

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

Date: **13 November 2014**

By: **Chief Executive**

Title of report: **Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR)**

Purpose of report: **To enable the Committee to continue its engagement in the Council's business and financial planning process (Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources) for 2015/16 and beyond.**

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

- (1) consider the responses to any outstanding points from the September scrutiny committee deliberations on RPPR (appendix 1);**
 - (2) confirm the membership of the RPPR Scrutiny Board to meet on 18 December 2014; and**
 - (3) identify any further work or information needed to aid scrutiny's contribution to the RPPR process for consideration at the December RPPR Board.**
-

1. Financial implications

1.1 The *State of the County 2014* report was agreed by Cabinet on 22 July 2014. That report initiates the Council's business and financial planning process known as *Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources* (RPPR) for 2015/16 and beyond. It outlines the national and local policy, financial and performance context and provides the background for the development of the detailed business and financial plans that will eventually be agreed by the County Council early in 2015. It is available at www.eastsussex.gov.uk/yourcouncil/about/committees/meetingpapers/cabinet/2014/22july.

1.2 The Council Plan encompasses four cross-cutting **priority outcomes** for the Council as a whole. The priority outcomes provide a focus for decisions about spending and savings and will direct work across the Council. The priority outcomes are:

- Driving economic growth;
- Keeping vulnerable people safe from harm;
- Helping people help themselves; and
- Making the best use of our resources.

2. Scrutiny engagement in RPPR

2.1 When developing portfolio plans for next year, Cabinet Members are focusing on how services we and our partners provide contribute to the four priority outcomes. With diminishing resources available in future, the Council needs to develop ever more innovation in achieving efficiencies and 'providing more for less'. The kinds of strategies that are becoming increasingly apparent include: ensuring fair and effective demand management for the services we wish to provide; and focusing on earlier intervention, where appropriate, to prevent more costly intervention 'further down the line'.

2.2 Scrutiny's engagement in the RPPR process is vitally important. The **September 2014 scrutiny committees** examined the current portfolio and savings plans to become familiar with the scope and functions of the Cabinet portfolios within their remit. The committees assessed how services were performing against previously agreed targets and budgets, and questioned Lead Members and senior officers about the impacts of previous spending decisions. The committee identified a number of questions for further scrutiny. Information relating to these points is presented in Appendix 1 and will be examined further as part of the RPPR Board's work.

2.3 The committee is asked to confirm the Membership of its RPPR scrutiny review board which will consider the developing portfolio plans and savings proposals in more detail as they emerge in December.

3. Next steps

3.1 Each scrutiny committee will provide commentary and recommendations to be taken into account by Cabinet and Council before a final decision is taken on next year's budget and Council Plan early in 2015. In recent years, the messages sent by scrutiny to Cabinet have predominantly highlighted the *impact* of proposed spending plans on services provided by the County Council and its partners. Increasingly, however, scrutiny has also:

- proposed mitigating action to offset perceived negative impacts of spending reductions in some cases
- recommended shifts in the balance of priorities between different activities, giving prominence to priorities that have emerged from the evidence scrutiny has uncovered;
- made judgements about value for money for areas of above-average costs;
- sought to identify additional efficiencies; and
- challenged performance targets to try to ensure better return on investment through increased performance.

3.2 The **RPPR scrutiny review boards** will meet in December 2014 to agree the detailed comments and any recommendations on the emerging portfolio plans and savings proposals to put to Cabinet on behalf of their parent scrutiny committees. The Chairs of all the scrutiny committees are invited to attend all the scrutiny review boards.

3.3 The **March 2015 scrutiny committees** will review the process and their input into the RPP&R process, and make recommendations for improvements for the future RPPR process.

BECKY SHAW
Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Paul Dean, Members Services Manager (01273 481751)
Local Member: All

Background Documents
None

RPPR Questions/Requests from September ASCCS Scrutiny Committee for departmental response to November Scrutiny Committee

1. Future planned closures of directly provided services: the committee requested further details of the programme.

At present all planned reviewing activity for Directly Provided Services (DPS) is included within the County Council's Forward Plan. ASCCS Scrutiny Committee will be informed when this position changes. The Committee will determine when it wishes to receive reports on impact of previous DPS decisions.

2. Mental health: the committee requested the figures for the numbers of acute beds reduced over the years in East Sussex.

Acute mental health beds were last reduced in a phased way through early-mid 2011/ 12, going from 112 to 92 beds

Closures were as follows:

	Eastbourne DGH (DOP)	Conquest (Woodlands)	Difference
Pre-closures	71	51	-20
Post-closures	51	41	-10
Total closures	112	92	-30

In addition, 10 beds closed at Woodlands re-opened to provide treatment for men with long-standing, treatment-resistant psychosis

3. The Committee requested more detail about the effectiveness of the investment in measures under safer communities: road deaths including types of roads, locations and who is being injured.

This has been referred to Economy Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee who will receive a report in March 2015.

4. The committee requested further clarity about how much, per capita, the council spends on working age and older people.

The information provided below relates to spend per head of population, rather than unit cost information, and is in the new national reporting format focusing on primary support reason rather than specific services.

Scrutiny Committee requested information on spend per capita for Working Age Adult and Older People Services; the table below sets out this information for 2014/15 (based on total population of 534,402) compared to the relevant local authority comparator group. Further breakdowns by population type are shown in Annex 1.

	14/15 Net Budget £'000	TOTAL POPULATION = 534,402	
		ESCC £ per head	Average Comparator Group £ per head
Mental Health:			
Working Age Adults	6,017	10.66	8.83
Older People		16.40	5.34
Learning Disabilities:			
Working Age Adults	44,513	94.14	79.66
Older People		13.34	7.87
Physical Disabilities	14,994	39.79	21.56
Older People:			
Physical Support	52,042	54.56	76.66
Sensory Support		6.61	2.84
Support with memory & cognition		12.06	14.11

(Comparator Group: West Sussex, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Somerset, Essex, Kent, Hampshire, Worcestershire, North Yorkshire, Norfolk, Warwickshire, Oxfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Cumbria)

The information above shows that the spend per head of population for Mental Health, Learning Disability and Physical Disability services continues to be greater than the average spend for our comparator local authorities. Whilst spend per head of population for older people services is lower than the average spend for our comparator local authorities.

The strategic direction for Adult Social Care remains the rebalancing and realignment of services and expenditure such that the spend per head is brought towards the average spend for our comparator group of local authorities.

Annex 1 – Spend per Capita by Population Types

	14/15 Net Budget £'000	POPULATION 18+ = 429,506		POPULATION 18-64 = 300,058	
		ESCC £ per head	Average Comparator Group £ per head	ESCC £ per head	Average Comparator Group £ per head
Mental Health:					
Working Age Adults	6,017			18.99	15.01
Older People		33.67	17.73	-	-
Learning Disabilities:					
Working Age Adults	44,513			167.66	135.77
Older People		133.72	109.62	-	-
Physical Disabilities	14,994	(1)	(1)	70.85	36.88
Older People:					
Physical Support	52,042	(1)	(1)	-	-
Sensory Support		(1)	(1)	-	-
Support with memory & cognition		9.53	4.84	-	-

(1) split not available between PD & OP clients

	14/15 Net Budget £'000	POPULATION 65+ = 129,448	
		ESCC £ per head	Average Comparator Group £ per head
Mental Health:			
Working Age Adults	6,017	-	-
Older People		67.70	25.26
Learning Disabilities:			
Working Age Adults	44,513	-	-
Older People		55.06	36.90
Physical Disabilities	14,994	-	-
Older People:			
Physical Support	52,042	225.33	366.33
Sensory Support		27.27	12.99
Support with memory & cognition		49.78	64.91

