,234	47,165	2,894	102,878
2015/16	519	52,924	47,480	3,724	104,647
2016/17	494	54,627	48,619	4,040	107,780
2017/18	512	54,959	47,505	4,247	107,223
Increase in funding over 5 year period (incl specific grants)					7.3%
Increase in funding (excl specific grants & delegations)					7.7%

## 6 Budget process and consultation

6.1 This report presents the draft proposals for the 2018/19 budget. The report asks Cabinet to note:

- The position on developing a balanced budget for 2018/19, acknowledging that the position will be subject to ongoing review and updates,
- and agree that the Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 will be implemented with immediate effect.
- That Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments have been completed for all proposals requiring one.

6.2 The report also asks Cabinet to agree a series of proposals for public consultation. This includes

- The budget savings proposals in Appendix 2 (summary table) and Appendix 6 (detailed business cases).
- The proposed increases to fees and charges in Appendix 7
- The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in section 5.

6.3 Seeking to capture and understand the opinions needs and suggestions of the public, specific service users and other stakeholders has been an important part of the Council's budget setting process in recent years. Each year the budget is informed by extensive consultation, which allows our knowledge and understanding to grow over time. Over the last three budget cycles we received more than 5,600 responses from the public with over 2,600 in the last financial year.

- 6.4 In addition to external public consultation, proposals will be reported to Scrutiny Committees, the Fairness Commission, Unions, School Forum and Third sector/Business community throughout December / January. As already noted, further work is required on the Council's Corporate Plan, Change programme and proposals to balance the overall MTFP both in total and over individual years.
- 6.5 A second budget report will be presented Cabinet on 14 February 2018. This will ask Cabinet to agree its final proposals for the 2018/19 budget and the resulting recommended level of council tax to fund that. The February report to Cabinet will include:
- The results of the public consultation process
  - Details and analysis of the final grant settlement from Welsh Government
  - Any updates from Welsh Government about future grant settlements
  - Any emerging details on specific grants which have financial implications.
- 6.6 Setting the Council Tax level and resulting total net revenue budget is the responsibility of full Council, so Cabinet's recommendations will be presented to the Council meeting on 27 February for approval and adoption.
- 6.7 Below is this year's timetable for consulting on and approving the 2018/19 budget:

**Table 5: Budget consultation timetable 2018/19**

Cabinet agrees budget proposals as a basis for consultation	20 December 2017
Consultation period	21 December 2017 to 31 January 2018
Cabinet considers feedback from consultation and agrees final budget proposals for recommendation to Council	14 February 2018
Council approves the 2018/19 budget and council tax level	27 February 2018

## 7 Report Review and Statutory Comments

### 7.1 Risks

Risk	Impact of Risk if it occurs* (H/M/L)	Probability of risk occurring (H/M/L)	What is the Council doing or what has it done to avoid the risk or reduce its effect	Who is responsible for dealing with the risk?
Planning parameters around inflation are incorrect	M	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Use of contingency, where required</li> <li>2 Use of reserves, where appropriate</li> </ol>	Head of Finance  SLT
Planning parameters around Welsh Government	H	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of contingency, where required</li> <li>2. Keep the assumptions under constant review</li> </ol>	Head of Finance

revenue grant are incorrect over medium term			3. Use of conservative assumptions	
Increasing budget pressures over medium term	M	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Manage demand, where possible</li> <li>2. Keep MTFP under constant review</li> <li>3. SLT review of all budget pressures within MTFP</li> </ol>	SLT

\* Taking account of proposed mitigation measures

## 7.2 Links to Council Policies and Priorities

The overall aim of the budget and MTFP is to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities, supports the delivery of the Council's change programme and saving proposals and protects the financial health of the Council.

## 7.3 Options Available and considered

There are few options available as the Council is required to consult on its budget where decisions do not fall under delegated authority and therefore needs to agree the basis of its consultation.

## 7.4 Preferred Option and Why

To consult on the new medium term package to ensure that savings are deliverable from the earliest opportunity.

## 7.5 Comments of Chief Financial Officer

The main financial issues are contained within the body of the report. Of particular importance is the need for the Council to develop a strategic approach to change the way services are delivered, within the context of a new, updated Corporate Plan. The on-going financial challenges will require significant changes in how services are delivered. In the meantime, the significant budget pressures in Social Care and SEN education will need to be managed before plans are brought forward to mitigate and stabilise.

In its February 2017 budget setting meeting, further details on financial resilience and capacity to meet performance targets and mitigate risk will be included. These issues were set out comprehensively when agreeing the main budget setting planning parameters in the September budget report to Cabinet and will be reviewed again as the final budget is agreed.

## 7.6 Comments of Monitoring Officer

There are no specific legal issues arising from the Report at this stage. Cabinet is being asked to approve draft savings proposals set out in the attached business cases in order to deliver a balanced budget for 18/19, as the basis for public consultation, where those business cases are not delegated to Heads of Service, in accordance with the Council's scheme of delegation. Cabinet and Cabinet Members (as appropriate) will then take the final decisions on those business cases in the light of the responses to the public consultation, prior to making a recommendation to Council regarding the budget for 18/19.

The implementation of all these business cases are executive matters, with the exception of any consequential staffing proposals which are non-executive matters delegated to Heads of Service. However, whichever decision-making process applies, all of the business cases have been the subject of equality and fairness impact assessments to ensure that the Council has regard to its public sector

equality duties under the Equality Act and is also acting fairly in terms of the impact of the proposed changes on service delivery. In addition, where specific proposals require more focussed consultation with staff and key stakeholders, this will be carried out prior to the implementation of any proposed changes.

The setting of the overall base budget and council tax rate for 18/19 is a matter for full Council as these are non-executive reserved matters under the Constitution.

## **7.7 Comments of Head of People and Business Change**

The report presents a series of proposals to Cabinet and Cabinet Members for consideration, prior to consultation with the public, partners and staff. The staffing implications of each proposal, along with those decisions delegated to Head of Service, are highlighted within the report in terms of head count and full time equivalent (FTE). There are also other impacts on staff that are detailed within individual business cases, whether positive or negative. Whilst the Council continues to do all it can to limit the impacts of staff reduction it also has a binding duty to manage the delivery of services within ever tightening financial constraints.

Over the last four years extensive public engagement has been undertaken in relation to setting service delivery priorities and identifying which services matter most to people, and contribute to their wellbeing. Cabinet have considered the results of this engagement and this has been reflected in the budget programs taken forward in 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18.

The Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, which came into force in April 2016 provides a framework for embedding sustainable development principles within the activities of Council and has major implications for the long-term planning of finances and service provision. A corporate training and development program was undertaken to ensure that senior management and elected members were aware of the implications of the Act and the part they should play in embedding its principles and ways of working. Key documents and processes have been revised so that they incorporate sustainable development and wellbeing principles. The Business Cases used to develop savings proposals now require the consideration of the “five ways of working”, and similar revisions have been made to report templates and the Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment format.

## **7.8 Comments of Cabinet Member**

The Chair of Cabinet has approved the report for consideration by Cabinet.

## **7.9 Scrutiny Committees**

The constitution requires that Scrutiny Committees are consulted on Cabinet’s draft budget proposals.

## **7.10 Equalities Impact Assessment and the Equalities Act 2010**

This is referenced in paragraph 4.5 of the report.

## **7.11 Children and Families (Wales) Measure**

All proposals will be consulted on widely, as required.

## **7.12 Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015**

The Act is referenced in the report.

## **7.13 Crime and Disorder Act 1998**

Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes a duty on the Local Authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

Dated: 13 December 2017

- Appendix 1 Budget investments
- Appendix 2 New budget savings for consultation
- Appendix 3 New budget savings implemented under delegated authority (Head of Service)
- Appendix 4 Budget savings previously approved
- Appendix 5 Savings summary
- Appendix 6 Budget savings for consultation – Business Cases
- Appendix 7 Fees & Charges for consultation

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX 2 – BUDGET SAVINGS FOR CONSULTATION (Cabinet & Cabinet Member)

Cabinet

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
<b>PEOPLE</b>									
Education	EDU9/ EDU 4	Inclusion Management Account/ Psychology Services	EDU181902	Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'	267	53	0	0	-6.3
Education	EDU11	Bridge Achievement Centre	EDU181904	Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit	285	200	0	0	TBC
Children & Family Services	SOC30	NCC Childrens Residential	CFS181901	Review of Oaklands Short Break Service	154	0	0	0	TBC
Children & Family Services	SOC26	Integrated Family Support Service	CFS181904	Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services	311	0	0	0	-4.0
<b>PLACE</b>									
Streetscene & City Services	STR21	Street Cleansing	SS181902	Closure of Public Conveniences	20	0	0	0	-0.3
Streetscene & City Services	STR26	Customer Services	SS181904	Reducing Telephone and Face to Face Services within Customer Services	5	16	0	0	-0.9
Streetscene & City Services	STR1	Environmental Services	SS181905	Introduce Parking Charges in City Parks	40	0	0	0	0.0
Non Service	N/A	N/A	NS181901	Council Tax - Increase Council Tax by a further 1% from current assumption of 4% to total of 5%	466	0	0	0	0.0
<b>NEW BUDGET SAVINGS FOR CONSULTATION - Cabinet</b>					<b>1,548</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-11.5</b>

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
<b>PEOPLE</b>									
Children & Family Services	SOC26	Integrated Family Support Service	CFS181902	Integrated Family Support Team Restructure	120	0	0	0	-3.0 (9 alternative employment)
Children & Family Services	SOC31/32/34	Various	CFS181913	Reduction in expenditure on placements for Looked After Children	213	0	0	0	0.0
Adult & Community Services	SOC1	Homecare & Extracare	ACS181903	Review of the Domiciliary Care Service	150	150	0	0	-57.2 (TUPE)
Adult & Community Services	SOC3	Supported Living Agency	ACS181904	Re-provision of Supported Living Service	40	93	0	0	-7.0
Adult & Community Services	SOC8/10/11	Various	ACS181907	Reduction in Adult Budget	257	0	0	0	0.0
<b>PLACE</b>									
Streetscene & City Services	STR11	Sustainable Waste	SS181901	Composting at Docks Way	42	14	0	0	2.0
Streetscene & City Services	STR2	Cemeteries	SS181903	Review of Back office Cemetery Operations and facilities in some parks	23	0	0	0	0.0
<b>NEW BUDGET SAVINGS TOTAL - Cabinet Member</b>					<b>845</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-65.2</b>



## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Education Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	<i>EDU1819902</i>
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Consolidation of the educational psychology team (EP), additional learning needs team (ALN), and specific learning difficulty service (SpLd) into an 'inclusion enrichment team'
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	Consolidation of three teams into one with a complementary purpose to provide advice, support and training to schools. This team would also meet the statutory duties of the local authority regarding statements of special educational needs and support vulnerable groups of pupils.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	The consolidation of three teams into one should maximise value for money, provide resilience and have a contained impact on services for schools and vulnerable pupils.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	<p>The ALN team is currently made up of 2 FTE advisory teachers and 2 FTE curriculum improvement advisors. This would reduce to a 0.5 FTE advisory teacher and 2 FTE curriculum improvement advisors.</p> <p>The SpLd service currently comprises 3 teachers and 4 teaching assistants. This would reduce to 2 teaching assistants.</p> <p>There is currently one principal educational psychologist managing the team of educational psychologists. The total current staffing is 5.4 FTE. This would reduce to 4.6 FTE.</p> <p>The total reduction is 6.3 FTE posts across the three teams.</p>
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	Less staff overall will result in reduced face to face contact with pupils, however the merged team will develop more teacher and teaching assistant training opportunities to ensure that school based staff can support pupils in their own learning environments.
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	A reduction in staffing can lead to decreased support to schools; however the merging of three teams will ensure that work is re-prioritised to meet the needs of vulnerable pupils across the city in a valuable way.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet
<b>Activity Codes</b>	EDU 9 inclusion management account

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	267	53		

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	150			
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total	150			

### Current Position

The educational psychology (EP) team consists of a 0.8 FTE principal educational psychologist and 4.6 FTE main scale educational psychologists. The specific learning difficulty (SpLD) service is made up of 3 teachers and 4 teaching assistants. The additional learning needs (ALN) team is made up of 2 FTE advisory teachers and 2 FTE curriculum improvement advisors

The key functions of the three teams are:

- Assessing learning and emotional needs by observing and consulting with multi-agency teams and providing advice on the best approaches and provisions to support learning and development;
- Developing and applying effective interventions to promote psychological wellbeing, social, emotional and behavioural development, to raise educational standards and reduce exclusions;
- Designing and delivering courses for parents, teachers and others involved with the education of children and young people;
- Writing statutory reports for pupils with additional learning needs and to make recommendations on action to be taken, including formal statements of special educational needs (SEN);
- Conducting active research;
- Supporting whole school communities at times of crisis, bereavement etc.
- Supporting the SEN manager at tribunal;
- Providing and delivering individual programmes of work in primary schools for those who are experiencing literacy difficulties which meet the SpLD criteria.
- Providing schools with individual learner targets and a programme of work.
- To ensure ALN and SEN resources are deployed effectively.
- To actively monitor, analyse and prevent pupil exclusions with support and challenge for schools.
- Lead the Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) steering group.
- Provide advice and support on the local authority SEN panel and at managed move panel.
- To develop inclusion practices through monitoring and evaluating and reporting on the work of schools.
- To lead on the development of Welsh Government initiatives linked to the inclusion agenda.

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

The proposal is to consolidate three teams that provide external ALN support and advice to schools into one 'inclusion team'. The single team will consist of educational psychologists; two curriculum improvement advisors for ALN; a 0.5 FTE teacher advisor for ALN and two teaching assistants for SpLd who will provide direct support for pupils with specific learning difficulties.

The combined team will operate school cluster-based support to develop the skills and capacity of school staff to provide bespoke learning packages for pupils (including advice to families and some direct work with vulnerable pupils). This will further enhance the local authority's approach to developing 'seamless learning pathways' and promoting cluster-based work. Funding for SEN has already been delegated to schools and is managed on a cluster basis. The proposed new model will also support the implementation of ALN reform legislation which places greater emphasis on timely, coordinated response to the identification of pupils with ALN by schools, and a reduction of the use of statements of SEN.

Under the proposal the following changes to current staffing levels are planned:

- The ALN team is made up of 2 FTE advisory teachers and 2 FTE curriculum improvement advisors. This would change to 2 FTE curriculum improvement advisors and 1x 0.5 FTE teacher advisor.
- The SpLd service currently comprises of 3 teachers and 4 teaching assistants. This would change to 2 teaching assistants.
- There is currently a principal educational psychologist and a team of educational psychologists (a total of 5.4 FTE). This would change to a total of 4.6 FTE.

The total reduction is 6.3 FTE posts across three teams. This includes 5.8 FTE redundancies and 1 FTE reduction in hours to 0.5 FTE (teacher adviser role).

### **Options considered**

1. Maintain the status quo

This would present no cost savings and present no relative risk to performance.

2. Reduce educational psychology service to statutory levels (2 FTE educational psychologists) and remove all non-statutory post within the ALN and SpLD teams.

This will present a saving of £688,000 and pose a potential risk to performance.

3. Consolidation of the educational psychology, additional learning needs, and specific learning difficulty teams into a single 'inclusion team'.

This will present an annual saving of £320,000

### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

3. Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and specific learning difficulty teams into a single 'inclusion team'.

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

This would present an annual saving of £320,000 and present a low risk to performance

### **Required Investment**

Redundancy costs would be approximately £150k

### **High Level Milestones and Timescales**

Proposal to be implemented by April 2018

### **Key Risks/issues**

<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
The reduction in staff may reduce capacity for support in schools and the face to face support of pupils.	12	The integrated inclusion team will build capacity in schools (via the training and support of teachers and teaching assistants) to support learners directly, within in their everyday learning environments. Inclusion support will be more accessible. Face to face support for pupils will be available for the most vulnerable pupils. Cluster work will improve resilience and capacity for sharing good practice, resulting in an improved culture of inclusion within the city.

### **Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements**

Integration – This proposal continues to support the target to decrease the rates of exclusion, increase the rates of school attendance and reduce the number of NEETS (those not in education, employment or training)

Long term – This proposal continues to support wellbeing in schools which will impact positively on end of key stage results, attendance, exclusion, employability and NEETS.

Prevention – This proposal continues to support early intervention, assessment and training.

Collaboration - This proposal acknowledges the need for schools to work with the integrated inclusion team to support its vulnerable learners.

Involvement – This proposal will be subject to wider consultation as part of the democratic process.

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

This page is intentionally left blank

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Education Services
Unique Reference Number	EDU181904
Proposal Title	Remodelling of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)
Version	For Cabinet 20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To undertake a statutory school reorganisation proposal to reduce provision and LA funding to the Secondary PRU by establishing a SEBD Special School which could be funded out of the Individual School Budget (ISB)
Impact on Performance	This proposal would result in short term (turnaround) provision in the PRU only. Schools would need to find their own alternative provision for young people who cannot successfully engage in a mainstream curriculum for example 'Aspire programmes'. This will add additional pressures to school and could result in the increase of secondary school exclusion rates. However this proposed model reflects good practice.
Impact on FTE Count	There would be no impact on FTE as staff would either stay in the PRU or move to the Special School
Impact on other Service Areas	There could be an impact on mainstream schools if savings are kept centrally (as the ISB would have an additional cost pressure to cover the cost of the Special School).  Schools will need to maintain and extend their skill sets in supporting pupils disengaged from mainstream provision. Schools will also need to access more preventative support services; however such services are at risk in the current financial climate.
Impact on Citizens	Potential impact on mainstream pupils who may have less focus on their own learning needs if PRU or alternative education places cannot be sourced.
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Cabinet
Activity short code	EDU11 Bridge Achievement Centre

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/2019	2019/20	2020/21	2021/2022
	285	200	0	0

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/2019	2019/20	2020/21	2021/2022

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	tbc	tbc		
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

### Current Position

#### Staffing at the centre :

1 Manager, 1 Deputy Manager, 7 full time teachers who are supported by 1 HLTA, 3 Level 3 TA's Workers , 1 Learning Coach/Attendance Officer,4 permanent level 2 TA's plus additional TA's linked to pupils with statements if the need arises. Nine young people suffering from high anxiety are taught offsite in a small group by one of the teachers. There is one full time administrator and one who works term time only. Home tuition is supplied to pupils with medical needs by a team of casual home tutors who work as necessary to meet the fluctuating need.

The Bridge Achievement Centre is a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) maintained by Newport City Council which was formed in September 2011 following a restructure of two existing PRU's. The provision is split between two sites, primary provision is based within The Gol Centre temporarily and the KS3/4 is based on a refurbished site in Stephenson Street. The Bridge Achievement Centre is also the 'Umbrella' that sits over Home/Medical Tuition and Alternative Provision and all managed by the PRU Manager under the line management of the Assistant Head of Education for Inclusion . There are currently 88 pupils on the register but this fluctuates due to the revolving door, short-term element. All have additional needs and 33 have statements of Special Needs. All other pupils are registered as needing additional support at 'School Action Plus'. A total of 185 pupils accessed the PRU last academic year.

PRU's should operate as a 'revolving door' system, aiming for children and young people to be reintegrated into their home school with support from PRU staff. There is currently a short term, turnaround provision which should be maintained for KS2, 3 and 4 pupils along with Home Tuition. This business case proposes that the 'long term' provision at the PRU is not appropriate and should be replaced with a registered 24 place SEBD school to support high end pupils who have SEBD statements. This would benefit the Local Authority, schools, pupils and their families by ensuring that young people can maintain their education within the city rather than 'Out of County', which does not provide value for money. The establishment of a new school for pupils with SEBD would require the Council to take forward a school reorganisation proposal in accordance with the statutory School Organisation Code. This will include a period of formal consultation and stakeholder engagement.

### Key Objectives and Scope

The objective is to reduce the funding to the Current Pupil Referral Unit and establish a small SEBD School on the current site plus a satellite provision for highly anxious pupils.

The scope is to move the short term, turnaround PRU and home tuition provision base but cease LA funding to the long term element . Cost of the new PRU provision:



## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Overall 1 Manager	59,239	covering ALNCO/CP
1 HLTA	26,685	covering Home Tuition/CP
1 Admin	18,697	
KS3 Teacher	38,338	
2 TA's	44,688	
KS2 Teacher	47,928	
2 TA's	44,688	
Running costs	40,000	
Home Tuition	150,000 (has been higher than this but will need to reduce)	
Total	470,263	
Potential Savings	484,807	
<b>Options considered</b>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Set up short term PRU and SEBD School. Use £484, 807 as central savings over 2 years (2018/19 £285k 2019/20 £200k) creating an additional cost pressures on the ISB with the setting up and opening of a new SEBD provision.</li> <li>2. Set up short term PRU and SEBD School. Transfer a total of £484, 807 (Over 2 years 2018/19 £285k 2019/20 £200k) to the ISB to supporting the cost pressure of establishing a new SEBD school resulting in no cost savings centrally.</li> </ol>		
<b>Recommended Proposals/Options</b>		
Option 2.		
<b>Required Investment</b>		
N/A		
<b>High Level Milestones and Timescales</b>		
In order for consultation to take place we would be unlikely to realise this proposal until September 2018 at the earliest.		
<b>Key Risks/issues</b>		
<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<p>There could be an impact on mainstream schools if the central cost savings are made as the ISB would be further diluted to cover the cost of the Special School.</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>Option 2 mitigates this risk, placing the cost savings in to the ISB.</p>
<p>Increased pressure on Educational Psychologists and Additional Learning Needs Team (ALN) to support young people causing concern although these posts are at risk of deletion.</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>School staff will need to provide further intervention and support and extend their options for alternative provision. Young people with a specific SEBD need (Social and Emotional Behavioural Disorder) will be assigned a place in the new SEBD provision.</p>
<p>The current PRU building would be suitable for a small EBD School although could not cater for the amount of places we are likely to need in the future.</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>The council Capital Assets Management Group will work collectively to find additional space.</p>
<p>Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements</p>		
<p>Integration – This proposal poses a risk to decreasing the rates of exclusion, increasing the rates of school attendance and, in the long term, continuing to increase the end of key stage assessment rates. Increase to the number of NEETS</p> <p>Long Term – This proposal poses a risk to the support for wellbeing in schools which will impact on end of key stage results, attendance, exclusion, employability, NEETS</p> <p>Prevention – This proposal poses a significant risk . The reduction of early intervention ,assessment and training based on research will impact on individual young people and schools in general.</p> <p>•</p> <p>Collaboration - This proposal acknowledges the additional risks and extra pressure that will be put on Health, Social Services and other agencies.</p> <p>Involvement – This proposal will be subject to wider consultation as part of the democratic process</p>		
<p>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment Initial</p>		
<p>Yes</p>		

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Children's Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	CFS181901
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Review of Oaklands short breaks service
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	To remodel the short breaks service at Oaklands to provide care on five nights a week with an increased emphasis on outreach care.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	The – council has a duty to provide short breaks for disabled children. Short breaks will still be provided for families but the service will be provided over five days and nights a week instead of seven
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	The rotas for Oaklands will be revised. The final figure will depend on the restructuring.
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	There could potentially be increased demand on other Children's Services teams and schools
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	Support for families with a disabled child will be reduced.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet
<b>Activity Code</b>	SOC30 children residential

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	154			

<b>Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension</b>	tbc			
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>	0			
<b>Revenue - Other</b>	0			
<b>Capital – Building related</b>	0			
<b>Capital - Other</b>	0			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>				

### **Current Position**

The local authority has specific requirements under the Children Act 1989 and the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 to provide support for disabled children. The definitions of which children and the type of support are laid out in our Short Breaks statement agreed by Cabinet and the Care and Social Services Inspectorate for Wales (CSSIW).

As part of this support, Oaklands provides short breaks for disabled children. The children accessing Oaklands have multiple disabilities including learning disabilities,

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

autism, physical disabilities and life limiting medical conditions. All of the children require extensive physical care for example, feeding, toileting and/or changing, mobility, behaviour management, lifting and turning, invasive medical procedures

Currently during the course of each year the service provides support on a rota basis to 35 – 40 children.

The purpose is twofold. Firstly, to provide positive experiences to children who, because of their disability, find it extremely difficult to access other play and leisure opportunities and, secondly, to give parents and carers time to recharge and provide care for siblings. Many of the children require 24 hour care and place very heavy demands on carers. The break of Oaklands gives parents time to be able to carry out ordinary domestic tasks and recover a little. It can mean the difference between a child continuing to remain with their family and coming into local authority care.

A scoping exercise has been completed with the manager at Oaklands

### **Current Resources**

The staff group can be restructured as a result of anticipated changes from expected retirements and other movements. The potential for a reduction and change in the services will require further discussion and consultation.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

This proposal, if agreed, would result in a remodelling of the current short breaks services for disabled children.

To ensure the shared objectives of short breaks of respite for families and positive experiences for children are still met, implementing this proposal will require extensive consultation with families.

The scope of the savings would be focussed on Oaklands and the children accessing the services of Oaklands.

### **Options considered**

#### **Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements**

The services would continue to be funded in the same way so no saving would be realised.

#### **Option 2 - Saving of £124K**

The service would be remodelled to provide care on five nights a week instead of seven and with an increased emphasis on outreach care. For some children there would be a reduction in the offer within their package of care.

### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

Option 2

### **Required Investment**

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

This proposal will require ongoing staff support

### **High Level Milestones and Timescales**

Staff would need to be advised before the end of the calendar year to achieve a full year saving

In light of the need for full consultation with families, a full year saving may not be possible to achieve and this will require further consideration.

### **Key Risks/issues**

<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
Poor communication with parents and children leading to dissatisfaction and complaints	2 x 5	Communication plan implemented with early and meaningful consultation
Diminution to service creates additional stresses for families thus placing pressures on other services	3 x 4	Ensure remaining services offer families effective support

### **Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements**

The proposal is a direct saving as a result of a reduction in services. Specific linkage with the Future Generations Act requirements is, therefore, limited. However, the proposal will ensure full collaboration with services working with disabled children and collaboration with families to ensure the services if the savings are achieved can deliver positive outcomes for families.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

Yes

This page is intentionally left blank

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Children's Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	CFS181904
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Restructuring of the funding within the prevention services.
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	Restructuring of the funding within preventions services.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	<i>Option 1</i> No impact <i>Option 2</i> No impact <i>Option 3</i> Reduction in number of families supported preventatively
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	<i>Option 1</i> No impact <i>Option 2</i> No impact <i>Option 3</i> Reduction of 4 FTE
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	Reduced access to services particularly for schools and increased referrals to Children's Services if Option 3 is agreed
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	Reduced service if Option 3 is agreed
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet
<b>Activity Code</b>	SOC 26 integrated family support

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	311			

<b>Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension – if option 3 is agreed</b>	100			
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>				
<b>Revenue - Other</b>				
<b>Capital – Building related</b>				
<b>Capital - Other</b>				
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	100			

### **Current Position**

The preventions team provides support and interventions to families below the

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

threshold for statutory intervention by Children's Services

This service has been independently evaluated by IPC as part of the wider Families First evaluation and is an effective provision for families. It contributes to the sustainability of comparatively low numbers of looked after children in Newport and provides the step up and step down provision for vulnerable families on the cusp of child protection. It provides the foundation for the Families First services and coordinates the single point of entry.

CANS (Children with Additional Needs) mirrors the preventions service but with a focus on children who have additional needs who do not meet the criteria for statutory interventions from the Disabled Children's Team.

Young Carers supports children and young people undertaking a caring role for their parents because of disability.

This proposal if Options 1 or 2 were agreed would not change the service and would not impact on the numbers of staff.

However, Option 3 would see a reduction in the service and a loss of posts.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

The objective of this business case is a simple restructuring of the existing preventions service budget.

Families First provides a ranges of preventative services for children and families across the city. The existing grant funding is spread across strands with some delivered directly by council services and some by other providers. Welsh Government reviewed the grant in 2016 and has changed the parameters of the grant funding with an increased emphasis on parenting and direct work with children and young people. The stress on skills and employment related projects has reduced. Families First has to be recommissioned for the commencement of services in April 2018.

Children's Services delivers statutory interventions for families. The services are delivered in line with legislation and a regulatory framework. Services are inspected against the statutory and regulatory framework. Performance for Children's Services is measured externally against services for the most vulnerable. Early intervention and prevention, while desirable, are not part of the statutory provision.

Therefore, the preventions services should reasonably be funded by Families First. The timing of the recommissioning of Families First is an opportunity to reconfigure the funding in line with the statutory requirements.

### **Options considered**

#### **Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements**

The services would continue to be funded in the same way across Families First and Children's Services so no saving would be realised.

#### **Option 2 - Children's Services continues with funding of £130,000 while Families First funds £181,000 thus generating a saving of £181K from the core budget**

Families First has to be recommissioned by April 2018. There are already changes anticipated because of the changes in the grant conditions. The changes would allow



## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

for the increased funding of Preventions, CANS and Young Carers from the grant as all three will satisfy the grant requirements.

### **Option 3 - Children's Services saving of £311K so Families First would fund £181,000 while Children's Services ceases all funding**

This would lead to a diminution of the service offered. The increased pressure would in the short term be felt in other Families First services, education and community providers. In the medium term this would lead to greater numbers of children surfacing in statutory Children's Services. The three elements of Preventions, CANS and Young Carers all have waiting lists for services so any decrease in funding would increase the gap in provision.

#### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

Option 3

#### **Required Investment**

#### **High Level Milestones and Timescales**

In order to achieve a full year saving the engagement with staff would need to commence prior to the final cabinet decision.

#### **Key Risks/issues**

<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
Greater number of referrals to Children's Services	4 x 4	None in place
Reduced capacity in schools for support	4 x 4	None in place

The primary risk will be an increased demand for other services including statutory Children's Services. This could bring about greater costs for acute services.

#### **Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements**

The preventions service is a core element of working with families in such a way as to prevent future problems. The service offers integrated interventions involving a range of agencies.

This business case potentially reduces the preventative services offered to families. A potential restructuring of the Families First grant may lead to a reduction in opportunities for third sector organisations.

#### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

Yes

This page is intentionally left blank

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Children Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	CFS181902
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Integrated Family Support Team (IFST) restructure
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	The IFST is a regional team delivering family support using a range of intervention services to families where parental substance misuse is a key issue. It is proposed to wind up the regional team and replace with a consultation service in line with statutory requirements.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	The performance of the IFST is reported to Welsh Government. The reporting will be part of the proposed new arrangements which will be discussed with Welsh Government officials.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	12 posts. 3 posts return to the health service, six will have alternative roles
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	There will be increased demand on family assessment and support services but, given the current demands, this will be a manageable impact.
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	There will be a change in the way services are provided but the recommissioning of the reduction in the service available for Family Support but the recommissioning of the Integrated Family Support Service (IFSS) contract and the use of very similar interventions will mean a similar level of delivery.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet Member
<b>Activity Code</b>	SOC 26 integrated family support service

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	120			

<b>Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension</b>	75			
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>	0			
<b>Revenue - Other</b>	0			
<b>Capital – Building related</b>	0			

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Capital - Other</b>	0			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	25			

### **Current Position**

The Integrated Family Support Team is a regional service delivered across the five Gwent councils. The requirement for the IFST is set out in Part 9 of the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 (SSWA). The current arrangements have been reviewed and the five councils are in agreement that, in order to deliver more aligned outcomes for family support and achieve savings, the service needs to be restructured.

In principle, agreement for the restructuring is already in place across the five local authorities and the type of minimal arrangement proposed has, again in principle, been agreed with Welsh Government.

In Newport, the work undertaken by the IFST would be absorbed into the wider family support services of the Integrated Family Support Service (IFSS).

### **Current Resources**

Three staff seconded from Aneurin Bevan University Health Board who will return to the board. There are nine staff employed by Newport who work across the region. All are qualified social workers and are likely to be redeployed by the five councils following consultation.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

The IFST has operated regionally for the past four years. While the service has supported many families and offered a strong range of evidence-based interventions, the regional delivery model has been challenging to deliver because of the structures of local teams and variations across the five councils.

Changes as a result of the SSWA bring an opportunity to review and rethink the delivery of the model. The best way to meet the needs of families and the requirements of the Act is being considered across Wales. For Newport, it is clear having the FASS and FST provision in place will ease the transition and ensure service delivery can be largely protected.

The IFST staff are already aware changes are required.

### **Options considered**

#### **Option 1** Retain the current arrangements

A restructuring would still be required to deliver the services in a way that is more effective

#### **Option 2** Secure a saving of £120k

The current proposed restructuring to provide minimal service will generate a saving of £120k

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

<b>Recommended Proposal/Option</b>		
Option 2		
<b>Required Investment</b>		
None		
<b>High Level Milestones and Timescales</b>		
<p>If the proposal is accepted the restructuring for the alternative arrangements will be finalised. Given the work already completed a full year saving will be achievable.</p> <p>The final model will need to be agreed with the Regional Partnership Board and Welsh Government.</p>		
<b>Key Risks/issues</b>		
<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
A loss of service will impact directly on families	3 x 3	Work with FASS and FST to consider additional pressures
<b>Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements</b>		
The proposal is a saving which would result in a reduction in service. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.		
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>		
Yes		

This page is intentionally left blank

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Children and Family Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	CFS181913
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction in expenditure on placements for looked after children
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	Reduction in three key areas of expenditure on placements for looked after children
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	Quantifying performance for placements has to be linked to individual child outcomes.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	None
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	Placement options create workload pressures across Children's Services and are closely linked to out of authority placements in education. Changes in Children's Services in respect of placement will impact on education.
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	The current lack of placements for looked after children are reducing the options for matching children with good placements. The savings identified will be aligned with work in house to improve choices and increase positive choices.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet Member
<b>Activity Codes</b>	SOC32 Independent foster agency placements SOC31 Out of authority residential placements SOC 34 Kinship payments

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
Independent Foster Agency Placements	54			
Out of Authority Residential Placements	113			
Kinship Payments	46			

<b>Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other	52			
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>52</b>			

<b>Current Position</b>

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

The placements budget in Children's Services is used to support a range of placement options for looked after children.

This proposal is for savings in three key areas: independent fostering agency(IFA) fees; out of authority (OOA) residential placement fees  
care fees

All three areas have seen increasing spend over the past two years resulting from lack of choices in-house, the increasing complexity of presenting and enduring need and a wider national shortage of placements leading to a very strong providers market.

The three component areas of this proposal will require significant work to achieve the savings. This proposal will need to link to an invest to save proposal to create a small amount of capacity in Children's Services to first undertake a concentrated review of the current position and then put in place the framework to achieve long term change.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

This proposal is specifically to reduce spending in three key areas of the placements budget.

IFA and OOA residential could be achieved relatively easily if alternative placements can be identified. The work and challenge will be to identify safe alternatives for the children currently in placement which are sustainable.

### **Options considered**

The option is to consider is the reduction in spend in the three key areas of placements. The only alternative is to maintain the status quo which would prevent the achieving of a saving.

### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

As outlined reduce spending in each of the areas by developing alternative placement options.

### **Required Investment**

### **High Level Milestones and Timescales**

The high level milestones and timescales will be developed in the final quarter of this financial year.

### **Key Risks/issues**

The risk in this proposal is simply that because of external demands and increasing complexity in the children being cared for that we will be unable to achieve the saving.

### **Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements**

The proposal is a direct saving as a result of reducing the spend on placements. There



## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

is therefore no linkage with FG Act requirements.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

No

This page is intentionally left blank

## Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult & Community Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	ACS181903
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Review of the Domiciliary Care Service
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	This proposal outlines the opportunity to reduce cost by moving the domiciliary care service used in four Linc Cymru Extracare schemes to a new provider.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	This business case supports Improvement Plan priorities, Newport a Caring City – supporting independent living for older people and ensuring that people have the right social services.  The service will be focussed on the outcomes model required by Social Services and Wellbeing Act.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	The number of staff affected 57.22 FTE (TUPE)
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	Strategic housing – Linc Cymru is the landlord for the Extracare scheme .
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	A new domiciliary care provider will be contracted. TUPE will ensure the staff team remains consistent which will be important for tenants and the on-site Linc team.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet Member
<b>Activity Codes</b>	SOC1 Homecare and extra care

<b>Recurring Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	150	150		

<b>One off Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension</b>				
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>				
<b>Revenue – Other</b>				
<b>Capital – Building related</b>				
<b>Capital – Other</b>				
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>				

<b>Current Position</b>
The council's domiciliary care service has been subject to a number of changes since 2013 in order to reduce cost and make savings. Specifically for the Extracare schemes, in 2013 changes were made to the deployment of staff; in 2014 consideration was given to outsourcing the service but with uncertainty over living wage and domiciliary care framework this was not pursued and savings were

## Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case

achieved through a wider re-structure. In 2016/17 further changes are being undertaken initially to night-time staffing within Extracare, with more significant restructuring being undertaken of the whole service which will create specific and separate frailty and Extracare services.

The service is registered and regulated by Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSiW) and there are 57.22 FTE employees in Extracare, the majority of who are as carers. The Extracare service is provided 365 days a year, with the majority of staff working between 7am to 10.30pm with two staff (one waking and one back-up sleeper) providing support each night, allowing tenants to continue to live independently in their own homes.

A three year partnership agreement, signed June 2015 between the council and Linc for the Extracare schemes requires that Linc is consulted on any proposed changes. A costings exercise has demonstrated that an outsourced model would save the council £300k per year. The timing of the process of contracting out means that in 2018/19, half year savings would be achieved.

The cost of re-provision, £1.3m, would transfer to the community care budget to cover the cost of commissioning a contract with a provider to deliver the service.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

To reduce the costs of providing the domiciliary care service within the Extracare schemes by outsourcing the in-house service to a new single provider. This business case considers the service provided in Extracare, not the service that forms part of the Gwent frailty service.

### **Options considered**

**Option one:** The option of outsourcing the domiciliary care service has been considered previously by the council, most recently in the 2017/18 budget.

The proposal to move to an external provider would ensure consistency of staff supporting the tenants, at a lower cost to the council. It is likely that the process of procuring a contract will take six months. The restrictions of TUPE may impact on the ability to source an external provider but there have been similar arrangements made in other local authorities. .

**Option two:** maintain the Extracare service in-house.

### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

Option one: to begin the process of securing an external provider during 2017/18 to start in October 2018.

### **Required Investment**

Staff support

### **High Level Milestones and Timescales**

- December 2017, start engagement with Linc and residents
- Consultation with key stakeholders from December 2017 when the MTRP proposals are published.
- February 2018 Cabinet/Council approval, subject to consultation.
- March 2018, formal notice of change given to Linc and residents
- April 2018 commence process for securing external domiciliary care provider
- October 2018, new contract starts

### **Key Risks/issues**

## Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case

Risk	
The costs of TUPE may impact on our ability to secure an external partner	
Change of care provider for tenants	
Capacity of the commissioning and procurement teams to support process	
Projected costs/savings are based on current unit costs and hours of care delivered may not reflect the cost of contract in two years time.	
<b>Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements</b>	
Future Generations Act 2014 requires that the council makes the right services available at the right time. A commissioning approach, rather than in-house service allows greater flexibility around services for individuals.	
<b>Impact Assessment</b>	
Yes – a FEIA will be completed once we fully understand details of the transfer arrangements	

This page is intentionally left blank

## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult and Community Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	ACS181904
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Re-provision of supported living service
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	<p>Reduction in Newport City Council's in-house supported living services for adults with learning disabilities</p> <p>To reduce the capacity of NCC's internal supported living services to meet the changing needs of the tenants and to reflect a modernised approach to delivery of the supported living model.</p>
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	Social work input, supported by the operational area project manager, is required to arrange alternative provision to meet the changing needs of tenants.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	<p>By the end of 2019/2020, the staff capacity of the supported living service can be reduced by 40%, based on the phased consolidation of the existing four schemes into two.</p> <p>This will be a reduction of seven FTEs.</p>
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	As some of the older tenants in Newport City Council's supported living services require residential accommodation due to their changing needs, this may result in an increased demand for the Council's residential services.
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	Tenants will require support from council staff to move to the new delivery model.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet Member
<b>Activity Codes</b>	SOC 3 Supported Living Agency

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	40	93		

<b>Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension</b>	53	123		
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>				
<b>Revenue - Other</b>				
<b>Capital – Building related</b>				

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

<b>Capital - Other</b>				
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	53	123		

### **Current Position**

The council operates four supported living services in Newport, supporting 14 adults with learning disabilities and employs support workers to meet the needs of the tenants, while Charter Housing and Newport City Homes are the registered social landlords.

These small group homes have successfully enabled people to live within the community, but no longer reflect the council's approach to meeting the needs of adults with learning disabilities. There are three vacancies across the service, presenting a risk that the council may be required to pay rental voids to the landlords.

The model of supported living has evolved with younger adults with learning disabilities preferring to rent their own flat, rather than living in traditional small group homes. The council is required by the Social Services and Wellbeing Act 2014 to promote pathways to greater independence. Social work assessments have shown that several tenants would benefit from a change of accommodation and services to help them achieve greater independent living skills.

There are a number of tenants who require residential care to meet their changing needs as they age and become more physically dependent. The council's draft Independent Living Strategy 2017-2022 prioritises working with registered social landlords to look at developing accommodation that supports independent living and meets the demand for accessible accommodation for older adults with learning disabilities.

This business case proposes a change from the current four services to two, giving a more sustainable support model.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

- To reduce the provision of the council's in-house supported living services from four homes to two by the end of 2019/2020.
- To restructure the management and staff team within the in-house supported living service to support identified tenants to move to more independent living in accordance with changes in their assessed needs
- To support identified tenants to move to residential care in accordance with their assessed needs
- To continue to work with registered social landlords to develop accommodation and supported living that provides more independence

### **Options considered**

1. Status quo – continue to work with tenants but fill any voids with new tenants as people move on.
2. Targeted move-on approach for those tenants who have an assessed need for a change of service and phased reduction of the capacity of the in-house service.
3. Tender the service to the external providers.



## MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<b>Recommended Proposal/Option</b>		
Option 2 is the recommended proposal.		
<b>Required Investment</b>		
Staff investment required.		
<b>High Level Milestones and Timescales</b>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Engagement with service users and their families to commence December 2017</li> <li>2. Engagement with staff to commence December 2017</li> <li>3. Engagement/briefings with housing associations December 2017</li> <li>4. Completion of social care assessments by June 2018</li> <li>5. Alternative provision sourced by October 2018</li> <li>6. Completion of first phase of targeted move on of tenants by October 2018.</li> </ol>		
<b>Key Risks/issues</b>		
<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
Opposition from the supported living staff may have a negative impact on the tenants.	12	Meaningful consultation with the staff team to explain the rationale behind the initiative.
Opposition from tenants and their families	6	Consultation with the tenants and families to explain the rationale behind the initiative.
Difficulties in sourcing alternative accommodation and support provision for the tenants	12	Workstream planning with registered social landlords to develop suitable options
<b>Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements</b>		
<p><b>Integration</b> This proposal is consistent with the council's focus on improving people's lives, as it promotes a pathway to increased independence for adults with learning disabilities.</p> <p><b>Long term</b> It offers a long term approach that acknowledges the imperative of the Social Services and Well-Being Act 2014 and the Future Generations Act to reduce dependency and</p>		

## **MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case**

promote long-term sustainability.

### **Prevention**

The proposal focusses on enabling adults with learning disabilities to have opportunities for greater independence and community participation, rather than excessive reliance on direct support provision. For those older adults who are becoming more frail, the proposal identifies the need for more appropriate accommodation solutions which can facilitate their changing health needs.

### **Collaboration**

The proposal is based on ongoing collaboration with colleagues in housing and social services to work with registered social landlords to develop appropriate models of accommodation and support, while maximising available funding opportunities.

### **Involvement**

A consultation plan involving all key stakeholders will be developed.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

Yes

## Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult & Community Services
<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	ACS181907
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction in Adult Budgets
<b>Version</b>	20 <sup>TH</sup> December 2017
<b>Proposal Summary Description</b>	This proposal will aim to reduce budgets across Adult & Community Services by £222K The budgets impacted will be Community Care and Mental Health.
<b>Impact on Performance</b>	This business case affects Improvement Plan priorities, Newport a Caring City – supporting independent living for older people and ensuring that people have the right social services.  The service will be focussed on the outcomes model required by Social Services and Wellbeing Act.
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	0
<b>Impact on other Service Areas</b>	N/A
<b>Impact on Citizens</b>	A reduction in budgets across Adult Services will impact on the capacity to deliver care and support for people with eligible needs.
<b>Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)</b>	Cabinet Member
<b>Activity Codes</b>	SOC8 Centrica Lodge Respite SOC10 Externally commissioned care packages SOC11 Mental health

<b>Recurring Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	257			

<b>One off Implementation Costs (- £000's)</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
<b>Revenue – Redundancy/Pension</b>				
<b>Revenue – External consultants</b>				
<b>Revenue – Other</b>				
<b>Capital – Building related</b>				
<b>Capital – Other</b>				
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>				

<b>Current Position</b>
Centrica Lodge £30,000 This is a respite service for people with learning disabilities which operates from a building owned by Newport City Council but the service is provided through a

## **Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case**

commissioned provider. We have been successful in securing an ICF capital bid to improve the facilities and install a lift to the first floor. This will both improve the occupancy levels and also provide an opportunity for income generation as neighbouring local authorities have indicated that they will purchase some capacity. This should mitigate the reduction in the budget of £30k.

### **Community Care £71,000**

This represents a further reduction in the Community Care budget which has been under considerable pressure due to the impact of an aging population and the numbers of people with profound disabilities surviving into adulthood.

### **Mental Health £96,000**

This will be a reduction in the budget availed for funding care and support plans including in residential placements for people of working age with Mental Health problems. Many of the people affected by Mental Health problems are subject to a Mental Health Section 117 and so the cost of their Community Treatment plan is shared across health and social care. This has meant that the cost to social care have reduced as a more robust approach to attributing these costs has been put in place.

### **GWICES – £25,000**

This is the Gwent Integrated Community Equipment Service which is part of a Section 33 pooled budget arrangement. The service has recently been re-tendered and it is anticipated that this will deliver efficiency saving with any impact of the service delivery.

### **Supplies and services budgets £35,000**

The savings will be achieved through reviewing existing care and support plans to identify people whose needs have changed and can be met through an alternative service or the use of their own resources.

### **Key Objectives and Scope**

This business case will reduce the budgets available for commissioned services in the areas listed above as follows:-

Centrica Lodge £30,000

Community Care £71,000

Mental Health £96,000

GWICES £25,000

Supplies and Services £35,000

**TOTAL £ 257,000**

### **Options considered**

Option one: To reduce the budgets in Adult & Community Services by £257,000

Option two: Status quo

### **Recommended Proposal/Option**

## Medium Term Revenue Plan Proposal - Business Case

Recommended proposal is option one				
<b>Required Investment</b>				
N/A				
<b>High Level Milestones and Timescales</b>				
To reduce available budget from April 2018				
<b>Key Risks/issues</b>				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>RISKS</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reduction in budget may affect service provision</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increased demand may affect ability to deliver savings and increase budget pressures.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Projected Costs/savings are based on current unit costs and hours of care delivered may not reflect cost of contract 2 years hence</td> </tr> </table>	<b>RISKS</b>	Reduction in budget may affect service provision	Increased demand may affect ability to deliver savings and increase budget pressures.	Projected Costs/savings are based on current unit costs and hours of care delivered may not reflect cost of contract 2 years hence
<b>RISKS</b>				
Reduction in budget may affect service provision				
Increased demand may affect ability to deliver savings and increase budget pressures.				
Projected Costs/savings are based on current unit costs and hours of care delivered may not reflect cost of contract 2 years hence				
<b>Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements</b>				
Future Generations Act 2014 requires that the City Council makes the right services available at the right time.				
<b>Impact Assessment</b>				
Yes				

This page is intentionally left blank

**APPENDIX 7 – FEES & CHARGES FOR CONSULTATION** for People Directorate

**SERVICE AREA:** Social Services

Income Source	Current Charge (Exc VAT)	Proposed Charge (Exc VAT)	Unit of charge	% Increase	Reason if different from 4% fee increase MTFP assumption
	£ (2 d.p)	£ (2 d.p)	(per hr/ day etc)		
<b>Other Local Authorities Charges</b>					
<b><u>Local Authority Residential Homes (£/week)</u></b>					
Blaen-y-pant - Residential Care	550.00	560.00	per week	1.81%	A review of the market of other Local Authority charges and private sector homes, these increases bring the fees in line.
Blaen-y-pant - Dementia Care	605.00	650.00	per week	7.43%	
Parklands - Residential Care	550.00	560.00	per week	1.81%	
Spring Gardens - Dementia Care	605.00	650.00	per week	7.43%	
<b><u>External Respite Facilities (£/week)</u></b>					
Centrica	903.00	975.00	per week	7.97%	As above
<b><u>Day Services (£/Day)</u></b>					
Day Services/Opportunities – Learning Disability	75.00	97.00	per day	29.33%	Full cost recovery of providing a place
Day Services/Opportunities – Mental Health/Older People	56.00	84.00	per day	50.00%	Full cost recovery of providing a place
Spring Gardens Day Opportunities	56.00	84.00	per day	50.00%	Full cost recovery of providing a place
<b><u>Supported Housing (£/week)</u></b>					
Supported Housing for Learning Disability clients	855.00	1,022.00	per week	19.49%	Full cost recovery of providing a place

Income Source	Current Charge (Exc VAT)	Proposed Charge (Exc VAT)	Unit of charge	% Increase	Reason if different from 4% fee increase MTFP assumption
	£ (2 d.p)	£ (2 d.p)	(per hr/ day etc)		
<b>Newport Residents Charges</b>					
<u><b>Local Authority Residential Homes (£/week – Short Term Stays over 9 weeks and Permanent Admissions</b></u> Blaen-y-pant - Residential Care Blaen-y-pant - Dementia Care Parklands - Residential Care Spring Gardens - Dementia Care  Applicable to those who have capital in excess of £40k (capital threshold level set by the WG) or sufficient disposable income.	550.00 605.00 550.00 605.00	560.00 650.00 560.00 650.00	per week per week per week per week	1.81% 7.43% 1.81% 7.43%	A review of the market of other Local Authority charges and private sector homes, these increases bring the fees in line.
<u><b>Local Authority Residential Homes (£/week – Short Term Stays up to 8 weeks duration</b></u> Blaen-y-pant - Residential Care Blaen-y-pant - Dementia Care Parklands - Residential Care Spring Gardens - Dementia Care	Charged under non-residential charging policy and capped at £70 per week (current rate set by WG and due to be increased in April 2018)			N/A	
<u><b>External Respite Facilities (£/week –short term stays up to 8 weeks duration)</b></u> Centrica <u><b>Supported Housing (£/week) Inter Authority Charges</b></u> Supported Housing for Learning Disability clients <u><b>Day Services (£/Day)</b></u> Day Services/Opportunities – Learning Disability	Charged under non-residential charging policy and capped at £70* per week (*current rate set by WG and due to be increased in April 2018)			N/A	



Income Source	Current Charge (Exc VAT)	Proposed Charge (Exc VAT)	Unit of charge	% Increase	Reason if different from 4% fee increase MTFP assumption
	£ (2 d.p)	£ (2 d.p)	(per hr/ day etc)		
Day Services/Opportunities – Mental Health/Older People Spring Gardens Day Opportunities					
<b><u>Extracare Services (£/hour)</u></b>					
Domiciliary Services	14.00	14.70	per meal	5.00%	Increase to recover the costs of providing the meal
<b><u>Meal Income (per meal)</u></b>					
All Establishments (Service Users, Visitors & Staff)	3.00	3.50	per meal	16.67%	Increase to recover costs of providing the meal
<b><u>Legal and Administration Charges</u></b>					
Deferred Payment Administration Charge (DPA)	60.00	100.00	each	66.66%	Review deemed the previous charges were insufficient to cover the cost of legal and administration of the charge. Includes land registry costs and administrative and professional costs for preparing the DPA contract and placing land charges
Legal Charge	40.00	50.00	each	25.00%	
Residential Care- Provided by External Providers Non-Residential Care- Provided by External Providers Direct Payments Telecare  Where services are provided by external providers the charges made are based on actual costs paid to providers (after income assessment has been made)	Charged under non-residential charging policy and capped at £70* per week (*current rate set by WG and due to be increased in April 2018)			N/A	

This page is intentionally left blank

# Scrutiny Report

## Performance Scrutiny Committee - People

### Part 1

Date: 23 January 2017

### Subject **Forward Work Programme Update**

**Author** Overview and Scrutiny Officer

The following people have been invited to attend for this item:

Invitee:	Role
Daniel Cooke – Scrutiny Officer	<b>Present the Committee with the draft work programme for discussion and update the Committee on any changes.</b>

## Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

### 1 Recommendations to the Committee

The Committee is asked to:

1. Confirm the topics scheduled to be considered at its meeting on 6 March 2017 including:
  - Information requested;
  - Invitees;
  - Whether any additional information / research is required.
  
2. Note the list of reports that have been sent to the Committee for information over the last month.

### 2 Context

#### Background

- 2.1 The purpose of a forward work programme is to help ensure Councillors achieve organisation and focus in the undertaking of enquiries through the Overview and Scrutiny function. Effective work programming is essential to ensure that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services.
  
- 2.2 Further information about the work programming process, including the procedures for referring new business to the programme, can be found in our Scrutiny Handbook on the Council's Scrutiny webpages ([www.newport.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.newport.gov.uk/scrutiny)).

- 2.3 The Centre for Public Scrutiny's Good Scrutiny Guide recognises the importance of the forward work programme. In order to 'lead and own the process', it states that Councillors should have ownership of their Committee's work programme, and be involved in developing, monitoring and evaluating it. The Good Scrutiny Guide also states that, in order to make an impact, the scrutiny workload should be co-ordinated and integrated into corporate processes, to ensure that it contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.

### **Forward Work Programme Updates**

- 2.4 The Committees work programme was set in July 2017, including estimated timescales for when the reports will be considered by the Committee. This programme is then managed and implemented by the designated Scrutiny Officer for this Committee under the direction of the Committee Chairperson.
- 2.5 The Committee agreed to keep a degree of flexibility within its work programme to enable the Committee to respond to urgent / emerging issues. This item is an opportunity for the Committee members to raise any suggested additions to the work programme.

## **3 Information Submitted to the Committee**

- 3.1 The following information is attached:

**Appendix 1:** The current Committee forward work programme;

**Appendix 2:** List of information Reports sent to the Committee over the last month.

## **4. Suggested Areas of Focus**

### **Role of the Committee**

#### **The role of the Committee in considering the report is to:**

- Consider:
  - Are there any amendments to the topics scheduled to be considered at the next two Committee meetings?
  - Are there any additional invitees that the Committee requires to fully consider the topic?
  - Is there any additional information that the Committee would like to request?
- Note any information reports that have been circulated to the Committee this month (Appendix 2)

## **Section B – Supporting Information**

### **5 Supporting Information**

- 5.1 The Corporate Assessment, and the subsequent [follow up assessment](#) provide background information on the importance of good work programming. Specific reference is made to the need to align the Cabinet and Scrutiny work programmes to ensure the value of the Scrutiny Function is maximised.
- 5.2 The latest Cabinet work programme was approved by the Cabinet at its meeting on 21 December 2017 and includes the list of reports scheduled for consideration. Effective forward planning by

both Cabinet and Scrutiny needs to be coordinated and integrated in relation to certain reports to ensure proper consultation takes place before a decision is taken. A link to the Cabinet work programme ([here](#)) is provided to the Committee as part of this report, to enable the Committee to ensure that the work programmes continue to reflect key decisions being made by the Cabinet.

## **6 Risk**

- 6.1 If proper work programming procedures are not put in place, the organisation and prioritisation of the work programme is put at risk. The work of Overview and Scrutiny could become disjointed from the work of the rest of the Council, which could undermine the positive contribution Overview and Scrutiny makes to service improvement through policy development.
- 6.2 This report is presented to each Committee every month in order to mitigate that risk. The specific risks associated with individual topics on the work programme will need to be addressed as part of the Committee's investigations.

## **7 Links to Council Policies and Priorities**

- 7.1 Having proper work programming procedures in place ensures that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services, contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and ensures that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.

## **6 Financial Implications**

- 6.1 There will be financial consequences for some of the reviews undertaken. These will be commented upon by the Head of Finance as the reports are presented. The preparing and monitoring of the work programme is done by existing staff for which budget provision is available.

## **7 Background Papers**

- [The Essentials - Wellbeing of Future Generation Act \(Wales\)](#)
- [Corporate Plan](#)
- [Cabinet Work Programme – 20 December 2017 Cabinet Agendas](#)
- The Corporate Assessment and [follow up assessment](#).

Report Completed: 4 January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

## Performance Scrutiny Committee – People – Forward Work Programme

**Tuesday 6 March 2018**

Topic	Role / Information required	Invitees
<b>Performance Update:</b> Service Area Performance data	<p><b>Performance Monitoring - holding the executive to account for the Council's performance, focusing on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement of agreed measures, outcomes and actions;</li> <li>• Scrutinising progress in improvements to areas of poor performance;</li> <li>• Assessing the extent to which performance objectives are contributing to the overall objectives and priorities of the Council;</li> <li>• Assessing the extent to which performance is in keeping with the performance management strategy.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee will also receive more detail on the service area performance for <b>Adult and Community Services</b>, <b>Children and Young People Services</b> and the <b>Education Service</b>, including detail on the red and amber measures and finance dashboard.</p> <p><b>Information upon Key Stage 4/5 Pupil Data Performance Data and National Categorisation of Schools to be included.</b></p>	<p><b>For Adult and Community Services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Adult and Community Services;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Social Services.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Children and Young People Services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Children and Young People;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Social Services.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Education Service</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deputy Chief Education Officer;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Education and Skills</li> </ul>

**Tuesday 10 April 2018**

Topic	Role / Information required	Invitees
<b>Improvement Plan</b> Quarterly Update: Q3	<p>Performance Monitoring - holding the executive to account for the Council's performance.            To consider the progress of the Council towards actions associated with the improvement plan objectives and provide comment to Cabinet.</p> <p>The current relevant objectives for the Committee are:</p> <p>1 - Improving Independent Living for Older People.            2 - Ensuring people have the right social services to meet their needs.            6 - Ensuring the best educational outcomes for children.            8 - Improving outcomes for youth justice.</p> <p>The Committee will be receiving this update prior to Cabinet considering the report and any comments or recommendations from the Committee will be provided to the Cabinet when they consider this report.</p>	<p><b>IP Objective 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Adult and Community Services;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Social Services.</li> </ul> <p><b>IP Objective 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Adult and Community Services;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Social Services.</li> </ul> <p><b>IP Objective 6:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deputy Chief Education Officer;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Education and Skills</li> </ul> <p><b>IP Objective 8:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Children and Young People;</li> <li>• Cabinet Member for Social Services.</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank



**Performance Scrutiny Committee – People  
– Forward Work Programme**

---

<b>INFORMATION REPORTS</b>		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Information</b>	<b>Timescale / Deadline</b>
2016-17 Adult Protection Annual Report	Also Information report to Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee	TBC
Care Close to Home Strategy	Also Information Report to Performance Scrutiny Committee- Partnerships	January 2018
Extra Care Service Inspection Report	To be included with Performance report	As and when occurs
CSSIW Inspection Report NCC Fostering Services	To be included with Performance report	As and when occurs
Adult & Community Service Plan	Service Plans, Mid Year Reviews and Year End Reviews	As available
Children and Young People Service Plan		
Education Service Plan		

This page is intentionally left blank