

Report to: **Adult Social Care and Community Safety Scrutiny Committee**

Date: **7 March 2013**

By: **Assistant Chief Executive, Governance and Community Services**

Title of report: **Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources 2012/13**

Purpose of report: **To review scrutiny's input into the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) process during 2012/13.**

RECOMMENDATION: The committee is recommended to a) review its input into the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources process and b) identify any lessons for improvement for the process in future.

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 There are no specific financial implications associated with this report.

2. Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) and scrutiny in East Sussex

2.1 Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (i.e. aligning the Council's budget setting process with service delivery plans) is now established as an effective and transparent business planning process in East Sussex. The 2012/13 round began with the *State of the County 2012* report, considered by Cabinet on the 24 July 2012.

2.2 Scrutiny committees actively engaged in the process, firstly to allow them to bring the experience they have gained through their work to bear and, secondly, to help inform their future work programmes.

2.3 In September 2012 each scrutiny committee considered extracts from the *State of the County* report and made comments to Lead Members on the policy steers and their contribution to the objectives of the whole Council (the County Council Promise) prior to consideration by County Council.

2.4 The scrutiny committees established scrutiny boards to provide a detailed input into the RPPR process. These met in December 2012 or January 2013 to consider the draft portfolio plans and the impact of proposed savings. The boards:

- considered whether the amended policy steers were reflected satisfactorily within the proposed key areas of budget spend for the coming year;
- considered whether all possible efficiencies were identified; and
- assessed the potential impact of these savings on services provided to East Sussex County Council customers.

2.5 Appendix 1 summarises the comments and recommendations made by the Adult Social Care and Community Safety RPPR board.

3. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation

3.1 The committee is recommended to review its input into the 2012/13 RPPR process and in particular to establish whether there are lessons for improvement for the future.

SIMON HUGHES

Assistant Chief Executive, Governance and Community Services

Contact Officer: Paul Dean

Tel No. 01273 481751

Local Members: All

Background Documents

None

Overview and Scrutiny: Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) boards 2012/13

This table is a summary of the outcomes, observations and findings of the **Adult Social Care and Community Safety RPPR Board** held in January 2013.

The board considered the draft Portfolio Plans. It attempted to assess the impact of the significant budget cuts facing the County Council over the coming years, and reviewed activities where savings were not being proposed but which accounted for significant use of resources.

The Scrutiny board is supportive of the plans being put in place, and the means being proposed, to protect front line services as far as practicable. In general, the board endorsed the decisions of the Cabinet to protect a number of key activities.

All the RPPR boards emphasised the continuing importance of presenting RPPR information in an open, clear and understandable way.

Board: Councillors Pragnell (Chairman), Barnes, Field, Ost, Scott, Taylor and Tidy

Lead Members: Councillors Elkin and Bentley

Observers: Councillor Sparks

Key messages to Cabinet:

- 1) The level of savings required of the department, and the fact that this will inevitably have an impact on clients, is recognised.
- 2) Given the level of savings required, the Board supports the approach being taken which aims to minimise the impact as far as possible. In particular, the Board supports:
 - Retaining a focus on prevention and early intervention, viewing this as an investment in reducing longer term care needs
 - Protecting carers' services, recognising that carers are an increasingly critical resource for the county
 - Reducing back office costs where possible, whilst retaining sufficient capacity to implement and monitor changes which will deliver savings in future.
- 3) The Cabinet's proposed use of mitigation funding to offset the impact of savings in Adult Social Care is welcomed and the Board would wish to ensure that all possible savings are found elsewhere in the Council in order to 'cushion' priority services for the most vulnerable, including Adult Social Care, as far as possible.
- 4) **The proposed savings and impacts are endorsed subject to the following detailed comments and observations:**

Older people - community based services – proposed review and focus on services to meet personal care needs (£8,593,000 total saving over three years with £3,444,000 proposed mitigation)

 - Noted that this saving, which represents an average 30% reduction in the value of individual care packages, will inevitably have an impact on clients' quality of life.
 - Concerned about the possible impact on social isolation and potential knock-on impact on issues such as mental health (and associated costs). Assurances were given regarding level of protection of universal and preventative services which will offset the impact to some degree.

In addition, as ASC funding focuses on personal care needs, other avenues for supporting social needs will be explored, but the impact will be felt.

- Highlighted the degree of risk given that this saving is based on modelling, and delivery will be dependent on reviews of many individual care packages.
- Noted the need for close monitoring of progress towards delivery, both in terms of savings and the impact on clients.

Older people - telecare – promotion of telecare/telehealth to reduce overall value of care packages through meeting needs through alternative means (£300,000 saving in 2014/15)

- Noted that a saving has not been allocated in 2013/14 to allow time for reviews to be undertaken and alternatives put in place. Level of savings will be reviewed in 2014/15 to identify if any further savings are likely to accrue in future years.

Older people – reablement services – 3,000 clients to receive reablement as first service offer – will reduce volume and cost of long term care packages (£2m saving in 2014/15 and £3m saving in 2015/16 – total £5m saving)

- Highlighted level of risk in achieving this saving. Level of saving is based on modelling and requires ongoing investment in new model for integrated community services, including by NHS.
- Assurances given that the Neighbourhood Care Team model is in place, although requires further development, and that a level of prudence had been built into modelling.

Working age adults - community based services – proposed review and focus on services to meet personal care needs (£8,761,000 total saving over three years with £2,956,000 proposed mitigation)

- Noted that this saving, which represents an average 30% reduction in the value of individual care packages, will inevitably have an impact on client's quality of life.
- Highlighted the degree of risk given that this saving is based on modelling, and delivery will be dependent on reviews of many individual care packages.
- Noted the need for close monitoring of progress towards delivery, both in terms of savings and the impact on clients.

Working age adults - telecare – promotion of telecare/telehealth to reduce overall value of care packages through meeting needs through alternative means (£200,000 saving in 2014/15)

- Noted that a saving has not been allocated in 2013/14 to allow time for reviews to be undertaken and alternatives put in place. Level of savings will be reviewed in 2014/15 to identify if any further savings are likely to accrue in future years.

Universal services – Supporting People – Young Parent Services reduction from three to two accommodation based services and loss of night cover (£10,000 saving in 2014/15 and £26,000 in 2015/16)

- Noted that the saving is based on recommissioning as much support as possible in the community rather than residential settings for lower risk clients. Residential services to focus on higher risk.
- Noted that there had been liaison with Children's Services on the best approach to making savings within the service and the core Children's Services offer would remain in place out of hours.

Universal services – Supporting People – reduce from five to four domestic violence refuges (£65,000 saving in 2014/15)

- Assurance was given that the saving is being achieved through a wider review process which has involved district and borough councils. Services will be recommissioned to meet identified needs whilst making a saving.

Universal services – general

- The Board explored additional savings in universal services in order to reduce savings elsewhere. However, key areas of the universal services budget, notably Supporting People, have already been subject to significant review.
- Noted that the focus of services commissioned through the grants prospectus may be subject to future review in order to target priority outcomes.
- Accepted the risk that further savings in universal services (beyond the 15% proposed) could generate knock-on costs in other services.

Management and support – general savings

- Concerned at the impact of reduced staff support and training, particularly in procurement/ negotiation, at a time when savings are being sought through renegotiation of contracts; assurance was given that sufficient capacity would be retained to focus on priority areas.
- Recognised the need to retain assessment and care management capacity in the short term to support the significant number of reviews required. Also recognised the need to retain safeguarding capacity given its increasing significance.
- Welcomed the intention to retain capacity at corporate level to support 'invest to save' projects.

General – use of 2011/12 departmental underspend (£1,901,000 in older people's services and £1,400,000 in working age adult services)

- Noted that the underspend will be deployed in years one and two in order to smooth the path to achieving the required overall savings by year three. This will support delivery of the required changes and reassessments in the first two years.

