

Report to: **Adult Social Care and Community Safety Scrutiny Committee**
Date: **6 March 2014**
By: **Chief Executive**
Title of report: **Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources 2013/14**
Purpose of report: **To review scrutiny's input into the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) process during 2013/14.**

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee is recommended to a) review its input into the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources process; b) identify any lessons for improvement for the process in future, and c) review its work programme in the light of the issues raised.

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 an established, effective and transparent business planning process. A Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) has been produced. The 2013/14 RPPR round looks at the financial year 2014/15 which represents year two of current the three-year savings plan.

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

2.3 In September 2013 each scrutiny committee considered extracts from the *State of the County* report and the departmental savings and Portfolio Plans. Requests for further information or reports were made to help the scrutiny committee evaluate proposals made in the respective Portfolio Plans.

2.4 The scrutiny committees established scrutiny boards to provide a more detailed input into the RPPR process. These met in December 2013 or January 2014 to consider the draft portfolio plans and the impact of proposed savings. The boards:

- Considered any amendments to the Portfolio Plans and how they were being delivered against the proposed key areas of budget spend for the coming year;
- 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 to Cabinet.

3. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation

3.1 The committee is recommended to review its input into the 2013/14 RPPR process and to establish whether there are lessons for improvement for the future.

BECKY SHAW
Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Paul Dean Tel No. 01273 481751
Local Members: All

Background Documents None

Overview and Scrutiny: Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) boards 2013/14

This is a summary of the outcomes, observations and findings of the Adult Social Care and Community Safety RPPR Board held in December 2013 and January 2014.

All the scrutiny boards considered draft Portfolio Plans and savings plans and attempted to assess the impact of both any significant budget cuts facing the County Council over the coming years and those activities where savings are not necessarily being proposed but which account for significant use of resources.

Scrutiny boards commented on the plans being put in place and the means being proposed to protect front line services as far as practicable. As a consequence of this work, they have identified new priorities for scrutiny work programmes in the coming year.

Adult Social Care and Community Safety RPPR Board on 20 December 2013

Councillors: Peter Pragnell (Chair), John Barnes, Charles Clark, Angharad Davies, John Ungar and Trevor Webb.

Observer: Councillor Mike Blanch

Lead Members: Councillors David Elkin and Bill Bentley

Key messages to Cabinet:

Message / observation by the RPPR Board
1) The level of savings required in the financial year 2014/15, the 'middle' year of the current three year savings plan, will be especially challenging because of the '1:2:1' savings distribution.
2) <u>Key risks</u> currently faced include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the impact of the 30% reduction in the average social care personal budget • the impact of radical changes to those services that are directly provided by the Council • ensuring the proper targeting of the Better Care Fund (BCF) to be used to better integrate health and social care; not all this fund is under the department's control and there remain so many unknowns and competing demands on the fund that there are significant challenges in ensuring the maximum impact of this resource
3) <u>Reablement investment</u> is, as we have noted previously, highly successful but provision has not yet reached the optimum level to realise the maximum potential reablement. Some opportunities to expand reablement schemes will become available through the BCF whilst others would come about through broader engagement with the market and payment regimes linked to outcomes.
4) <u>Extra care housing schemes</u> have had demonstrable success in East Sussex and all attempts to expand these schemes across the County should be pursued. Extra care housing is likely to impact positively on our current relatively low performance indicator for the proportion of adults with a learning disability who live in their own homes.
5) Key elements of our <u>dementia delivery plan</u> need improved marketing and promotion to residents.

Updates to the scrutiny committee's work programme as a result of RPPR discussions

The Adult Social Care and Community Safety Scrutiny Committee identified the following possible topics for inclusion in its work programme:

- 1) Access to care and support

- the method of calculating personal budgets
- understanding the process from assessment to outcome
- understanding of the impact of the 30% average reduction in personal budgets
- helping 'self-funders' to get the best deal
- lessons from complaints information
- impact of the Care and Support Bill (due for implementation in 2016)
- understanding whether the eligibility criteria (to access social care services) are sufficiently responsive to any sudden, marked changes in demography.

2) Integration of health and social care

- use of the Better Care Fund (BCF)
- impact on support for people with long term conditions (as an example)

3) Developing the local market

- Review outcomes and impacts of DPS decisions after six months and beyond
- Reconciling the apparent reduction in numbers of providers overall with the promotion of more 'micro providers'.

Information requests (to determine whether further scrutiny is required)

1) Reducing re-offending

- Report (2010) on the effectiveness of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) scheme
- Information about the offenders on the IOM: age and gender breakdown / actions being taken to address the issues

2) Drugs and alcohol

- DAAT board minutes showing how the future priorities in drug-related offending are to be implemented.
- The breakdown of, and data and methodology leading to, the estimate that 23% of adults (in East Sussex) are drinking at increasing or higher risk levels; who is most at risk, and the extent to which demographic changes are a factor; area breakdown (when available)
- Future updates to the Committee on the work of the Drug and Alcohol Recovery Service and SWIFT (Specialist Family Services) (delivered through Children's Services)

3) Reducing the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on East Sussex roads

- Public health figures on proposed 'investment' in road safety.

4) Victims of antisocial behaviour (ASB) and hate crime

- Latest statistics, report (and video) on the scale of this issue.

5) Deaths in custody

- Review the outcome of the ESCC Scrutiny Review of the Mental Health Act Assessment Process (report published May 2003) that recommended "the establishment of one or more appropriate places of safety so that patients brought in by the police under section 136 of the MHA can be assessed in a calmer and more dignified environment than a police cell."