



PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2018

2.00 pm COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNTY HALL, LEWES

MEMBERSHIP - Councillor Angharad Davies (Chair)
Councillors Charles Clark, Michael Ensor, Kathryn Field, Roy Galley,
Tom Liddiard, Laurie Loe, Jim Sheppard, John Ungar (Vice Chair),
Trevor Webb and Francis Whetstone

Mr Simon Parr, Roman Catholic Diocese representative
Mr Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative
Mr Trevor Cristin, Diocese of Chichester
Mrs Nicola Boulter, Parent Governor Representative

AGENDA

- 1 Minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 1 October 2018 *(Pages 3 - 10)*
- 2 Apologies for absence
- 3 Disclosures of interests
Disclosures by all members present of personal interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the member regards the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.
- 4 Urgent items
Notification of items which the Chair considers to be urgent and proposes to take at the appropriate part of the agenda. Any members who wish to raise urgent items are asked, wherever possible, to notify the Chair before the start of the meeting. In so doing, they must state the special circumstances which they consider justify the matter being considered urgent.
- 5 Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) 2019/20 *(Pages 11 - 40)*
Report by the Chief Executive.
- 6 Scrutiny review of Schools Coping with Change - Report of the Review Board *(Pages 41 - 64)*
Report by the Chairman of the Review Board.
- 7 People Scrutiny Committee Work Programme *(Pages 65 - 82)*
Report by the Assistant Chief Executive.
- 8 Update report on the implementation of locality working *(Pages 83 - 86)*
Report by the Director of Adult Social Care and Health.
- 9 Any other items previously notified under agenda item 4

PHILIP BAKER
Assistant Chief Executive
County Hall, St Anne's Crescent
LEWES BN7 1UE

19 November 2018

Contact Stuart McKeown, Senior Democratic Services Adviser, 01273 481583,

Email: stuart.mckeown@eastsussex.gov.uk

PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the People Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber - County Hall, Lewes on 1 October 2018.

- PRESENT** Councillors Charles Clark, Angharad Davies (Chair), Michael Ensor, Kathryn Field, Roy Galley, John Ungar (Vice Chair) and Trevor Webb.
- Mr Trevor Cristin (Church of England Representative)
Mr Simon Parr (Catholic Diocese Representative)
Mr Matthew Jones (Parent Governor Representative)
- LEAD MEMBERS** Councillor Bob Standley, Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability
Councillor Sylvia Tidy, Lead Member for Children and Families.
- ALSO PRESENT** Becky Shaw, Chief Executive
Stuart Gallimore, Director of Children's Services
Keith Hinkley, Director of Adult Social Care
Darrell Gale, Director of Public Health
Lou Carter, Assistant Director (Performance and Planning)
Liz Rugg, Assistant Director (Early Help and Social Care)
Fiona Wright, Assistant Director (Education & ISEND)
Reg Hooke, Independent Chair, Local Safeguarding Children Board
Douglas Sinclair, Head of Children's Safeguards & Quality Assurance
Sally Williams, LSCB Manager
Elizabeth Funge, Head of Education Improvement
Danielle Cassell, Senior Manager - System Leadership
George Kouridis, Head of Service, Adult Safeguarding
Stuart McKeown, Senior Democratic Services Adviser

8 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 25 JUNE 2018.

8.1 RESOLVED to agree the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

9 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

9.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Liddiard, Loe and Whetstone.

10 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

10.1 Councillor Ungar declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest as he is a Director of Aspiration Housing and a Director of the Eastbourne Housing Investment Company Limited (with regard to Agenda item 5 and item 12 of these Minutes).

10.2 Councillor Webb declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest as, in relation to his role as a Hastings Borough Councillor, he has attended meetings where matters relating to the Flagship School were discussed (with regard to Agenda item 5 and item 12 of these Minutes).

11 URGENT ITEMS

11.1 The Committee welcomed Ofsted's judgement of 'outstanding' with regard to its recent inspection of Children's Social Services. Members were grateful to officers for their hard work and professionalism in securing this positive outcome. The Committee therefore asked that its congratulations and gratitude be recorded in the formal Minutes of the meeting.

12 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT KS4 - PROGRESS ON ACTION PLAN

12.1 The Children's Services Scrutiny Committee appointed a Scrutiny Review Board to review Educational Attainment at Key Stage 4. The review investigated the issues and challenges that secondary schools and academies face in relation to the recruitment and retention of teachers and the potential impact this has on educational attainment. The final report of the Review Board was presented to the Children's Scrutiny Committee in June 2017. Following its progress through Cabinet and Full Council, a six monthly monitoring report was considered at the final the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee in March 2018. The latest report provided Members of the People Scrutiny Committee (the successor body to the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee) with a second opportunity to review the Departmental Action Plan. Following a request from Members, the report also included the revised East Sussex Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy.

12.2 Elizabeth Funge, Head of Education Improvement, introduced the report and highlighted the Children's Services Department's desire to develop a revised Teacher Recruitment and Retention strategy in collaboration with key partners, such as Teaching Schools and Teaching Partnerships.

12.3 The Committee welcomed the report and then discussed a number of issues in relation to the Action Plan and the revised recruitment and retention strategy document. Members agreed that it is important that local housing plans include an element relating to Key Worker accommodation. The Committee also discussed the proposed establishment of 'The Flagship School' in Hastings. In response to this, the Department undertook to provide the Committee with a written briefing on recent developments regarding SEN school provision in the county.

12.4 The Committee asked for more detail regarding what quantitative data the Department had to support the objectives set out in the revised recruitment and retention strategy. More specifically, the Committee requested more detail as to how the Department identify which subjects have teacher shortages.

12.5 In response the Department informed Members that it had conducted surveys to establish what the key recruitment and retention pressures are for schools and academies within the county. However, precise data was difficult to obtain. The resources are no longer available within the service to conduct detailed data collection processes. Furthermore there are a wide range of different types of educational establishment in the county and this has made the data collection process more difficult to achieve. Given this, the Department have developed a pragmatic approach to identifying the key recruitment and retention challenges. This involves developing and maintaining good working partnerships with all the local educational establishments. Whilst such relationships do not provide 'perfect' data, the Department are confident it provides evidence which is sufficient for the purpose of developing an informed strategy. One example of the Department's approach in this respect relates to its programme of external advisers and consultant Head teachers. The dialogue between these colleagues and schools results in useful data regarding teacher shortages for specific subjects. The Committee were also informed that the Government provide data to the Department which also influences the recruitment strategy. For example, that currently there is a surplus of Physical Education teaching staff.

12.6 RESOLVED – the Committee agreed to:

- i) To receive the Departmental Action Plan and revised Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy.
- ii) To request a briefing note regarding recent developments regarding SEN

school provision in the county.

13 EAST SUSSEX LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT - 2017/18

13.1 Reg Hooke, Independent Chair of the LSCB, introduced the annual report and highlighted the LSCB's priorities for the past three year period (as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the covering report and in more detail in Section 3 of the Annual Report). Mr Hooke also drew the Committee's attention to the revised version of the Department for Education's guidance document, 'Working Together to Safeguard Children'. The revised guidance was published in July 2018 and sets out new arrangements which require three safeguarding partners (the local authority, police and clinical commissioning groups) to publish new arrangements by the end of June 2019.

13.2 A summary of the key points discussed by the Committee are set out below:

- **Home education.** The Committee asked for the LSCB's views on the potential safeguarding risks for children who are home educated. In response, the Committee were informed it is the LSCB's view that there is a lack of regulation relating to this area. As a result, this is a group of children which the LSCB and relevant stakeholders cannot be complacent about. Given the lack of regulation, the Board's focus has been on those children who are at most risk (for example, children who have been placed on a Protection Plan).
- **Impact of new arrangements for scrutiny.** In response to a query regarding the impact of the new arrangements, the Committee were informed that in terms of reporting to scrutiny, and for the time being at least, the process would remain unchanged.
- **Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).** The Committee asked for clarification as to how the LSCB measures the impact of its efforts regarding the multi-agency response to CSE. In response, the Committee were informed that a number of different methods are used in this respect. One key tool is the examination of trends. In this example, trends relating to the number of cases being moved from the 'High Risk' to 'Low Risk' category are used to help identify the impact of the LSCB's measures.
- **Sexual offences against children data.** In response to a query regarding the figure of '500 sexual offences against children' statement which appeared in an infographic in paragraph 2.4 of the Annual Report (page 55 of the agenda), the Committee were informed that the data relates to sexual offences reported to and recorded by the Police (not convictions). Whilst the data does not reflect the total number of offences committed against children, it does provide an important picture of abuse committed against children. Trends in data may reflect increased public awareness and changes in policing, rather than an increase in incidence (Data also reflects the year in which an offence was reported, not the year it was committed, so a proportion of offences will be historic).
- **Exploitation by organised crime groups.** The Committee asked for clarification regarding the steps being taken to combat the exploitation of children and young people by criminal gangs for the purposes of supplying drugs. In response, Mr Hooke informed the Committee that this is a relatively new issue and that all agencies are learning how to deal with the challenges this form of exploitation produces. The issues are complex and impact at both local and national levels. It was also confirmed that there is now an established process for responding to reports of this form of exploitation and that a 'disruption strategy' has been developed. It was also confirmed that the Government is working on deploying a national centre and is looking to develop national guidance.
- **Strengthening Safeguarding in Schools.** In response to a question regarding safeguarding in the independent school sector, the Committee were informed that the LSCB act in a 'sector blind' manner. The Committee were also informed that the

independent sector had now established its own safeguarding group and that response rates to the safeguarding audit were now in the 90% range. It was also confirmed that all referrals on the audit are followed-up on.

- **Board Membership.** The Committee queried whether the Board membership is set at the right level and whether there is room for more expertise. Clarification was also sought as to whether the budget for the LSCB is sufficient. In response, the Committee were informed that the work of the LSCB covers a large and complex area and that to manage its workload, a number of sub-groups have been established. In terms of the budget, the service needs resources for training and to fund reviews and steps are taken in partnership with relevant agencies to manage costs.

13.3 RESOLVED – the Committee agreed to receive the LSCB’s annual report.

14 RECONCILING POLICY, PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES (RPPR) 2019/20

14.1 Becky Shaw, Chief Executive introduced the item by providing an overview of the context within which the current RPPR process is taking place. This included discussing the strategy of developing a ‘Core Offer’ in the light of proposed further savings of £45m required over the next three years. The Committee were also informed that further detail will be provided to Members after the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivers the Government’s budget on 29 October (with a response to the budget being considered at Cabinet in November).

14.2 The Committee sought further clarification regarding what services would either be potentially be included or excluded from the Core Offer. In response, the Chief Executive commented that no decisions had been made yet, and that whilst she was sympathetic to the requests for more detail, it was not possible to do so at the time of the meeting.

14.3 The Committee noted the Core Offer extract (attached as Appendix 3 to the report), and asked for clarification as to whether safeguarding was being given an appropriate level of priority. In response, the Committee were informed that Appendix 3 is not a priority list and that instead, it should be viewed as a work in progress document. The Chief Executive also confirmed the Council has been lobbying the Government regarding providing local authorities more discretion over such matters as the fees the Council are able to charge for certain types of service.

14.4 RESOLVED: to establish a Scrutiny Review Board which will meet on Thursday 10 December 2018.

15 PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

15.1 The Committee discussed its draft work Programme which is comprised of a number of ongoing Scrutiny Reviews, Reference Groups and planned reports.

Current Scrutiny Reviews

15.2 In relation to the ‘Coping with Change – the Way Forward’ Scrutiny Review, Councillor Galley provided an update on the Board’s activities and confirmed that the review is on course to deliver its final report to the Committee at its meeting on 27 November 2018.

15.3 In relation to the ‘Changing Care Market’ Initial Scoping Board, the Committee agreed that there is sufficient merit in a review of the areas identified by the Board. The Committee therefore RESOLVED to:

- (1) Appoint Councillors Davies, Ensor, Galley, Sheppard and Ungar to conduct a review of the Changing Care Market; and
- (2) Appoint Councillor Ensor to act as Chair of the Changing Care Market Review Board.

Initial Scoping Reviews

15.4 In relation to the 'Fostering Service' Initial Scoping Board, and on the basis of the evidence considered as part of the scoping process, the Committee RESOLVED to:

- (1) not proceed with a formal Scrutiny Review of issues relating to the Fostering Service; and
- (2) support the suggestions of the Initial Scoping Board as set out in Section 3 of Appendix 2 of the report.

15.5 As part of the process it follows to review the Work Programme, the Committee considered a proposal to appoint an initial scoping board to look into issues relating to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC). The Director of Children's Services informed the Committee that he would value scrutiny input into this challenging area for the Department. For example, the numbers of UASC may start to increase and this is a challenge for the Department as the Government only part fund the costs associated with this group. The Department also indicated that it would value the insights Members could provide into the views of local communities on this subject.

15.6 With the above in mind, the Committee RESOLVED to:

appoint Councillors Field, Webb and Whetstone to undertake scoping work with a view to establishing whether a recommendation should be made to the People Scrutiny Committee to approve a formal review being undertaken.

Reference Groups

15.7 The Committee discussed the membership of the Educational Attainment and Performance Scrutiny Reference Group and the details of its next meeting. The Committee RESOLVED:

- (1) to appoint Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative, to the Educational Attainment and Performance Scrutiny Reference Group; and
- (2) that the next meeting of the group should take place in January.

Reports for Information

15.8 Councillor Galley updated the Committee with regard to the additional SACRE report listed under the 'Reports for Information' section of the Work Programme. The Committee were informed that the Department have undertaken to include within SACRE's Annual report a section which considers the issue of the provision of Religious Education in secondary schools (the Annual Report will be considered by the Committee in March). As a result, the Committee agreed to remove this item from the Work Programme.

Future Committee Agenda Items

15.9 The Committee discussed the progress and effectiveness of ESBT locality working and RESOLVED to:

add to the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee (which is taking place on 27 November 2018) an update report on progress with and the effectiveness of locality working.

15.10 The Committee discussed the areas of prevention and integration and its impact on Adult Social Care. The Committee therefore RESOLVED to:

add to the agenda 'prevention and integration' as an discussion item for the People Scrutiny Committee meeting taking place on 7 March 2019.

Forward Plan

15.11 The Committee agreed that the update report on progress with the implementation of the Adult Social Care and Health RPPR decisions for 2018/19 (which being considered by the relevant Lead Member on 27 November) will be attached as an annexe to the People Scrutiny Committee's RPPR report.

16 SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT AND STRATEGIC PLAN

16.1 George Kouridis, Head of Service, Adult Safeguarding, introduced the item and highlighted some of the key issues contained within the Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) Annual Report. This included:

- the four safeguarding adult review (SAR) referrals made in 2017-18; and
- the key findings of the ADASS Peer Review of Safeguarding. The review was undertaken in March 2018 and delivered an overall positive review of adult social care and found no issues with regard to Safeguarding Adults practice. The one key area the review did identify for development relates to the ability of staff to take on appropriate levels of risk. The review recommended therefore that the service should provide support and training which empowers staff in this respect. As a result an Action Plan has been implemented which includes, for example, a new threshold decision making process guidance tool for partners and providers.

16.2 The key points discussed by the Committee are summarized below:

- **Implementing the findings of SAR.** The Committee welcomed the overall positive situation described in the annual report. Although further clarification was sought regarding the mechanisms the Department have in place to ensure learnings are acted upon. The Committee also sought clarification regarding whether the Department believes it has sufficient resource available to successfully implement the findings of its SARs. In response, the Committee were informed that training is key for the Department. So, for example, the last referral to the SAB resulted in an 'open discussion' amongst staff regarding the issues. At a strategic level, the Department have a process for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of a SAR.
- **Staffing Levels.** In response to a question about staff levels within the safeguarding team, the Director of Adult Social Care informed the Committee that an 8% reduction in staffing levels will have an impact across the Department. The Department's response to this is to re-focus its resources on key areas, such as safeguarding. This response should also be seen in the context of the broader changes taking place across the Council, whereby resources for the most vulnerable are prioritised. Within the context of adult social care, this re-prioritisation process may have an impact on, for example, how long people wait for an assessment. The Director also noted that its peer review process is still relatively well-funded in terms of support to the SAB.
- **Mental Health - responsibility for responding to a threatened suicide.** Councillor Ensor asked which agencies would be responsible for responding to and caring for an individual who was making threats in public to commit suicide. In response, the Committee were informed that the NHS would ultimately be responsible, but that there would also potentially be an element of Adult Social Care involvement too.
- **Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Adult Board.** In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that the Chair of the Safeguarding Adult Board, Graham Bartlett, would normally be in attendance for this report. However, Keith Hinkley, Director of Adult Social Care, confirmed Mr Bartlett was unfortunately not able to attend the meeting due to a long standing prior commitment.

16.3 RESOLVED: to receive the Annual Report of the Safeguarding Adults Board.

The meeting ended at 12.45 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: **People Scrutiny Committee**

Date: **27 November 2018**

By: **Chief Executive**

Title of report: **Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources**

Purpose of report: **To provide an update on the Council's business and financial planning process, Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR), and the Committee's comments and requests for further information.**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Scrutiny Committee is recommended to review the attached RPPR Cabinet report of 13 November 2018 (Appendix A) and:

- (1) comment on the Core Offer proposals (Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report)**
 - (2) review the Medium Term Financial Plan (Appendix 2 to the Cabinet report)**
 - (3) comment on the areas of search for savings (Appendix 3 to the Cabinet report)**
 - (4) comment on the attached Update on the progress of the 2018/19 Adult Social Care and Health savings report for the Lead Member Adult Social Care and Health - 27 November 2018. (Appendix B)**
 - (5) identify any further work or information needed to aid the Scrutiny Committee's contribution to the RPPR process for consideration at the December RPPR Board, or as part of the Committee's ongoing work programme.**
-

1. Background

Core Offer

1.1 The Cabinet agreed in July that the next step of the RPPR process was to ground our planning in a "Core Offer". The Core Offer is an articulation of what officers consider the minimum outcomes a competent and efficient Council could expect to be able to provide by 2020/21 having regard to East Sussex County Council's agreed priorities with the resources it anticipates having available to it over the next three years. Its backdrop is the saving of £129m made over the last 8 years, and the work we have done to ensure we are efficient and maximise the availability of resources to front line services. The Core Offer is ambitious but realistic: seeking to maintain our track record of delivering excellent services, innovation and providing good value for money. The Core Offer is an articulation of what we believe local people most need from the Council. This is based on the Council's agreed priorities, local knowledge, evidence of need and demand and Members' ambitions for East Sussex. It will act as a focus for our planning on how best to deploy the £390m/pa funding we will have by 2021/22.

1.2 The Core Offer is not the ideal that we would wish to be able to provide but seeks to capture what is most appropriate and possible in a time of austerity. We have already removed a number of early intervention and preventative services, which we know help to maintain the resilience of communities and individuals and whose removal may lead to increased costs in the long term. The proposals which form the Core Offer make further reductions in these services. However, building local people's long-term health and wellbeing is better than stepping in when families and individuals are in crisis. So the Council would want to reinvest in these areas if our financial situation were to improve.

1.3 The Core Offer will help us in our lobbying with Government to set out the realistic level of funding we need to continue to serve local people adequately. We have listed both the areas that we consider should be included in the current Core Offer and the proposed current areas that would be excluded. The Core Offer proposed by Chief Officers is set out in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report. In drawing it up and considering the resources required to deliver it, Chief Officers have aimed to be realistic but ambitious about the level of service that can be maintained with minimum resources. It will however rely on a huge effort by our already reduced workforce, continued creativity and innovation working with our partners and may risk to our ability to meet statutory guidance and deadlines.

Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)

1.4 The updated MTFP included in the 13 November 2018 RPPR Cabinet report, indicates that the Council may face a cumulative budget deficit in a worst case scenario of £45.7million by 2021/22 based on projections of income, expenditure and the growth in demand for services. Whilst we have had the Chancellor of the Exchequer's budget announcements which have implications for local government, the direct effect on our position will not be certain until we receive the provisional local government settlement which is expected on 6 December. The Budget included welcome announcements of some additional funding for Children's and Adults' Social Care of £410m nationally in 2019/20. In addition £240m has been announced to help relieve winter pressures on the health system, continuing the winter pressures allocation of £240m already announced for 2018/19. We do not know, however, what the County Council's share of the £410m will be; whether the Government will split the funding between Children's and Adults or whether it will be for Councils to decide how to spend their shares and what, if any, conditions will be placed on the funding. £420m was also announced to fix potholes and carry out other highways repairs in 2018/19. Again we do not know how much of this East Sussex will receive or what restrictions will be placed on the use of funding. The additional funding, whilst helpful, is one off. It will not, therefore, change our savings requirement, unless the Government gives a commitment to replicate the funding for remainder of the MTFP period.

1.5 The RPPR report presented to Cabinet on 13 November sets out a number of other areas of uncertainty. For example we still await the outcome of the bid by East Sussex Councils to be a business rate retention pilot. In the longer term the Government is still working through proposals for future funding of local government once it has removed all Revenue Support Grant. All these factors will have an effect on our MTFP. In addition, work continues on a number of proposals that finance and support the changing costs of service delivery.

Savings Proposals

1.6 The initial areas of search for savings to be considered by Cabinet would still result in a total deficit of £33.4m to be identified. Work continues on the areas of search in relation to the costs of operations and financing.

2. Scrutiny engagement in RPPR

2.1 At the October meeting the Scrutiny Committees discussed the current Portfolio Plans and outline Core Offer contained in the State of the County report.

2.2 The **November 2018 scrutiny committees** are invited to:

- review the Core Offer proposals;
- review the MTFP;
- review the areas of search for savings for 2019/20 - 2021/22 and suggest any amendments or potential alternatives that should be explored; and
- consider any additional information requested at the September meeting in preparation for the RPPR Board in December;
- identify any further work or information needed to aid the scrutiny committee's contribution to the RPPR process for consideration at the December RPPR Board; and

- fine tune the scrutiny committee's work programme to ensure the committee is in the best position to contribute to the ongoing RPPR process.

Appendix A contains the 13 November Cabinet RPPR report, which details the Core Offer proposals, the updated MTFP for the Council for the next 3 financial years and the areas of search for savings.

Appendix B contains the Update on the progress of the 2018/19 Adult Social Care and Health savings report for the Lead Member Adult Social Care and Health (27 November 2018).

2.3 The committee's **RPPR Board** will meet on 10 December 2018 to agree detailed comments and any recommendations on the Core Offer, emerging portfolio plans and savings proposals to be put to Cabinet on behalf of the committee in January 2019. The Chairs of the People and Place scrutiny committees are invited to attend the RPPR boards of both committees.

2.4 The **March 2019 scrutiny committees** will review the process and their input into the RPPR process and receive feedback on how scrutiny input has been reflected in final plans. Any issues arising can be reflected in the future committee work programme.

2.5 Running alongside this process, there will be a number of opportunities for all Members to engage in the RPPR process.

BECKY SHAW
Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Stuart McKeown Senior Democratic Services Advisor

Telephone: 01273 481583

Email: stuart.mckeown@eastsussex.gov.uk

Local Member: All

Background Documents:

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to:	Cabinet
Date:	13 November 2018
By:	Chief Executive
Title of report:	Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR)
Purpose of report:	To set out the proposed East Sussex County Council Core Offer, the latest Medium Term Financial Plan and the areas of search for savings which will be used to develop proposals for the Council's budget for the next three years

RECOMMENDATION:

Cabinet is recommended to:

- **Consider and comment on the proposed Core Offer by 2020/21 (Appendix 1);**
 - **Note the latest update on the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) (Appendix 2); and**
 - **Agree the areas of search for savings (Appendix 3)**
-

1. Core Offer Development

1.1 The Cabinet agreed in July that the next steps of the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) process was to ground our planning in a "Core Offer". The Core Offer is an articulation of what officers consider the minimum outcomes a competent and efficient Council could expect to be able to provide by 2020/21 having regard to East Sussex County Council's agreed priorities with the resources it anticipates having available to it over the next three years. It's backdrop is the saving of £129m made over the last eight years, and the work we have done to ensure we are efficient and maximise the availability of resources to front line services. The Core Offer is ambitious but realistic: seeking to maintain our track record of delivering excellent services, innovation and providing good value for money. The Core Offer is an articulation of what we believe local people most need from the Council. This is based on the Council's agreed priorities, local knowledge, evidence of need and demand and Members' ambitions for East Sussex. It will act as a focus for our planning on how best to deploy the £390m/pa funding we will have by 2021/22. Agreement is not being sought now to reduce services to the Core Offer. Decisions relating to changes in policy, service delivery and reductions in services leading to only the Core Offer being provided, will be taken in the usual way through the RPPR process and in accordance with the Council's constitution.

1.2 The proposed Core Offer set out in Appendix 1 is based on the four priority outcomes that Members have agreed: driving sustainable economic growth; keeping vulnerable people safe; helping people to help themselves; and making best use of resources. This means that we will continue to support economic development because the County's economy lags behind the rest of the South East and providing access to high quality employment is the single most important thing that can be done to reduce avoidable reliance on public services. It also means that some element of preventative services are included in the Core Offer where they prevent immediate need for more costly interventions. Enabling people to help themselves to live independently gives better health, wellbeing and quality of life for individuals and families and reduces the need for more costly intervention in the very short term.

1.3 The Core Offer will need to evolve over time as the needs of local people change and new ways of meeting needs become available.

1.4 The Core Offer is not the ideal that we would wish to be able to provide but seeks to capture what is most appropriate and possible in a time of austerity. We have already removed a number of early intervention and preventative services, which we know help to maintain the resilience of communities and individuals and whose removal may lead to increased costs in the long term. The proposals which form the Core Offer make further reductions in these services. However, building local people's long-term health and wellbeing is better than stepping in when families and individuals are in crisis so the Council would want to reinvest in these areas if our financial situation were to improve.

1.5 We will also continue to innovate and be creative about how we work to make the best use of the available resources. Extensive work and change will be required by the County Council and with partners to deliver the Core Offer as effectively as possible. We will work across the Council to make sure that we are maximising the use of all funding and resources to achieve the best outcomes we can for local people, including the best use of public health resources. We will also continue to compare our costs and practices with others to make sure we are making the best of every penny we spend.

1.6 The partnership work we undertake with all or local partners, particularly with health and the voluntary and community sector, will continue to be vital and also evolving in nature.

1.7 Getting the Core Offer right and clear, so that we can use it in discussion with residents, businesses, the Government, our partners and stakeholders is crucial. This means being clear about what is most needed from the Council for children and young people in the county, for adults with disabilities or who are vulnerable, for older people and what our universal offer is to all residents. This will ensure that we are looking across the Council at our offer to residents and businesses rather than through any departmental silos.

1.8 The Core Offer will help us in our lobbying with Government to set out the realistic level of funding we need to continue to serve local people adequately. We have listed both the areas that we consider should be included in the current Core Offer and the proposed current areas that would be excluded. The Core Offer proposed by Chief Officers is set out in Appendix 1. In drawing it up and considering the resources required to deliver it, Chief Officers have aimed to be realistic but ambitious about the level of service that can be maintained with minimum resources. It will however rely on a huge effort by our already reduced workforce, continued creativity and innovation working with our partners and may risk our ability to meet statutory guidance and deadlines.

2. Medium Term Financial Plan

2.1 The latest update of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) is set out in Appendix 2. Whilst we have had the Chancellor of the Exchequer's budget announcements which have implications for local government, the direct effect on our position will not be certain until we receive the provisional local government settlement which is expected on 6 December. The Budget included welcome announcements of some additional funding for Children's and Adults' Social Care of £410m nationally in 2019/20. In addition £240m has been announced to help relieve winter pressures on the health system, continuing the winter pressures allocation of £240m already announced for 2018/19. We do not know, however, what the County Council's share of the £410m will be; whether the Government will split the funding between Children's and Adults or whether it will be for Councils to decide how to spend their shares and what, if any, conditions will be placed on the funding. £420m was

also announced to fix potholes and carry out other highways repairs in 2018/19. Again we do not know how much of this East Sussex will receive or what restrictions will be placed on the use of funding. The additional funding, whilst helpful, is one off. It will not, therefore, change our savings requirement, unless the Government gives a commitment to replicate the funding for remainder of the MTFP period. Neither is it sufficient to close the budget gap. The Chancellor, although saying austerity is coming to an end, also said that plans may need to be reviewed if there were to be a no-deal Brexit and that the next period would be one of “continued financial discipline”. Funding for local government is therefore unlikely to improve and may get worse. Further savings are therefore inevitable unless new Government funding becomes available.

2.2 There are a number of other areas of uncertainty. For example we still await the outcome of the bid by East Sussex Councils to be a business rate retention pilot. In the longer term the Government is still working through proposals for future funding of local government once it has removed all Revenue Support Grant. All these factors will have an effect on our MTFP. In addition, work continues on a number of proposals that finance and support the changing costs of service delivery. The paragraphs below set out how these scenarios may affect the current MTFP.

2.3 The projection of Government funding is based on what has been confirmed in the latest Local Government Financial Settlement. The Council’s funding will reduce by a further net £15.1m over 2019/20-2021/22. In the same period there are unavoidable costs to cover projected inflation, demographic and service pressures of £64.8m. This equates to a real term loss of purchasing power over this three year period of £79.9m. Forecast increases in Council Tax receipts brings £34.2m additional funding but this still leaves a shortfall in spending power of £45.7m, which represents the current forecast savings requirements.

2.4 The updated MTFP sets out a worst case scenario deficit budget position by 2021/22 of £45.7m.

MTFP (cumulative)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Total Resources	(374,254)	(381,027)	(390,411)
Total Expenditure	390,979	417,362	436,112
Total Budget Deficit	16,725	36,335	45,701

2.5 The annual budget deficits are set out in the table below:

MTFP (annual)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Annual Budget Deficit	16,725	19,610	9,366
Savings from move to Core Offer	(5,844)	(4,495)	(1,972)
Remaining Annual Budget Deficit - subject to further areas of search	10,881	15,115	7,394
Cumulative Budget Deficit	10,881	25,996	33,390

2.6 The development of the Core Offer has identified savings of £12.3m (Appendix 3), leaving a total deficit of £33.4m to be identified. The work continues on the following areas of search, with the “indicative range” showing the potential opportunities to contribute towards the total deficit:

2.7 *National funding (indicative range: £0-6m for permanent relief; £5-7m for one-off funding)*

There are potential positive impacts of a number of national funding streams:

- recent Budget announcements (see para 2.1 above);
- further announcements from the provisional and final Local Government Settlement;
- the Fair Funding Review: a revised formula for Local Government funding allocation is awaited. The timeline for implementation is 2020/21;
- Business Rates Retention 75% Pilot 2019/20 (one year only): ESCC together with Eastbourne BC, Hastings BC, Lewes DC, Rother DC and Wealden DC, have submitted a bid to be a pilot area for 2019/20. The potential gain for the authority has been estimated at £1.6m. The successful bids will be announced as part of the Local Government Finance Settlement;
- Business Rates Retention (BRR): the longer term model for BRR has yet to be announced and will be informed by the learning from the 75% BRR Pilot for 2019/20;
- Comprehensive Spending Review 2019: Central Government is set to review funding allocations to all departments, which will impact from 2020/21 but no information is available at this stage; and
- Older People Social Care Green Paper: now delayed until the autumn but unlikely to provide additional funding until after the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and General Election.

2.8 *Cost of Operations (indicative range: £2m-4m):* including:

- the assessment of inflation, using Office of Budget Responsibility and CPI indices;
- the review of current fees and charges, assessing levels of collection, comparing with benchmarking data and assessing the opportunities to raise existing, and set new, fees and charges; and
- through established protocols, assess the level of pressures and appropriateness of funding through the MTFP; and
- improving the way we work across the council through: technology, digital and Artificial Intelligence; removing duplication and improving efficiency and commercialisation.

2.9 *Financing (indicative range: £3m-8m):* including:

- updating the Treasury Management Strategy, with consideration of the basis for the calculation of the Minimum Revenue Provision, opportunities to reduce the cost of debt and increase the level of investment income;
- updating the Capital Strategy, with consideration of the impact of current capital programme slippage, reassessment of service needs and opportunities for refinancing the programme, including reduction in the revenue contribution to capital; and
- reviewing the overall use of Working Capital to support the MTFP.

2.10 The areas of search and possible impact of national funding announcements, add a significant level of complexity in setting a balanced budget for 2019/20 and a deliverable MTFP to 2021/22. Options will be developed in the intervening period to Cabinet in January 2019 and Full Council in February 2019.

2.11 In addition to all these areas of uncertainty, the effects of Brexit on the economy of the country, the duties the Government expects us to carry out and the workforce available to both the Council and the service providers on whom we rely, particularly in the Care Sector, remain unclear. It will be an additional factor that we need to take into account as the details of any deal and the practical realities begin to emerge.

3. Savings proposals

3.1 The initial savings proposals attached at Appendix 3 would take the Council to its Core Offer and would reduce the budget by £12.3m over the next three years. They will be subject to consultation and impact assessment before any final decisions are made, but Cabinet's agreement to these areas of search for savings is sought ahead of further work and scrutiny.

4. Communication, Consultation and Lobbying

4.1 The Council is using its best endeavours to live within its means and is continuing to work to make sure it is making the best use of resources. It remains unlikely, however, that even the Core Offer will be sustainable by the end of the next three year planning period. Lobbying will continue, therefore, to try to achieve a realistic settlement from Government in the short term leading up to the Comprehensive Spending Review. We will also make the case that in the long term, a truly "fair funding review" needs to recognise that the resources needed to meet local need cannot be raised from East Sussex residents and businesses. The economy and demography of the County mean that it is imperative that national funding solutions are found to fund the growth in demand for social care for older people.

4.2 In addition, the Council is asking for more local discretion about what services it provides and the choice to charge for some services. If funding is all to be obtained locally, local people should have a greater say in what is provided with that funding.

4.3 A programme of communications and engagement is being launched with residents, staff, stakeholders and partners about our Core Offer. We will also be carrying out statutory consultation and impact assessment on the overall budget proposals. More detailed impact assessments and consultations with those likely to be affected will be carried out in advance of any specific saving proposal being considered.

5. Staffing Impacts and Implications

5.1 Moving to a Core Offer and the need to make savings may lead to a reduction in staffing. These are yet to be identified and quantified. The County Council has established robust employment protection policies and will continue to try and avoid making compulsory redundancies, wherever possible.

Becky Shaw
Chief Executive

Contact Officers:
Ian Gutsell, Chief Finance Officer
Jane Mackney, Head of Policy and Performance

As one council

We will:

- be driven by the needs of our residents, businesses and communities and focus on our four priority outcomes;
- be democratic, open and honest about our decision making;
- work with all our partners to make sure there is a shared view of priorities and that we make the most of opportunities and resources available in East Sussex;
- work effectively with the community and voluntary sector;
- work well as a single organisation;
- provide the best quality service we can within the resources we have available;
- compare our cost and performance against others to make sure we provide value for money;
- learn from others to improve outcomes for residents;
- ensure that as much money as possible is directed towards front line services;
- lobby hard to protect and promote the interests of East Sussex.

Customer Service

We will:

- respond to formal complaints and statutory information requests;
- seek to provide information and services online wherever possible.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we will expect people to use the online resources available and will provide automated responses wherever possible, so people may not always get an individualised reply to enquires.

Protecting and supporting vulnerable people

Children at risk

We will:

- provide a statutory social care offer to safeguard children at risk of harm. This includes: protecting children; looking after children who are in care, helping care leavers become successful adults and managing efficient and effective fostering and adoption services;
- we will provide an Early Help Service for 0-19 year olds where it helps us manage the demand for higher cost services, including an integrated service with Health Visitors for 0-5 year olds;
- we will work with partners to prevent young people from offending and to respond effectively when they do.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we will reduce the training and preventative services that social workers can use to work with children and families. Though not statutory, these services are an important contributor to preventing children requiring a child protection plan or being taken into care;
- a reduction in the Early Help offer to families. A review, which will include consultation, is underway. Consideration will be given to working with fewer families and focussing our support to those families most at risk of social care intervention and the problems that are most likely to lead to crisis (mental health, substance misuse and domestic violence).

Special Education

We will:

- carry out statutory assessments of children with Special Education Needs (SEN), where there are significant barriers to learning;
- use our best endeavours to secure the right educational provision for those with the greatest need;
- fulfil our statutory duties to safeguard and promote the welfare of disabled children who meet the threshold under the Continuum of Need;
- where possible, work to build capacity in Early Years settings to ensure vulnerable pupils can attend a pre-school setting from 2 years old and can be supported to attend and succeed in mainstream schools.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- there will be a reduction in the timeliness of our response to assessment of SEN;
- we will set up fewer annual review meetings, including post 16 students, which may mean that fewer plans are ceased and costs within plans may increase;
- there will be a reduction in the preventative activity that we undertake with schools to support children with additional needs to be successful and remain in mainstream education.

Adults

We will:

- provide information and advice for all those seeking care and support;
- assess need and arrange help for individuals and their carers who are eligible for support from Adult Social Care;
- provide support that reduces the need for social care in the longer term and/or prevents the need for a more expensive service;
- continue to ensure that we safeguard vulnerable adults who are at risk of harm or abuse.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we will remove the subsidy we currently give to meals in the community;
- we will review support plans for working age adults to ensure they continue to deliver high outcomes and represent best practice and value for money.

All Children

Schools

We will:

- operate a light-touch monitoring of the performance of maintained schools. We will use our best endeavours to intervene when a school is at high risk of failure;
- encourage the Regional Schools Commissioner to intervene where academies in East Sussex are under-performing;
- use our best endeavours to improve the outcomes of pupils vulnerable to under-achievement;
- promote post-16 participation in education and training, including provision and support for young people with learning difficulties/disabilities.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we won't offer a school clerking service;
- we won't offer our current programme of support to schools to help them to improve;

- we will reduce the support to develop school partnerships, federations or move to academy status.

School planning and access

We will:

- plan to have enough Early Years and school places where they are needed;
- co-ordinate and administer the admission process;
- provide home to school transport where we have a statutory duty to do so.

Universal offer to all residents

Highways and Transport

We will:

- maintain roads, pavements, bridges, structures, highway drainage and verges and carry out repairs to our current standards;
- investigate road accident sites and take measures to prevent recurrence where this is possible;
- carry out safety audits of proposed highways improvement schemes;
- manage the national concessionary fares scheme and provide limited bus subsidies where they provide access to vital services, education and employment for communities which would otherwise be cut off;
- enforce civil parking restrictions where they are in place;
- carry-out strategic planning of the highways network to help to ensure the County's transport needs are met now and in the future;
- provide footpath clearance on priority and popular rights of way routes, maintain the Definitive Map and respond to public requests for footpath diversions and searches.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we will reduce our maintenance of rights of way and expect landowners to maintain footpaths on their land.

Economy and Trading Standards

We will:

- provide access to high quality employment to reduce avoidable reliance on public services by acting as a strategic economic authority that intervenes, in partnership, decisively and cost effectively where it can make a difference, especially by leveraging in external funding;
- carry out food sampling and food inspection where the risk is high; carry out reactive animal health disease control and take enforcement action where necessary.

The change from our current offer is that:

- there will be a reduction in our preventative and support work, to business, to people vulnerable to scams and the reduction in routine inspection may increase public health risks.

Waste Management

We will:

- dispose of waste collected by the borough and district councils and provide sufficient waste sites to meet national guidance.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- there may be further reductions in the number of household waste recycling sites in the county.

Planning & Environment

We will:

- fulfil our statutory duties on planning, development control, flood risk and environmental management, including specialist environmental advice where required;
- provide emergency planning services.

Libraries

We will:

- provide a library service which meets our assessment of current and future needs.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- we will keep our Needs Assessment and Accessibility Analysis under review, and as a result we may in future provide a reduced library service.

Public Health

We will:

- provide a core service to Clinical Commissioning Groups;
- provide nationally mandated functions: currently these are sexual health services, drugs and alcohol treatment, NHS health checks and the national child weight management programme;
- fulfil our health protection duties;
- deploy the Public Health resources to improve health and wellbeing in support of the County Council's agreed priority outcomes.

Archives and Records

We will:

- manage the records which we are required to keep by law. We will meet our basic statutory duties as a Place of Deposit for public records at The Keep including a basic level of public access to those records.

The proposed change from our current offer is that:

- We will not be able to provide the same level of support to customers of The Keep when requesting archive material, both in person and online and we will not provide an educational outreach offer.

Gypsies and Travellers

We will:

- manage our current portfolio of permanent and transit sites.

Registration Service

We will:

- fulfil our duties to register births, deaths and marriages.

Community Safety

We will:

- deliver our local Community Safety priorities, commission effective substance misuse and domestic abuse support services and fulfil our statutory duties in relation to Prevent; Modern Slavery and the Crime and Disorder Act.

Support Services

We will:

- work in partnership with others to provide the best value for money, ensuring professional and modern support to front line services as efficiently as possible so maximum resource is focussed on front line delivery;
- manage our assets and central financial resources, including Treasury Management, capital and reserves prudently and effectively to support the County Council's business and sustainability.

Medium Term Financial Plan	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
	Approved Budget	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	£million	£million	£million	£million
TAXATION AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING		(371.304)	(374.254)	(381.027)
Business Rates	(74.706)	(3.930)	(0.620)	(1.677)
Revenue Support Grant	(14.966)	11.475	1.476	1.506
Council Tax	(272.567)	(10.729)	(7.966)	(9.245)
Council Tax - Adult Social Care Precept	(7.834)			
New Homes Bonus	(1.231)	0.234	0.337	0.032
TOTAL TAXATION AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING	(371.304)	(374.254)	(381.027)	(390.411)
SERVICE PLAN				
Service Expenditure	344.204	328.083	350.701	374.866
LGPS Secondary element, budget transfer to Corporate *		(2.352)		
Inflation				
Pay Award	2.954	3.714	2.709	2.741
Contractual inflation as per contract	1.101	0.834	0.760	0.830
Contractual inflation at OBR rates	8.485	8.634	9.193	9.767
Adult Social Care				
Growth & Demography	4.500	5.000	5.300	5.300
IBCF planned reduction	(3.239)			
Children's Services				
Extension of Foster Care to 21	0.700			
Dedicated Schools Grant	2.500	4.891	2.200	
Transition Funding for Schools planned reduction	(0.750)			
Growth & Demography		2.708	0.503	1.070
Looked After Children		1.043	(0.185)	(0.591)
Post 16 i-Send (New Burden)		0.269		
Fostering		0.374		
Care leavers (New Burden)		0.163		
Communities, Environment & Transport				
Waste Housing Growth	0.177	0.238	0.231	0.218
Removal of one-off Economic Development Grants	(1.000)			
Street lighting Electricity	0.107		(0.195)	(0.655)
Trading Standards	0.025			
The Keep rates and utilities	0.061			
Libraries Hastings rates and utilities	0.045	0.046		
Business Services				
Data Centre	0.250			
Contract pressures	0.112			
IT & Digital Licences		0.450		
Governance Services				
Legal pressures	0.059			
Specific Grants				
Improved Better Care Fund	(7.814)	(7.088)		
Improved Better Care Fund - Supplementary	(7.343)	3.694	3.649	
NET SERVICE EXPENDITURE	345.134	350.701	374.866	393.546
Corporate Expenditure		43.221	40.278	42.496
Treasury Management	21.436	(1.100)	0.600	
Funding Capital Programme - base contribution	4.000			
Funding Capital Programme - New Homes Bonus	1.231	(1.231)	0.660	(0.032)
General Contingency	3.500	0.040	0.060	0.090
Contribution to balances and reserves	4.481	(3.833)		
Pensions *	7.202	3.136	0.885	
Apprenticeship Levy	0.600			
Levies & Grants	0.771	0.045	0.013	0.012
TOTAL CORPORATE EXPENDITURE	43.221	40.278	42.496	42.566
TOTAL PLANNED EXPENDITURE - before savings	388.355	390.979	417.362	436.112
CUMULATIVE DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	17.051	16.725	36.335	45.701
Savings	(17.051)			
TOTAL PLANNED EXPENDITURE - less savings	371.304	390.979	417.362	436.112
CUMULATIVE DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	0.000	16.725	36.335	45.701
ANNUAL DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	0.000	16.725	19.610	9.366

* LGPS Secondary element transferred from service expenditure into corporate expenditure, £2.352m 19/20

Movement since State of the County	18/19 Estimate £million	19/20 Estimate £million	20/21 Estimate £million	21/22 Estimate £million	Estimate £million
State of the County DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	0.000	15.756	18.239	12.365	46.360
Council Tax Base and Collection Fund					
Service pay award - National Living wage provision		(0.600)			(0.600)
Revision of contractual inflation to reflect CPI		(0.258)	(0.274)	(0.286)	(0.818)
Business Rates - Proceeds of Pooling		(0.295)	0.295		
CSD: service pressures and new burdens		1.849	(0.185)	(0.591)	1.073
CSD: Dedicated School Grant reprofiled		0.734	0.733	(1.467)	
CET: service pressures		0.046	(0.195)	(0.655)	(0.804)
GS: service pressures		0.040			0.040
BSD: service pressures		0.450			0.450
New Homes Bonus retain in revenue for one year		(0.997)	0.997		
Cabinet October 2018 DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	0.000	16.725	19.610	9.366	45.701

CUMULATIVE DEFICIT/(SURPLUS)	45.701
-------------------------------------	---------------

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22

	Proposed Savings			
	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Communities, Economy & Transport	2,397	1,414	917	4,728
Children's Services	1,714	1,672	268	3,654
Adult Social Care	730	248	0	978
Business Services / Orbis	1,003	1,161	787	2,951
Total Departments	5,844	4,495	1,972	12,311

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Highways							
Highways Maintenance	Budgets for highways related investigations and studies and ESCC highways staff costs to be funded from capital budget.	16,552	14,332	889	0	0	889
Community Services							
Archives and Records Service	We will not be able to provide the same level of support to customers of The Keep when requesting archive material and we will not provide an educational outreach.	1,042	1,074	32	74	104	210
Trading Standards Services	Carry out food sampling and food inspection only where the risk is high; carry out reactive animal health disease control and take enforcement action where necessary. There will be a reduction in our preventative and support work, to business, to people vulnerable to scams and the reduction in routine inspection may increase public health risks.	803	656	18	82	0	100
Road Safety Services	Reduced road safety education and no engagement with Community Safety Partnerships or Joint Action Groups.	944	720	32	33	0	65
Library Services	We will keep our Needs Assessment and Accessibility Analysis under review, and as a result we may in future provide a reduced library service.	4,214	3,595	0	0	528	528
Transport							

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Concessionary Travel	Reduce the budget in line with current trends in usage.	7,855	7,837	150	0	0	150
Parking: Civil Parking Enforcement	Increase on-street parking charges where possible. Surpluses to be used for transport related funding.	6,134	(910)	1,000	1,000	0	2,000
Transport Hub Services	Reduced staffing capacity may result in a reduction in the overall level of service in the Transport Hub. This may mean answering public queries and our ability to resolve problems with bus operators and transport providers will be slower. This could increase public dissatisfaction and complaints to the Council.	1,525	594	0	100	0	100
Rights of Way Services	We will provide a reduced footpath clearance focused on those priority / popular routes resulting in a deterioration in the condition of other paths. Staff reductions may also lead to delays and longer timescales for dealing with requests for Definitive Map modifications and requests for footpath diversions which may result in an increase in public dissatisfaction and complaints to the Council.	1,173	683	0	100	0	100

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Waste Disposal							
Household Waste Disposal	Ongoing review of commercial saving opportunities.	43,286	26,456	200	0	0	200
Household Waste Disposal	Possible reduction in the number of HWRCs.	1,144	884	0	0	250	250
Planning and Environment							
Environmental Advice Services	Income generation through traded services.	1,631	420	15	25	35	75
Ashdown Forest	Remove financial support to conservators.	131	61	61	0	0	61
TOTAL Communities, Economy & Transport				2,397	1,414	917	4,728

* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Support to schools and pupils							
Schools Learning and Effectiveness Service (SLES): Promote high standards	Reduce the support provided to prevent failure in schools causing concern. Limited support only for schools that have failed in terms of performance, leadership and governance or financial matters. No support for building school improvement capacity or for federations and partnerships. This could mean pupil attainment will not improve and may decline.	911	172	124	7	0	131
SLES: Performance monitoring	Reduce staffing and management capacity for performance monitoring across maintained and academy schools, only light touch monitoring where risk of serious failure has been brought to attention of LA. This could reduce the proportion of good or outstanding schools.	3,993	2,112	725	403	0	1,128
SLES: Clerking Service	Remove the clerking service. This will mean schools will need to recruit, train and pay for their clerking service.	1,523	165	158	0	0	158
I-Send: EHCP Assessment Services	Reduced staffing capacity may mean the process for completing statutory assessments will be slower. This could increase parental dissatisfaction and complaints to the Council and LGO. We will reduce the number of high cost placements that we challenge at tribunals and significantly reduce the proportion of annual reviews we attend.	28,597	862	0	188	0	188
I-Send: Inclusion Services	From 2020/21 statutory duties in relation to attendance will be met wholly through DSG. This will reduce the number of families we work with to improve attendance and may lead to an increase in pupil absence from schools.	9,364	1,061	0	19	0	19

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Early Years: Inclusion Services	No support to schools and early years providers to promote inclusion and share best practice. This may increase the proportion of pupils who are referred for statutory assessment, it may increase the proportion of pupils with EHCPs. We will need to continue to monitor the long term spend in SEN budget as the decisions made could have an impact throughout pupils' education.	27,746	326	85	0	0	85
Home to School Transport	Further reduction in funding provided to colleges to support disadvantaged pupils attending college and reduction in Independent Travel Training spend .	12,115	11,551	36	6	0	42

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Children's Social Care							
Safeguarding Services	We will no longer be offering some additional training and preventative services that social workers can currently access to work with children and families – this will include stopping Family Group Conferences (family meetings) when children are subject to Child Protection Plans, the ACT service which is an assertive outreach service for young people aged 16-24 who are at risk of or being exploited criminally, the problem solving team which supports the Family Drug and Alcohol Court and Video Interactive Guidance which helps parents who are already in difficulty learn how to respond better to their children. In addition some activity will be reduced including assessment of families who are going through court proceedings and the Foundations Project which works with families who have already had children removed from their care. The impact of these reductions is likely to mean that more children may become subject to Child Protection Plans or enter or stay longer in the care system.	44,026	38,105	586	0	268	854
Early Help	A review is underway which will be the subject of consultation, but is it likely to result in working with fewer families and focussing our support to those families most at risk of social care intervention and the problems that are most likely to lead to crisis (mental health, substance misuse and domestic violence).	9,592	5,652	0	1,049	0	1,049
TOTAL Children's Services				1,714	1,672	268	3,654

* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Working Age Adults: Nursing, Residential and Community Based services	Review care packages to ensure these are focused on those with Care Act eligible needs and deliver support in the most cost effective way. The average spend on Working Age Adults is significantly higher in East Sussex than in other south east councils. The intention is to deliver an overall level of support which is fair, reflects need and achieves a level of spend comparable to other councils. Any decisions to change care arrangements will be dependent on reviews that take account of a clients individual circumstances. Some clients may however have their support reduced or removed.	62,332	49,031	247	248	0	495
Meals in the Community	The proposal is to withdraw the subsidy that support clients to pay for their meals. Clients would now pay the full cost of this service. A range of options are available within the market to ensure that vulnerable adults can access good quality, nutritious meals. Clients would continue to be signposted and supported to access these services.	483	483	483	0	0	483
TOTAL Adult Social Care				730	248	0	978

* Budgets shown reflect the areas against which savings have been proposed.

East Sussex County Council - Proposed Savings 2019/20 to 2021/22		Gross budget *	Net budget *	Proposed Savings			
		2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Activity	Savings Proposal and impact Assessment	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Business Services: Orbis and Managed on Behalf of (MOBO) services: Finance, IT&D, Procurement, Property Services, HR and OD and Business Operations	The Advisory and Change areas of support are being analysed and presented to the 3 partner Councils to determine which elements need to form part of the Core Offer as they are essential in supporting the partners deliver their priorities, and which elements will no longer be provided. The aim would be to reduce spending as set out in this table although the details of how this might be achieved is still being developed.	47,534	22,270	1,003	1,161	787	2,951
TOTAL Business Services / Orbis				1,003	1,161	787	2,951

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health

Date of meeting: 27 November 2018

By: Director of Adult Social Care and Health

Title: Update on the progress of the 2018/19 Adult Social Care and Health savings

Purpose: To update the Lead Member on the progress of 2018/19 savings in relation to Adult Social Care and Health

RECOMMENDATION:

The Lead Member is recommended to consider and comment on the progress of the savings plans agreed by Cabinet from the Adult Social Care (ASC) budget.

1. Background

1.1. The Adult Social Care's Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) savings requirements for 2018/19 totalled £9.6m, which were agreed by Cabinet on 26th June 2018.

1.2. Cabinet further agreed at their meeting on 26th June 2018 that the Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health will receive six-monthly updates on progress with the savings plans. This is the first of these updates, which will be presented to the People Scrutiny Committee prior to presentation to the Lead Member.

2. Supporting information

2.1. The Adult Social Care and Health savings proposals agreed at Cabinet on 26th June 2018 were:

Savings area	Savings to be delivered (£000)
Older People's Commissioned Day Services	188,000
Older People's Directly Provided Services	1,086,000
Learning Disability Directly Provided Services	1,170,000
Supporting People – Community Based Housing Support Services	2,500,000
Supporting People – Accommodation Based Housing Support Services	800,000
Assessment and Care Management Staff	1,958,000
Strategy and Commissioning Staff	590,000
Affinity Trust Service	360,000
Stroke Recovery Service	80,000
Discretionary East Sussex Support Scheme	390,000
HIV Support Service	48,000
Carers Services	422,000
Total	9,592,000

2.2 Cabinet also agreed to use the non-recurrent additional adult social care grant announced in June 2018 of £1.6m to mitigate the proposed savings by allocating £404k to reduce the savings target for Supporting People – Accommodation Based Housing Support Services from £800k to £396k, and allocating £1.2m to Supporting People – Community Based Housing Support Services to reduce the savings target from £2.5m to £1.3m.

2.3 Following Cabinet on 26th June 2018, which considered the results of the consultations undertaken and the Equalities Impact Assessments for each of the proposed areas, work was commenced to make the necessary contractual or service changes, or continue the staff and client consultation processes to achieve the agreed savings.

3. Progress of savings plan

3.1 All of the savings proposals have been progressed since the decisions made at Cabinet on 26 June 2018, and the savings are projected to be delivered as per the original proposals. The progress for each proposal is outlined in more detail below.

3.2 Older People's Commissioned Day Services

3.2.1 The Charter Centre in Bexhill closed on 31st October 2018 with all clients receiving a review of their needs. New day service placements have been found for all clients.

3.2.2 The Isabel Blackman Centre in Hastings is planned to close on 31st March 2019. No sustainable alternative proposal has been received from the incumbent provider. The clients currently accessing services at the centre have started to receive reviews of their needs and their eligible needs will be re-provided from alternative providers.

3.2.3 The Phoenix Centre is currently subject to a procurement process, as agreed by Cabinet.

3.3 Older People's Directly Provided Services

3.3.1 Firwood House intermediate care beds have now closed and transferred to Milton Grange. The number of mental health intermediate care beds has reduced from 18 to 10.

3.3.2 Warwick House Day Centre has now closed and clients have transferred to Milton Grange or the Phoenix Centre. Client journeys are taking an average 5-10 minutes longer than to Warwick House.

3.3.2 Staffing structures have been revised to create a new, consolidated service, with 38 posts made redundant, 36 of which were voluntary, and two which were compulsory.

3.3.4 The service changes are forecast to deliver £1.086m savings in 2019/20.

3.4 Learning Disability Directly Provided Services

3.4.1 Individual reviews have been completed for all clients whose services will be reduced, and support plans have been adjusted accordingly. The reduction or cessation of directly provided services has been agreed with clients and families, and alternative support arranged where necessary. A small number of clients and families are still in the process of agreeing appropriate alternative services.

3.4.2. The overall staffing complement of Learning Disability (LD) Services has reduced by 31.3 full time employment (FTE) posts. In addition, all 75 staff in day services who currently have full time contracts, face a 20% reduction in their contracted hours. All affected staff have either been redeployed within LD services or have requested voluntary redundancy.

3.5 Supporting People: Community Based Services

3.5.1 Plans have been developed and agreed with the providers of Homeworks and STEPS to manage the transition to reduced services for working age adults and the removal of the Navigator service for older people. It was agreed at Cabinet to partially mitigate the original savings proposals through the deployment of the additional Adult Social Care grant of £1.6m, which was announced in March 2018.

3.5.2 The contract for working age adults community based housing support is scheduled to be re-tendered from January 2019. The current contract is to be extended for the final time until September 2019. A triaging process has been developed with the current provider to ensure that resources are focused on reducing the risk of a crisis and preventing more costly interventions. The service will be reduced in line with the reduction in the funding provided by the Council. District and Borough councils have been provided with the option of purchasing additional services as required.

3.5. The community based housing support services for older people will cease the Navigator service from 21st November. The number of people who will be able to receive housing support will not change, and it has been agreed with providers to lower the age of eligibility from 65 to 60.

3.6 Supporting People: Accommodation Based Services

3.6.1 Refuge: a bid application has been submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Fund for Domestic Abuse services. The bid has been submitted in partnership with Refuge (the service provider) and if successful will attract £124k funding in 2018/19 and £233k in 2019/20. A successful funding bid would be used to meet the needs of women with the most complex needs; address environmental barriers for women with a physical disability; and improve referral rates for women from black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) communities, improve referral pathways and ease of access to domestic abuse services. If the bid is unsuccessful, work will proceed with the provider to reduce the services by the required amount.

3.6.2 Young People: discussions are being held with providers to identify alternative sources of funding or reconfigure services to limit the impacts of the reductions in funding.

3.6.3 Homeless: Discussions are being held with the provider to accommodate the Rough Sleepers Prevention Project which will ensure sustainability of the remaining beds. The provider is bidding for the Homelessness Assessment Unit tender which, if successful, would allow the organisation to sustain the existing services in East Sussex. The reduction in ASC funding will mean a loss of 12 beds out of 41 for this area of housing support.

3.6.4 Young Mums: the reduction in funding will be mitigated through alternative funding sources and is not expected to affect service provision.

3.6.5 Mental Health and Homeless: the service will be reduced in line with the reduction in funding from January 2019.

3.7 Assessment and Care Management Staff

3.7.1 41 staff have taken voluntary redundancy, which will deliver savings of £1.935m in 2019/20. The shortfall of £23k will be delivered through vacancy control procedures.

3.7.2 12 staff who were at risk of compulsory redundancy were offered redeployment opportunities, 7 staff members accepted redeployment, the remainder chose to take voluntary redundancy.

3.7.3 It is anticipated that the reduction in posts may lead to some deterioration in performance for waiting times for assessments, delayed transfer of care, numbers of adults in receipt of Direct Payments, and reviews. A number of workstreams have been generated to mitigate these pressures by improving access to online assessments; reviewing the role of Health and Social Care Connect (HSCC) and Occupational Therapy Clinics; and maximising the efficient use of East Sussex County Council (ESCC) estate.

3.8 Strategy and Commissioning Staff

3.8.1 A number of staff have taken voluntary redundancy and the savings target is forecast to be realised in 2019/20. Staffing structures and workloads are being reviewed to ensure resources are targeted on areas of priority.

3.9 Affinity Trust Service

3.9.1 The project is progressing in line with key milestones. The planning process went smoothly with involvement of families and advocacy where needed. Meetings were held with families, advocates and care management to identify the most appropriate services for clients to move to. All the moves took place at the beginning of October and the property is now vacant. The staff team at Cregg Na Ba have also moved to the same services as the clients to ensure continuity of care.

3.9.2 The savings target will be achieved.

3.10 Stroke Recovery Service

3.11.1 The provider has been informed of the Cabinet decision to reduce the contract sum, and the necessary contractual waiver has been completed and approved through the designated governance channel. Clients have been informed by letter of the proposed reduction in the contract. A new triage process has been developed in partnership with the provider and key stakeholders to ensure that resources are targeted at those who need it most.

3.11.2 The service reduction has been scheduled to take effect from 1st November, and will deliver the savings target.

3.11 Discretionary East Sussex Support Scheme (DESSS)

3.11.1 Two posts have been deleted in the team with the staff members requesting voluntary redundancy.

3.11.2 Due to the termination of the contracts for both furniture and white goods suppliers from 2nd October, there has been a significant increase in requests for those services between July and October, resulting in a relatively high commitment on the DESSS budget for the half-year spend in 2018-19.

3.11.3 The full savings target is projected to be realised from 2019/20.

3.11.4 The remaining budget of £110k has been allocated across the five Districts and Boroughs to fund Rent in Advance Payments.

3.12 HIV Support Service

3.12.1 The Terence Higgins Trust gave notice on the contract six months before the contract was due to end, as a result of reducing volumes of clients accessing the services. All clients who were accessing the services have been supported to access wider services. The HIV Clinics have been advised to contact HSCC to access support for clients with additional support needs.

3.12.2 The revenue savings target of £48k has been achieved.

3.13 Carers Services

3.13.1 As agreed at Cabinet, the services for carers are in the process of being remodelled. All contracts with the voluntary sector for these services have been extended to September 2019, to allow procurement processes to take place within the reduced budgets available, to deliver the required savings. The reduction in the Carers Breaks Engagement Team has been achieved through voluntary redundancies and redeployment.

4 Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

4.1 The savings proposals agreed by Cabinet on 26th June 2018 are proceeding in line with the decisions made by Cabinet, to deliver the required savings from the Adult Social Care budget.

4.2 The Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health is asked to consider and comment on this report.

KEITH HINKLEY

Director of Adult Social Care and Health

Contact Officer: Kirstie Battrick, Staff Officer

Telephone: 01273 482016 kirstie.battrick@eastsussex.gov.uk

LOCAL MEMBERS

This report impacts on all wards across the County.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Adult Social Care Proposals 2018/19, Cabinet, 26th June 2018

Report to: People Scrutiny Committee

Date: 27 November 2018

By: Chair of the Review Board

Title: Scrutiny Review - Schools Coping with Change – the Way Forward

Purpose: To present the outcomes of the scrutiny review and make recommendations

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee considers and endorses the report of the Review Board, and makes recommendations to Cabinet for comment, and County Council for approval.

1. Background

1.1 The Children’s Services Scrutiny Committee agreed on 27 November 2017 to appoint a ‘Schools Coping with Change – the Way Forward’ Scrutiny Review Board. Subsequent to this and following the Council’s review of its scrutiny arrangements, the People Scrutiny Committee reaffirmed its commitment to the review at its meeting on 25 June 2018.

1.2 Members were particularly keen that the review should have a forward-looking nature. The goal therefore was to develop recommendations that would ultimately help schools and academies be better placed to cope with change. More specifically, and following its initial discussions, the Board decided to focus on issues relating to school partnerships, small schools and the role of strategic bodies.

2. Supporting information

2.1 The Scrutiny Review Board is comprised of Councillors Roy Galley, Kathryn Field, Laurie Loe, Francis Whetstone and Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative. Councillor Galley was elected as the Chair of the Review Board. Following earlier changes to the membership of the committee, Councillors Stephen Shing and Alan Shuttleworth and Nicola Boulter, Parent Governor Representative also contributed to the work of the Review.

2.2 The attached report (appendix 1) contains the findings and recommendations of the Review Board. Copies of evidence papers listed in the report and other supporting documentation are available on request from the contact officer.

2.3 The Committee is recommended to receive the Review Board’s report for submission to Cabinet and County Council on 22 January 2019 and 5 February 2019 respectively.

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

3.1 The Committee is requested to consider and endorse the report of the Review Board for submission to Cabinet and Full Council.

Councillor Roy Galley
Chair of the Review Board

Contact Officers: Stuart McKeown
Tel: 01273 481583
Email: stuart.mckeown@eastsussex.gov.uk

APPENDICES

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

Scrutiny Review Board

Schools Coping with Change - the Way Forward

Report by the Review Board

Councillor Roy Galley (Chairman)

Councillor Kathryn Field

Councillor Francis Whetstone

Councillor Laurie Loe

Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative

Former Members:

Nicola Boulter, Parent Governor Representative

Councillor Alan Shuttleworth

Councillor Stephen Shing

People Scrutiny Committee – 27 November 2018

Cabinet – 22 January 2019

Full Council – 5 February 2019

Final report of the Scrutiny Review Board: 'Schools Coping with Change - the Way Forward'

Contents

Objectives and scope of the review.....	Page 5
The future role of the Local Authority and other strategic matters.....	Page 6
School partnerships.....	Page 11
Sustainability of small schools.....	Page 16
Concluding comments.....	Page 18
Appendix: Terms of reference, membership and evidence.....	Page 19

	Recommendations	Page
1	The Chair of the People Scrutiny Committee to write on behalf of the committee to the Secretary of State for Education seeking further detail regarding his vision for schools and academies. In particular, the letter should seek clarity regarding the Department's stance on the academy programme and the promotion of formal partnership arrangements.	8
2	Work to be undertaken by the Local Authority to promote the leadership role of Governing Bodies and Head teachers. Such activity should seek to empower schools to consider actively their current organisational arrangements and the potential benefits of partnership arrangements. If already in some form of partnership, then relevant schools should review whether the benefits of their current arrangements are being fully exploited and actively consider how they strengthen these arrangements over the coming years.	8
3	The Local Authority to undertake a thorough review of how the ongoing budget for SLES is best utilised. This will help ensure the purpose of the service and its staffing arrangements are appropriately aligned to meet the needs of the evolving educational landscape in East Sussex.	9
4	a) The Local Authority to consider promoting to Head teachers and Governing Boards the benefits of a formal partnership arrangement, as well as developing its critical friend role with regard to partnership proposals. b) The Local Authority to consider also clarifying to individual schools at risk what it sees as the potential dangers to them of not actively pursuing a formal partnership arrangement.	10
5	The Local Authority to consider developing the next iteration of its 'Excellence for All Strategy' document and other related documents so that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotes the development of formal partnership arrangements; • emphasises the leadership role of schools; and • offers bespoke advice that is tailored to meet the needs of rural primary and small schools. 	10
6	So as to present a consistent and clear message to schools, and to draw on the combined strengths and experiences of each party, the Local Authority should seek to strengthen its relationships with the main strategic educational bodies in East Sussex. For example, this might include exploring the development of a common approach to formal partnerships.	10
7	That the Local Authority develop further it's 'brokerage' role and develop innovative ways of facilitating school partnership that might not otherwise come into being.	11
8	The experiences of successful formal partnership arrangements are recorded and shared by the Local Authority. The aim being to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help other existing partnerships more fully realise the benefits of their arrangements; and • develop advice for 'single' schools who are considering entering into a formal partnership arrangement. 	15
9	To help encourage the development of formal partnerships, the Local Authority should consider promoting to schools the creation of a federation as an initial step. This approach would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help address some of the perceptions which are discouraging change; and • better enable schools to consider, in the context of their local circumstances, whether or not they then wish to convert to academy status. 	15
10	The Local Authority to develop further guidance which has a focus on the specific role and responsibilities of the formal partnership arrangement governor and their training and development needs.	16

11	The Local Authority to further develop its toolkits and guidance for schools who are considering creating a federation or converting to academy status, or who are already in a formal partnership. Such guidance should include specific advice on the role of the Executive Head and Heads of School and their training and development. Consideration should also be given to developing such guidance in partnership with other regional strategic bodies.	16
12	Alongside the guidance set out in the Education Commissioning Plan for small and rural schools, that the Local Authority to take steps to explore innovative solutions to the specific problems small, (and in particular), small rural schools are facing. Such solutions could include, for example, technological responses and adapting training provided to primary school teachers. It could also include exploring the solutions which other authorities in similar situations have developed.	18

Objectives and scope of the review

1. The education system is undergoing a period of sustained change. As a result, schools are having to respond to an unprecedented range of new challenges. Some of the key drivers of this change include:

- the impact of the National Funding Formula;
- increasing school autonomy (including how schools are now increasingly making decisions regarding which services they purchase);
- the changing role of the Local Authority and other strategic partners;
- pressures on the Local Authority's budget;
- changes to the national curriculum and assessment methods;
- the sustainability of schools and in particular, small schools; and
- the impact of the Academy programme.

2. The above factors have helped create new opportunities and new ways of thinking. But the scale and pace of change has also helped create a complex and fragmented educational landscape, with diffuse lines of accountability. Some stakeholders point to what they regard as a lack of a 'direction of travel' within the system. Furthermore, the full impact of some of these changes has not yet been felt. As a result, it is not clear at this stage what the settled picture will look like and it is likely that there will be further change in the policy environment.

3. Given the above context, Members agreed to explore developments within the local education system and to seek to understand the challenges and opportunities the evolving situation is presenting to schools and academies in East Sussex. Fundamentally, and in this period of great change, Members wanted to see if they could contribute to the process of responding to the following questions:

- What can we do to ensure the quality of education we provide to our young people is not put at risk by these changes?; and
- How can we ensure the new opportunities these changes present are fully exploited?

4. As a result, it was agreed by the then Children's Services Scrutiny Committee on 27 November 2017 to appoint a 'Schools Coping with Change – the Way Forward' Scrutiny Review Board (the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee has now been superseded by the 'People Scrutiny Committee' which reaffirmed its commitment to this scrutiny review at its meeting on 25 June 2018). Members were particularly clear that the review should have a forward-looking nature. The goal therefore was to develop recommendations that would ultimately help schools and academies be better placed to cope with change.

5. The Board was also clear that the review is timely as it is now an urgent matter for all schools to take a strategic approach to planning for their future. Two of the most important drivers of this urgency are financial. The first relates to the financial pressures on East Sussex County Council. In this respect, the most up to date indication of the reduced level of support the Local Authority will be able to provide in relation to partnerships is set out in the Council's Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources report to Cabinet (13/11/18). This states that with regard to partnerships, it is proposed to reduce the Local Authority's:

“..support to develop school partnerships, federations or move to academy status.”

6. The other financial factor creating urgency relates to the National Funding Formula. The Government committed in 2015 to introducing a National Funding Formula (NFF) for mainstream schools. The Government's main aim in introducing the NFF was to deliver a fairer and more transparent system on the basis that schools would attract funding based on the needs of their pupils. The Board heard that that schools in East Sussex would receive an overall funding increase of 2.5%. However, and whilst the NFF will not be fully implemented until 2020, it seems inevitable some schools will do better than others. In particular, shifting the balance of funding away from a lump sum to a pupil place basis is likely to have a negative impact on the budgets of small schools.

7. Given the above factors, the Board concluded there is good reason to have an urgent focus on the changes occurring within the school system. The Board acknowledges that a great deal of excellent work has already done with this sense of urgency in mind - there are already many success stories within East Sussex. However, the evidence presented to the Board indicates that there is still some inertia and confusion in the system. Some schools appear to be failing to apprehend the scale of the challenge before them, whilst others may not be reviewing and fully exploiting the benefits of the changes they have already made.

8. As part of its early deliberations, the Board agreed to accept some fundamental points of reference that would inform its deliberations. This included the understanding that:

- de facto, we now have a mixed economy of schools;
- that proposed responses to the challenges schools are facing must begin with putting the quality of education first; and
- that the school system is now a school-led one.

9. As the factors driving change and the challenges and opportunities they present are diverse, the Board also made an early decision to focus on organisational matters and partnerships (rather than matters relating to educational attainment). In particular, the issues listed below were viewed by the Board as the most pressing:

- **Issues relating to the future role of the Local Authority and other strategic matters.** This includes the changing role of the Local Authority and its relationship with other key stake holders; the future shape and role of the Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service and the fragmented nature of the governance/management systems that may evolve in the future.
- **School partnerships.** This includes consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the different types of partnerships schools are creating; what the barriers are to their effective operation and whether schools are fully exploiting the benefits of the partnerships already in place.
- **The sustainability of small schools.** This includes consideration of the particular challenges facing small schools and exploring the potential to develop innovative responses to the evolving situation.

10. In the following sections, the report discusses the evidence gathered in relation to each of the above three areas of focus, the Board's conclusions on possible ways forward, together with its final recommendations.

The future role of the Local Authority and other strategic matters.

Background

11. As part of its evidence gathering process, the Board wanted to develop its knowledge of the framework within which schools in East Sussex operate. The Board received significant quantities of evidence in this respect – much more than can be described in any detail in this report. One key area for the Board, however, was a clear understanding of the roles of the main educational strategic bodies that operate in the county and their relationships with schools and each other. The main bodies are described below:

12. **The Local Authority (the LA).** The LA, which is the Children's Services Department of East Sussex County Council, has a duty to:

- act as a champion of children, young people and their parents, in particular the most vulnerable and disadvantaged;
- promote high standards of education and have high expectations for the outcomes of all groups of pupils and safeguard and promote the welfare of children.
- Ensure fair access to school places for all learners.

13. **The Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC).** Each RSC acts on behalf of the Secretary of State for Education and is responsible for:

- taking action where academies and free schools are underperforming
- intervening in academies where governance is inadequate
- deciding on applications from local-authority-maintained schools to convert to academy status
- improving underperforming maintained schools by providing them with support from a strong sponsor
- encouraging and deciding on applications from sponsors to operate in a region
- taking action to improve poorly performing sponsors
- advising on proposals for new free schools
- advising on whether to cancel, defer or enter into funding agreements with free school projects
- deciding on applications to make significant changes to academies and free schools

14. **The Diocese of Chichester Board of Education (DBE).** The DBE oversees the work of all Church of England state funded schools in the Diocese. In educational terms, this relates to three local authorities: West Sussex, East Sussex and Brighton and Hove. Currently there are 158 Church of England schools in the diocese. 60 have voluntary aided status and 98 have voluntary controlled status. The Diocese's Education Department has the following specific responsibilities:

- support and training in RE and Collective Worship;
- strategic and focused training for head teachers, senior staff and clergy;
- assistance in developing the Christian distinctiveness and character of the school;
- advising on the appointment of head teachers and deputy heads;
- manage inspections and provide support under Section 48 of The Education Act 2005;
- pre and post Ofsted training and support;
- advice in maintaining, developing and funding school buildings;
- governor appointment, training and support;
- advice in formulating and administering pupil admissions policies;
- Advice on structural changes including sharing headship and academies.

15. **Diocese of Arundel and Brighton Education Service.** The Diocese of Arundel and Brighton geographically consists of the counties of West and East Sussex, Surrey (outside the Greater London boundary, south of the Thames) and the City of Brighton and Hove. The Diocese currently has 53 primary schools and 11 secondary phase schools. The Diocesan Education Service aims to support the schools of the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton through:

- the provision of quality information, training, advice and guidance to head teachers and governors;
- working closely with heads and governors to develop policies and services that reflect schools' real needs;
- maintaining effective partnerships with other dioceses, the CES and the LAs;
- helping schools to recruit and retain senior managers, teachers and governors;
- helping schools to monitor and develop their religious education provision;
- supporting schools in difficulty;
- supporting newly appointed heads by induction and mentoring;
- providing a 'Section 48' school inspection service;
- encouraging productive collaboration between schools, parishes and diocesan agencies;

Issues relating to the role of the Local Authority and other strategic matters.

16. Having established an understanding of the main strategic bodies, the Board then moved on to consider the key challenges in this area.

National guidance

The Board accepts that key aspects of the Government's intentions with regard to the future of the school system are clear. The Government retains its drive to develop a self-improving, school-led system. It is also widely accepted that a mixed economy of different types of educational institution is now firmly embedded within the system. However, the Board received a consistent message from witnesses that greater clarity from the Government regarding its academy programme would be desirable. There is a widely shared view that no clear direction on this matter has been issued by the Government since its decision in 2016 to step back from its commitment to require all schools to become an academy. Witnesses informed the Board that this 'lack of a direction of travel' was impacting on the ability of both schools and regional bodies to plan effectively. So for example, and when discussing plans for creating an expanded MAT, one witness from a strategic body commented that:

"..so far not many schools have confirmed that they want to convert. There is some reluctance as schools and the diocese want to see what is happening at the national level with regard to the government's policy on academisation."

17. Given the above, the Board agreed that there is merit in seeking further clarity from the Secretary of State for Education regarding his intentions for the academy programme.

Recommendation 1

The Chair of the People Scrutiny Committee to write on behalf of the committee to the Secretary of State for Education seeking further detail regarding his vision for schools and academies. In particular, the letter should seek clarity regarding the Department's stance on the academy programme and the promotion of formal partnership arrangements.

School Leaders

18. Evidence presented to the Board indicates that some schools may not be sufficiently focused on the potential risks of not forming effective, sustainable partnerships and that this is now an urgent matter. Evidence considered also indicated that change is most effective when it emanates from schools themselves (rather than being dictated by regional authorities). As a result, the Board concluded that more should be done to re-emphasise to school leaders that the educational system is now a school-led one and that the responsibilities this entails will increase as the LA's capacity is further reduced. So as to lend confidence to these arrangements it is also important that, amongst other benefits, the capacity for formal partnership arrangements to deliver sustained improvement is also highlighted to school leaders.

Recommendation 2

Work is undertaken by the Local Authority to promote the leadership role of Governing Bodies and Head teachers. Such activity should seek to empower schools to actively consider their current organisational arrangements and the potential benefits of partnership arrangements. If already in some form of partnership, then relevant school leaders should review whether the benefits of their current arrangements are being fully exploited and actively consider how they strengthen these arrangements over the coming years.

Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service

19. The Standards and Learning Effectiveness Service (SLES) aims to provide the staff and governors of East Sussex schools with a range of high quality services, designed to help them raise standards by improving the quality of learning, teaching, leadership and management. The Board heard evidence regarding the perceptions of schools and academies in relation to the support and guidance SLES provides to them. Given the development of a school-led system and the commensurate changing role of the LA, the Board also considered the Department's position with regard to advising schools and academies about their partnership arrangements and its plans for the future shape of the service.

20. The key point made to the Board regarding SLES is that its capacity to provide support to schools will in future be severely restricted. Most recently, this point has been reinforced by proposals set out in East Sussex County Council's 'Core Offer'. With regard to school improvement services, it is proposed that the Council will not 'offer our current programme of support to schools to help them improve'. Whilst the precise proposed level of support is yet to be defined, it seems likely that the service will be greatly reduced.

21. The Board was therefore mindful of these pressures and limitations and accepted the need to develop recommendations that take this difficult funding picture into account. However, the Board suggest the current developments in the educational system mean a further thorough review of SLES should be considered. Such a review would seek to ensure the remaining service is effectively aligned to the meet the needs of the evolving situation. This review would include an exploration of whether SLES has capacity to help ensure partnerships are appropriately focused on key issues, such as partnership school improvement, collaborative professional development, the development of strategic leaders and the development of partnership governance.

Recommendation 3

The Local Authority to undertake a thorough review of how the ongoing budget for SLES is best utilised. This will help ensure the purpose of the service and its staffing arrangements are appropriately aligned to meet the needs of the evolving educational landscape in East Sussex.

Traded Services

22. As part of the range of possible responses to the challenges the LA is facing, the Board considered whether an expanded traded service offer could help deliver enhanced SLES support to schools and academies. However, the evidence considered by the Board led it to conclude that there was no realistic prospect of developing effective recommendations in this area. The Department's view is that school budgets are under great pressure and this diminishes the likelihood that sufficient numbers of institutions would purchase the service to make it viable. The Board also heard that the LA no longer has the capacity within SLES to create such an offer. There are also a range of practical factors that would make running a sustainable service difficult. For example, there is a tendency for schools to limit the time when they would be likely to want to pay for support. This means schools are less likely to want support at:

- The beginning or end of term
- The beginning or end of a day
- Other times when schools are under particular pressure

23. This creates a problem for staffing as requests for support are likely to create peaks and troughs which means it is very difficult to ensure sufficient resource is in place when schools require it. Given these restrictions, the Board concluded it would not be appropriate to develop an expanded traded services offer.

Advice to Schools regarding partnerships

24. In terms of its performance within the current strategy, the Board was satisfied that the LA fulfils its duties with regard to supporting schools which come forward and **ask** for assistance to either convert to academy status or to federate. Furthermore, the evidence provided to the Board was also clear that those schools which had sought help to change their status were also generally satisfied with the support and advice they had been given. Indeed many were clear that they viewed the LA as a highly valued source of advice and guidance.

25. In terms of the advice it offers to schools regarding partnerships, the LA currently provides guidance on the processes schools should follow to change their status and the potential benefits and challenges of the different available options. The LA's current strategy asks schools to identify their own potential structured relationship which the school believes will help it deliver good outcomes into the future. This strategy is informed by the LA's view that for change to be effective and sustainable it must be led from the bottom up and not dictated by strategic bodies. The Board also heard evidence that the LA is perceived by some witnesses to have a neutral stance with regard to whether schools should enter into a formal partnership.

26. The evidence presented to the Board was broadly supportive of the LA's policy on these matters - particularly of the need for change to be led by the schools themselves. However, the evidence indicated to the Board that there is still some scope to develop the guidance in this area. Schools are now entering into a crucial phase and the evidence points to a need for a stronger message about the kind of actions schools should be taking now. With this in mind, the Board recommend that the LA strengthen its message to school leaders about the benefits of a being in a partnership and reinforce its message to single schools about the future risks of not being in a partnership. The revised guidance could include wording that emphasises the leadership role of schools in a school-led system. Whilst responsibility for bringing partnership proposals forward is the responsibility of individual schools, the Board heard evidence that the LA play a 'critical friend' role for schools considering entering into a formal partnership. This friendly challenge role can help ensure proposed groupings have a realistic chance of delivering a sustainable/beneficial partnership. The Board welcomed this approach and recommend that this role is strengthened as it appropriately utilizes the experience and knowledge of the LA at a critical point in the development process of a formal partnership. Consideration should also be given to offering advice which is tailored to the particular needs of small and rural schools. Such a message could be also be set out in the next iteration of the Council's 'Excellence for All' strategy document.

Recommendation 4

- a) The Local Authority to consider promoting to Head teachers and Governing Boards the benefits of a formal partnership arrangement, as well as developing its critical friend role with regard to partnership proposals.
- b) The Local Authority to consider also clarifying to individual schools at risk what it sees as the potential dangers to them of not actively pursuing a formal partnership arrangement.

Recommendation 5

The Local Authority to consider developing the next iteration of its 'Excellence for All Strategy' document and other related documents so that it:

- promotes the development of formal partnerships;
- emphasises the leadership role of schools; and
- offers bespoke advice that is tailored to meet the needs of rural primary and small schools.

Relationships between strategic authorities

27. The Board heard evidence which suggests that it is not only schools which cannot afford to stand alone. No one (regional) strategic educational body can provide all the oversight and support which our schools and academies need. Authorities such as the RSC, the local dioceses and the LA therefore all need to collaborate. As one strategic leader said 'we are all in it together'. Indeed the Board received consistent evidence from these bodies about how they appreciate the excellent working relationships they have with each other and the benefits this can deliver. For example, the authorities the Board heard from all agreed that when they work together, the messages they deliver to schools and academies have greater credibility.

28. The Board accepts that all the relevant strategic bodies have their own clearly defined roles and that there are often clear limitations on the actions they are legally allowed to take. Nonetheless, evidence presented to the Board led it to conclude that the challenges facing our schools suggest these bodies should review their current working relationships and goals. Such a review should seek to strengthen these relationships in the light of the evolving school-led system. Where possible, it should also seek to develop common guidance on the promotion of formal partnership arrangements and advice and guidance on related training matters.

Recommendation 6

So as to present a consistent and clear message to schools, and to draw on the combined strengths and experiences of each party, the Local Authority should seek to strengthen its relationships with the main strategic educational bodies in East Sussex. For example, this might include exploring the development of a common approach to formal partnerships.

LA brokerage role

29. The Board heard clear evidence that it is in the best interests of all schools to develop their own policy with regard to the nature of a proposed formal partnership arrangement. The Board recognises though that there may be occasions when schools need help to identify suitable partners. The Board understands that the LA and RSC already offer such assistance when requested to do so. However, some schools may have a greater challenge finding a partner. For example, one witness informed the Board that ‘small schools are not attractive to federations and MATs’. The Board therefore considers that there may be scope for this brokerage role to be developed further - as without additional help, some schools may be left isolated.

30. The Board considers that the LA and the RSC have the necessary experience to explore innovative solutions that might not otherwise be obvious or accessible to these schools. Such help might be especially appropriate if the LA were to adopt an approach that promotes formal partnerships.

Recommendation 7

That the Local Authority develop further its brokerage role and develop innovative ways of facilitating school partnership that might not otherwise come into being.

School partnerships

Background

31. In a research report produced for the Department for Education (DfE) by Dr Paul Armstrong, the situation regarding inter-school collaboration is described as ‘complex, encompassing a wide range of different types of collaborative activity both informal and formal and involving schools of different phases and types’. Within this complex spectrum of collaboration types, it is possible to designate partnerships as being either ‘informal’ or ‘formal’ as described below:

- **Informal Partnerships.** This model is a non-statutory arrangement, with the school retaining its own Governing Body (this model is sometimes referred to as a soft partnership). In East Sussex the most common form of informal partnership is an Education Improvement Partnership (EIP). East Sussex County Council’s ‘Partnership Pathways’ guidance describes EIPs as:

“..groups of schools working together across an area to improve outcomes for pupils at all schools; they build on the earlier smaller school alliances. EIPs include primary and secondary schools. These informal networks and informal partnerships do not require any change to leadership or governance, although schools might want to consider whether they need to put their own accountability framework in place.”
- **Formal Partnership Arrangements.** A formal partnership is an inter-school collaboration that involves shared governance. The two main types of formal partnership are Multi Academy Trusts and federations (these partnerships are sometimes referred to as a hard partnership):
 - Multi Academy Trusts (MATs). Academies are state-funded schools which receive their funding directly from central government and are independent of the LA. As set out in East Sussex Council’s ‘Collaborations’ guidance document, a MAT is ‘established to take responsibility for more than one academy.’ In East Sussex an example of a MAT is the South Downs Learning Trust (which is comprised of Ratton School and Ocklynge Junior School in Eastbourne).
 - Federation Partnership. A federation is where a number of maintained schools come together under one Governing Body. The schools’ individual Governing Bodies are disbanded and a new single over-arching Governing Body is formed. This becomes the accountable body for all the schools in the group and sets the strategic direction. Schools share common goals and will usually have an Executive Head teacher working across all schools (with

individual Heads of School at each separate school). There are a significant number of federations in East Sussex, with one example being the Skylark Federation which is comprised of Barcombe, Hamsey and Plumpton Primary Schools.

32. Having established an understanding of the main strategic bodies, the Board then moved on to consider the key challenges in this area.

Issues relating to partnerships

33. The Board examined partnerships as they are widely seen as the most sustainable way for schools to operate in future. The Board considered a wide body of evidence relating to different types of partnership, their relative strengths and weaknesses and whether they were the most effective option open to schools.

Effectiveness of Partnerships

34. The Board sought evidence to establish whether partnerships are effective. The Board was informed by the LA that both national and local evidence supports the view that schools should enter into partnership arrangements. For example, one strategic authority explained that it is:

“..in favour of partnerships as this is the best way to make a difference to outcomes.”

35. Furthermore, when asked about the ability of schools to stand alone, one witness informed the Board that:

“A key issue is that single academies can be isolated and whilst they can succeed, it’s just more difficult for them.”

36. Given the above and other related evidence, the Board was satisfied that in the context of a school-led system, partnerships are the most realistic option for the majority of schools going forward. As a result, the Board then moved on to consider the strengths and weaknesses of informal and formal partnerships.

Informal partnerships

37. The majority of the evidence considered by the Board indicated that informal partnerships will not provide an effective response to the challenges discussed in this report. In general there was concern that such partnerships do not provide clear leadership. For example, at the national level, and in its ‘Enabling School Improvement’ guidance, the LGA comment that:

“One risk for the sustainability of current partnership arrangements is that they are founded on effective working between individuals. When those individuals move on, the basis of the partnership possibly weakens.”

38. At the local level, the Board heard similar evidence from a Chair of a Federated Governing Body who noted that whilst Education Improvement Partnerships (EIPs) can help share good practice, they are:

“..not strong enough...and that a formal Federation is better than a soft partnership as one Governing Board means you have less conflicts to deal with” and “with a Federation you get all the governors in one room to discuss key issues”.

39. While informal partnerships are not the response the Board would advocate in relation to the challenges being considered here, the Board accept that there may be circumstances where such arrangements can be beneficial. One example relates to the dip in academic performance which can occur in Key Stage 3, when pupils transfer from the primary phase to the secondary phase. One response to this problem can be to set up a cross-phase informal partnership as this helps enable a smooth transition of pupils from Year 6 into Year 7.

Formal Partnerships

40. The Board considered the strengths and weaknesses of the two main types of formal partnership – MATs and federations.

Multi Academy Trusts – Benefits

41. At the national level, and in its 'Governance in Multi Academy Trusts' guidance, the National College for Teaching & Leadership summarises its views on the benefits of MATs as enabling school leaders to:

- share best practice
- deliver economic benefits, such as centralised services
- focus funds where they are most needed
- have increased and flexible staffing resources
- establish more effective succession planning programmes and, in doing so, retain good staff who might otherwise move on – including head teachers

42. These views on the benefits of MATs were echoed at the local level when the Board met with representatives of two separate types of MAT. One is a local Trust comprised of two schools. When asked for some practical examples of the benefits that the MAT model can help deliver, the Executive Head commented:

“The Executive Business Manager manages across both schools in the MAT and this helps us identify real efficiencies. We can draw both schools into pre-existing contracts (and achieve better deals) and do parallel staff/resource planning. Other benefits include shared caretaker capacity across both schools. Quality of teaching and learning: we now have a larger network and are able to commission more support. We are creating a wider network to develop quality teaching. Areas like safeguarding and recruitment are easier to manage. Professional development and training - suddenly we have one set of training charges for certain areas.”

43. The Board also received evidence from a larger MAT which operates a number of academies in East Sussex and South London. This evidence echoed the above comments, with the Chief Executive Officer saying the benefits of a MAT include:

- effective strategic planning both for the Trust's schools both individually and as a group
- more scope for effective succession planning for staff
- greater scope for sharing resources and skills across a number of schools
- the leadership to react quickly to problems without the need to refer to a central bureaucracy
- MATs to be able to determine the numbers and roles of governors and to go for a smaller number of high quality governors.

Multi Academy Trusts - Challenges

44. Inevitably, whilst the shift within the school system for schools to work together has helped deliver benefits, it has also created new challenges and risks. Some of these challenges apply across the partnership as a whole, whilst others impact directly on the Executive Head - who takes on a greater range of responsibilities across more than one school site. When asked to comment on these challenges, the Executive Head of the local MAT quoted above said:

Strategic leadership capacity is stretched. We look to develop this within the school, but may also need to bring in external leadership. There are financial risks – such as unfunded salary increases. There is lots of change in the system – much more than five years ago. For example, new curriculum and GCSEs. We have to make sure the support is there to deal with these challenges.

Federation Benefits

45. The Board also considered evidence relating to the benefits of federations. For example, the Chair of a Governing Body of a federation informed Members that:

“With a federation you get all the governors in one room to discuss key issues. You can’t have too many governors though – so you then need to look at the skills of the governors you already have to ensure the single Governing Body has the best possible fit for purpose. You can then rotate the Governing Body meetings between the schools in the federation. Formal federations show a level of commitment - you have to ‘put your neck on the line’. It’s not a loose promise. Also, there is much more collaboration at a formal Federation. We all have the same INSET dates. Our bursars work together and benchmark together what we are buying in – joint procurement. We didn’t enter into this partnership for money – we went into it as there was not enough capacity without it to deliver quality teaching – so we have subject leaders.”

46. Furthermore the Board was presented with examples of successful local federations. This included an Ofsted inspection from June 2017 which commented that with regard to one federation:

“The school has certainly benefited from being part of the federation...Federation governors are competent and hardworking....The federation has enabled expertise in different subjects to be shared effectively throughout its schools. This has led to stronger professional development and better training for teachers.”

Federation - Challenges

47. The Board also heard evidence related to some of the challenges and risks associated with Federations. This included the view that:

“In small schools the difference between Executive Head and School Leader is not great and therefore in this model, a bigger grouping is desirable.”

48. Whilst the Board heard evidence that many of the benefits and challenges of a formal partnership apply to both MATs and federations, evidence was received regarding the perceived additional advantages of a MAT. For example, one local regional body commented that:

“Academies are more robust than federations, they have more control and stronger governance. In MATs the relationships are also more actively managed. We’ve seen some federations starting to fail, as schools can’t manage – you need external pressure.”

49. The Board did not, however, conclude that the above viewpoint means MATs should be promoted over Federations. Instead, the Board believe that the different options open to schools should be seen as a positive. This is because the circumstances relating to each school and its local community are different. This allows schools to make informed decisions about which type of formal partnership best suits their local situation.

Exploiting the benefits of a formal partnership.

50. The Board also investigated whether schools are fully exploiting the benefits of their partnership arrangements. The Board was informed by the LA that:

“.. it takes a long time for partnerships to produce benefits. However, and for a range of factors, some federations may not be exploiting the full range of benefits that the grouping can deliver. These factors include pre-existing contracts, the size of the Federation and the nature of the relationships between the schools within the group.”

51. Based on the evidence presented to them, the Board concluded that there would be value in assessing the performance of a formal partnership as a whole. A benchmarking process of this kind would not only help an individual partnership understand its performance, it could also create useful ‘good practice’ guidance for other schools. For example, when asked about their assessment process, the Chair of one federation commented that he thought assessing the performance is important because:

“We have had a massive learning curve. Staff surveys are one source of information. Parent surveys too. We have financial data and this helps us measure the impact of the federation, similarly there is data too on teaching and learning.”

52. With the above in mind, the Board proposes that the experiences of successful, mature federations are recorded. The learning from these successful partnerships should then be shared with both existing federations and other schools considering entering into such an arrangement. A similar process could occur with regard to the academy conversion process.

Recommendation 8

The experiences of successful formal partnerships should be recorded and shared by the Local Authority. The aim being to:

- help other existing partnerships more fully realise the benefits of their arrangements; and
- develop advice for 'single' schools which are considering entering into a formal partnership.

Resistance to Partnerships

53. The Board heard evidence regarding schools' impressions about the complex nature of both the process of creating a formal partnership and its subsequent management. The Board also heard that some schools may be concerned about their individuality and whether this would be diluted in a partnership. Such concerns indicated to the Board that this perception of complexity and potential loss of identity may be dissuading schools from taking the necessary steps to form sustainable partnerships. For example, when asked about the process of converting to academy status, one chair of a federated governing body said that for the time being at least, they were dissuaded from conversion as:

"..ahead of converting, it's quite a process, looking at land ownership, diligence matters, finance etc. It's a huge amount of work – you need enough capacity to do this properly."

54. When asked about whether the possibility of converting to an academy was ever considered by the schools in their group, another chair of Federation Governing Body responded by saying :

"No. There was a fear academisation would give us less flexibility over things like our branding (i.e. the school's identity). There is also a general concern about academisation, it seems more radical."

55. The Board also heard that some schools may be concerned about entering partnerships as they are:

"..reluctant to share key teaching staff and that parents can be strongly opposed to academy conversion."

56. In response to this reluctance, the Board heard that a possible solution to this concern is to promote the creation of a federation first as:

"Federation is sometimes adopted as a stepping stone approach, as this is seen as less permanent and controversial and helps to create new ways of working."

57. On the basis of the evidence presented, the Board concluded that the further promotion of this approach would be beneficial as it could help schools see the formation of a partnership as part of a journey which, depending on local context, may or may not result in conversion to academy status.

Recommendation 9

To help encourage the development of formal partnerships, the Local Authority should consider promoting to schools the creation of a federation as an initial step. This approach would:

- help address some of the perceptions which are discouraging change; and
- better enable schools to consider, in the context of their local circumstances, whether or not they then wish to convert to academy status.

The roles of governors and Executive Heads

58. The new structures and partnerships schools are entering into and the development of a school-led system may mean there is increased scope for gaps in oversight and governance to develop. One key area where this issue could manifest itself relates to the role of ‘partnership’ governors. The Board heard compelling evidence that the role of such governors is significantly different and more demanding than that of a governor at a single school. As one witness commented:

“Federations have one Governing Board overseeing both schools. This represents a change in mind-set for the governors as they have to take on responsibility for all the children in all the schools within the grouping.”

Another governor of an existing federation commented that:

“Becoming a federation governor is a real education. It is difficult.”

59. Given this and other supporting evidence provided to them, the Board identified a need that appropriate bespoke guidance is developed on the oversight role of the partnership governor. In particular, this guidance should help to ensure specific groups of children, such as vulnerable children, are given an appropriate level of focus and attention across all the schools within the partnership. The guidance should also set out the particular training and development needs of a partnership governor.

Recommendation 10

The Local Authority to develop further guidance which has a focus on the specific role and responsibilities of the formal partnership governor and their training and development needs.

60. The Board also heard evidence regarding the role of the Executive Head and how this is very different from that of a Head teacher of a single school. Evidence presented to the Board indicated that some schools entering into a federation arrangement were not clear on what the role would precisely entail and how it might work on a day-to-day basis. One witness commented that:

“More effective training is required for Executive Heads. They need to have vision.”

61. As this role is crucial to the effective operation of a formal partnership, the Board recommend that consideration should be given to developing specific advice and training for schools regarding the role of the Executive Head. This could extend to providing practical advice as to how other formal partnership arrangements operate. For example, the Board heard how one Executive Head spends a day and a half at each of the schools in their Federation. It could also provide specific help with regard to the transition process, such as job descriptions for the relevant roles.

Recommendation 11

The Local Authority to further develop its toolkits and guidance for schools who are considering creating a federation or converting to academy status, or who are already in a formal partnership. Such guidance should include specific advice on the role of the Executive Head and Heads of School and their training and development. Consideration should also be given to developing this type of guidance in partnership with other regional strategic bodies.

Sustainability of small schools

Background

62. The DfE defines a small school as one with a single form of entry (which is made up of 30 pupils). For primary schools therefore, a small school would usually not have a school roll of more than 210 pupils (across the seven year groups). The DfE also has a policy which sets out that proposals for new schools must have at least two forms of entry. That is to say, such a school would have a Published Admission Number of 60, with a potential total number on roll of 420.

63. The local context is that out of 153 primary schools in East Sussex:

- 39 have a single form of entry (30 pupils admitted per year in Reception).
- A further 49 are even smaller and have an intake below 30.

64. This means approximately one half of all primary schools in East Sussex would not meet the DfE's current standard for being built.

Pressures on small schools

65. Most of the issues discussed in this section affect, to varying degrees, all schools. However, the evidence presented to the Board indicates that the pressures on small schools are more pronounced. As a result, the Board focused on the particular challenges facing these schools with regard to their sustainability.

National Funding Formula

66. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the Government committed in 2015 to introducing a National Funding Formula (NFF) for mainstream schools. At the time of evidence gathering, the Board heard that schools in East Sussex would receive an overall funding increase of 2.5%. However, despite the potential funding increase, the Board heard that it was likely that the NFF would disadvantage small schools. This is because the NFF increases the balance of funding toward a pupil based system. Ultimately this means, to a greater degree than before, fewer pupils equals less funding. Given small schools have small intakes, any variation in admissions will have a proportionally higher impact. The LA confirmed its view on this matter by indicating that:

“In 2020 the National Funding Formula will be introduced. There is no question that this will really impact on small schools. Fluctuating admission numbers for these schools will be a massive issue in terms of their funding.”

67. The Board also heard that the LA has a very limited ability to assist schools who get into financial difficulty because ‘all the available funding is allocated to the schools straight away’. This potentially unstable financial picture means partners may be more cautious of entering into a formal partnership with a small school.

Equality of opportunity and quality teaching

68. The National Curriculum (NC) is a set of subjects and standards used by schools in England. It sets out what subjects are taught and the standards children should attain. The national curriculum is divided into blocks of years called Key Stages. In recent years there have been a number of major developments relating both to the delivery of education and its assessment (for children of compulsory school age). Developments of particular relevance include:

- the revised National Curriculum introduced for 2014 onwards; and
- the introduction of a new assessment framework that replaced national curriculum levels (which occurred within key stages) with a new process called ‘Assessment Without Levels’ (introduced in September 2015);

69. The Board heard evidence about the demanding nature of the new curriculum and the challenges that some schools will face trying to deliver quality outcomes for their pupils. One chair of a Governing Body commented that:

“It is difficult for small schools to deliver quality teaching across eight subjects – this impacts on performance.”

70. Another witness commented that:

“Small schools - are they really offering a fit for purpose education? Particularly taking into account the impact of the new tough curriculum. It is very difficult for one teacher with an entire class which is comprised of children made up of all the year groups in Key Stage 1.”

71. Evidence provided to the Board also indicated that very small schools will struggle to meet the requirements of the National Curriculum because, amongst other factors, the teacher recruitment and retention challenge is particularly acute for this type of school. Recruitment is more of a challenge because many teachers do not view small schools as offering the same career development opportunities as larger schools. For example, one Chair of a Federation Governing Body commented that prior to the creation of the federation, his original single school had had two failed attempts to recruit a new Head. This failure led them to think about the federation model.

72. Elsewhere in this report, and as happened in the above example, the Board was presented with evidence which suggests that the appropriate response to these challenges would be to enter into a formal partnership. However, the Board also heard evidence from the LA that such a response might not be sufficient for very small schools:

“..the trouble is that some schools are so small, federation will not be able to deliver the necessary savings. Unless we grasp this issue though, it will impact on educational attainment. So rather than thinking just about saving schools in a given area, we should also think about equality of opportunity.”

73. The Board understands both the severe challenges facing small schools and the importance they have for their local communities. One Chair of a Governing Body stated that:

“We must be careful about stripping facilities out of villages. We must act for educational needs. What are these schools doing and can they provide for their kids an equality of provision?”

74. Given the above points, the Board agreed it is important that the LA is able to demonstrate that it has explored all reasonable opportunities for addressing these challenges. This would include the consideration of radical solutions. Such an approach might, therefore, involve exploring the viability of exploiting technological solutions. The Board are aware, for example, that in other circumstances virtual teaching is provided to pupils. Another solution could involve examining how primary school teachers are being trained and whether there is a model that could help prepare more teachers to deal with more than one year group at a time. The Board also recognise that many other LAs will be facing a similar challenge in this area. As a result, the Board recommend the LA explore whether other authorities have developed innovative solutions which could potentially be suitable for transferring to East Sussex.

Recommendation 12

Alongside the guidance set out in the Education Commissioning Plan for small and rural schools, the Local Authority should take steps to explore innovative solutions to the specific problems small and in particular, small rural schools are facing. Such solutions could include, for example, technological responses and adapting training provided to primary school teachers. It could also include exploring the solutions which other authorities in similar situations have developed.

Concluding comments

75. Evidence presented to the Board indicated that it is now an urgent matter for all schools to take a strategic approach to planning for their future. However, the Board was also aware that the scale and pace of change within the system has helped create uncertainty amongst schools about the best way forward. With this mind, the Board agreed a number of practical, attainable recommendations which Members hope will be of real assistance to schools and academies in East Sussex. In particular, the recommendations contained in this report aim to help clarify the advice schools receive regarding the benefits of formal partnership arrangements. The recommendations also aim to help schools develop their confidence to take on the challenges and opportunities the evolving education system is presenting to them.

Appendix: Terms of reference, membership and evidence

Scope and terms of reference

This scrutiny review was originally established by the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee on 27 November 2017 (the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee was subsequently superseded by the People Scrutiny Committee which reaffirmed its commitment to the review at its meeting on 25 June 2018). The key aims of the review were to explore developments within the local education system and to seek to understand the challenges and opportunities the evolving situation is presenting to schools and academies in East Sussex. Fundamentally, and in this period of great change, Members wanted to see if they could contribute to process of responding to the following questions:

- What can we do to ensure the quality of education we provide to our young people is not put at risk by these changes?; and
- How can we ensure the new opportunities these changes present are fully exploited?

Members were particularly clear that the review should have a forward-looking nature. The goal therefore was to develop recommendations that would ultimately help schools and academies be better placed to cope with change.

Board Membership and project support

Review Board Members:

Councillor Roy Galley (Chairman)

Councillor Kathryn Field

Councillor Francis Whetstone

Councillor Laurie Loe

Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative

Former Members:

Nicola Boulter, Parent Governor Representative

Councillor Alan Shuttleworth

Councillor Stephen Shing

Support to the Board

The Review Board would like to thank for their co-operation and assistance:

- those Federations and Multi Academy Trusts listed below who were either visited or sent representatives to board meetings.
- Representatives of the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- Councillor Bob Standley, Leader Member for Education and Inclusion and Special Educational Needs and Disability for attending a Board meeting.

The Board are also grateful for the support provided by officers listed below from within the Children's Services Department.

School/Academy visits were undertaken by members of the Review Board:

Councillor Roy Galley undertook an evidence gathering session when he visited Hawkes Farm Primary Academy on 23 April 2018.

Witnesses providing evidence:

- Amy Baron, Team Leader for Sussex, Brighton and Hove, Regional Schools Commissioner
- Peter Clark, Co-Chair of the Skylark Federation
- Maria Dawes, Deputy Regional Schools Commissioner
- Mark Ducker, CEO, STEP Academy Trust
- Dr Ann Holt, Director of Education, Diocese of Chichester
- Huxley Know-Macaulay, Executive Head teacher, South Downs Learning Trust
- Ben March, Chief Finance and Operations Manager, STEP Academy Trust
- Jeremy Meek, Head teacher, Hawkes Farm Academy
- Sarah Rice, Schools Accountant, Children's Services Department
- Melanie Saunders, Interim Head of Service, Children's Services Department
- Councillor Bob Standley, Leader Member for Education and Inclusion and Special Educational Needs and Disability
- Jessica Stubbings Senior Manager: Places and Participation, Children's Services Department
- Mandy Watson, Chair of the Pioneer Federation
- Mark Whiffin, Head of Finance, Children's Services Department
- Fiona Wright, Assistant Director Education and ISEND, Children's Services Department

Support was provided by the following officers:

- Elizabeth Funge, Head of Education Improvement
- The Project Manager was Stuart McKeown.

Review Board meeting dates

Session	Date
Meeting 1	05/01/18
Meeting 2	15/03/18
Meeting 3	24/04/18
Meeting 4	05/06/18
Meeting 5	25/07/18
Meeting 6	05/09/18
Meeting 7	01/10/18
Meeting 8	24/10/18

Evidence papers

No.	Title of Evidence	Date
1	Regional Schools Commissioner's decision-making guidance	23 02 18
2	Local Government Association report 'enabling school improvement'	23 02 18
3	Excellence for All 2017-19 Strategy Document	23 02 18
4	Overview of school improvement service in the future CSD Report (07/12/17)	23 02 18
5	Data on School Reorganisation, Partnerships across schools, all-through Academy Schools, Lists of Primary and Secondary Academy Schools	23 02 18
6	East Sussex Federations and Non-maintained Schools Maps	23 02 18
7	Federations - including 'Federation Benefits -A Briefing for Governors' and Federation Case Studies	23 02 18
8	Collaborations Guidance	23 02 18
9	National College for Teaching and Leadership 'Governance in multi-academy trusts'	23 02 18
10	The Impact of the National Funding Formula (NFF): A summary of the process, guidance and support given to schools in East Sussex.	14 03 18
11	Internal - Audit Progress Report - Quarter 3 (01/10/16 - 31/12/16) - Schools Themed Review of Federations and Partnerships	14 03 18
12	Central School Services Block DSG 2018/19 - report to the Schools Forum	29 03 18
13	Summary of budget share comparison between 2017-18 and 2018/19	29 03 18
14	Schools Final over-underspend schedule 2016-17	29 03 18
15	Embracing Change: rural and Small Schools - report by the Church of England Education Office	29 03 18
16	Devon County Council 'Small Schools Task Group' report	20 04 18
17	STEP Academy data	18 05 18
18	Councillor notes from meeting with the STEP Trust (on 23 April 18)	18 05 18
19	SLES Budget 2018-19	18 05 18
20	Statutory guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Children's Services and the Lead Members for Children's Services	18 05 18
21	Schools Final Over/Underspend schedule for 17/18	25 07 18
22	Twenty questions 2nd Edition - produced by the Key for School Governors - only formal copies given to the Board members at the meeting on 5th September 18.	05 09 18
23	SLES organisation chart	19 10 18

Contact officer for this review: Stuart McKeown, Senior Democratic Services Adviser and School Appeals Manager

Telephone: 01273 481583

Email: stuart.mckeown@eastsussex.gov.uk

East Sussex County Council, County Hall, St Anne's Crescent, Lewes BN7 1UE

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to:	People Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	27 November 2018
By:	Assistant Chief Executive
Title:	People Scrutiny Committee Work Programme
Purpose:	To review and agree items for the People Scrutiny Committee's future work programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Committee is recommended to:

- 1) review and agree any amendments to the work programme set out in Appendix 1, including agreeing agenda items for future Committee meetings and any changes or additions to the Committee's other scrutiny work;**
 - 2) approve the recommendations of the Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Initial Scoping Board as set out in Appendix 2 and appoint a Chair and Review Board to take forward the proposed Scrutiny Review of Support for UASC; and**
 - 3) review upcoming items on the County Council's Forward Plan (Appendix 3) to identify any issues that may require more detailed scrutiny.**
-

1 Background

1.1 The work programme is an important tool in ensuring the correct focus and best use of the Committee's time in scrutinising topics that are of importance to the residents of East Sussex, and the efficient and effective working of the Council. It also provides clarity for those who may be requested to give evidence to the Committee on the issues under review, and the questions the Committee requires answers to.

1.2 All reports and activities on the work programme should have a clear objective and purpose. Reports should not be "to note" or simply to provide information to the Committee, which could be provided as briefings outside of the formal Committee meetings.

1.3 Discussion of the work programme provides the Committee with the opportunity to consider topics that it may be of value to scrutinise, and to decide whether further scoping work is required. This provides a basis for deciding the best way of scrutinising a topic, the timescale, and who from the Committee will be involved in carrying out the review work. If there are a number of potential topics for review, Members can determine the priority of the work within the resources available to the Committee.

2 Supporting information

Work programme

2.1 The Committee is asked to review and agree any amendments to the items set out in its work programme (attached at Appendix 1). This includes reviewing and agreeing the Committee's future agenda items, its list of potential future Scrutiny Reviews, the work of its Reference Groups and the subject matter for any reports for information.

2.2 When considering potential topics for inclusion in the work programme, the Committee is asked to consider a range of questions. These include:

- Is the topic relevant to the Council's Corporate Priorities?

- Is the issue of concern or of relevance to East Sussex residents?
- Can Scrutiny have an impact and add value by scrutinising this issue, service or policy?
- Is the issue one that the Committee can realistically influence?
- Are the resources needed to undertake the review available?

2.3 Any suggestions for potential Scrutiny Review topics should be discussed with the Chair, or the relevant Senior Democratic Services Adviser, in advance of the Committee meetings.

Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children - Initial Scoping Board

2.4 At its meeting in October the Committee agreed to appoint an Initial Scoping Board to gather evidence regarding the key challenges for the Children's Services Department in supporting UASC. The Scoping Board met with officers from the Department later in October to examine the issues and key challenges and to understand how these are currently being managed. As a result of this work, the Scoping Board agreed to recommend that the Committee undertakes a Scrutiny Review of Support to UASC. Appendix 2 sets out the process followed by the Scoping Board and the proposed terms of reference for this Review for the Committee's approval. Members are also asked to appoint a Review Board and a Chair to take forward this Review.

Forward Plan

2.5 A copy of the Council's Forward Plan of executive decisions for the period 1 November 2018 to 28 February 2019 to is included at Appendix 3. The Committee is requested to review the forthcoming items on the Forward Plan to identify any issues within the remit of this Committee that may require more detailed scrutiny. The Forward Plan is revised and published on a monthly basis and Committee members should regularly review the Forward Plan.

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

3.1 An important part of managing the work of the People Scrutiny Committee is to have an agreed future work programme. This involves the Committee assessing its priorities, ensuring its ongoing reviews are completed in a timely fashion and identifying new areas for scrutiny.

PHILIP BAKER
Assistant Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Stuart McKeown, Senior Democratic Services Adviser

Tel. No. 01273 481583

Email: stuart.mckeown@eastsussex.gov.uk

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

Current Scrutiny Reviews		
Title of Review	Detail	Proposed Completion Date
Coping with Change – The Way Forward Scrutiny Review	<p>It was agreed by the Committee on 25 June that this Review would continue and that the following Members would be appointed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Galley (Chair) • Cllr Field • Cllr Whetstone • Councillor Laurie Loe • Matthew Jones (Parent Governor Representative) <p>Proposed timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 November 2018 final report of the Review Board to the Committee • 22 January 2019 report to Cabinet • 5 February 2019 report to Full Council 	<p>Final report to the People Scrutiny Committee 27/11/18</p>
Changing Care Market - Scoping Review	<p>It was agreed by the Committee on 1st October to approve the recommendations of the Initial Scoping Board to appoint a Review Board and Chair as set as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Ensor (Chair) • Cllr Davies • Cllr Galley • Cllr Sheppard • Cllr Ungar <p>The Committee also agreed the following proposed timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 March 2019 final report of the Review Board to the Committee • 23 April 2019 report to Cabinet • 14 May 2019 report to Council 	<p>Proposed final report to the People Scrutiny Committee 07/03/18</p>

Initial Scoping Reviews		
Subject area for initial scoping	Detail	Proposed Dates
Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children - Initial Scoping Review	<p>The Committee agreed on 1st October that there is merit in conducting an initial scoping exercise into the issues and challenges the Children's Services Department are dealing with regard to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children.</p> <p>The Membership of the Board was agreed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Field • Cllr Webb • Cllr Whetstone <p>A report setting out the findings of the Initial Scoping Board will be presented to the People Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 27 November. It will then be for the Committee to decide whether to agree with the recommendations of the Board to proceed with a formal review that would aim to provide its final report to the March meeting of the People Committee.</p>	First meeting: to be confirmed.
List of Suggested Potential Future Scrutiny Review Topics		
Suggested Topic	Detail	
CQC Area Review	Progress against the action plan – particularly the areas to be led by ASC. Originally proposed by the Adult Social Care and Community Safety Committee. <i>Changing Care Market review originated from CQC recommendations.</i>	
Elective Home Education	Issues relating to the increase in the numbers of children being home educated. Originally proposed by the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee. The Committee were informed that Local Authorities are waiting for the Government's response to the outcomes of its recently undertaken consultation on Elective Home Education. The Committee can therefore potentially revisit this subject once the Government has published its response.	
Isolation/Loneliness for both older and younger people	Issues relating to isolation and loneliness in both younger and older age groups and how this can be addressed. The Government has published a national loneliness strategy which may assist the Committee with its consideration of this topic.	

Scrutiny Reference Groups

Reference Group Title	Subject area	Meeting Dates
East Sussex Better Together/ Connecting 4 You Scrutiny Boards (Member-led Reference Group)	It was agreed to create a group of Members who will keep track of ESBT and C4You related matters. This group will monitor progress of the two programmes and will identify potential scrutiny topics. It will meet on an ad hoc basis. Membership of the group: Cllrs Ungar (lead), Davies, Webb, Ensor and Clark.	Next meeting: group to meet as required.
Strategic Commissioning Review of Early Help Scrutiny Reference Group	It was agreed by the Committee on 25 June that following Members would sit on this group: Cllr Davies, Cllr Galley, Cllr Field and Cllr Whetstone. The purpose of this reference group is to provide scrutiny input into the review of Early Help.	Next meeting: further meeting dates to be agreed.
Educational Attainment and Performance Scrutiny Reference Group	Established in light of discontinuation of Education Performance Panel. It was agreed by the Committee on 25 June that the following Members would remain on this group and that it would meet once per annum (in the spring). Membership: Cllr Galley, Cllr Field and Cllr Whetstone. As agreed at the meeting of the Committee on 1 st October 2018, Matthew Jones, Parent Governor Representative was added to the Group.	Next meeting: Early 2019
Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR)	RPPR Board meeting to agree detailed comments and any recommendations on the emerging portfolio plans and savings proposals to be put to Cabinet on behalf of their parent scrutiny committees.	RPPR Board 10 December

Reports for Information		
Subject Area	Detail	Proposed Date
Delayed Transfers of Care	A written update on this subject.	By December 2018
Training and Development		
Title of Training/Briefing	Detail	Proposed Date
Briefing on ASC Green Paper	To gain a better understanding of the potential implications of the Government's Green Paper on Adult Social Care once published.	Tbc dependent on publication of Green Paper.
Future Committee Agenda Items		Author
All meetings		
Committee Work Programme	To manage the committee's programme of work including matters relating to ongoing reviews, initial scoping reviews, future scrutiny topics, reference groups, training and development matters and reports for information.	Senior Democratic Services Adviser
7 March 2019		
Mental health – commissioned community services	A follow-up report providing an evaluation of the progress of commissioned mental health community services (following initial report in November 2017). Committee requested officers to explore the possibility of visiting a Wellbeing Centre as a precursor to the March 2019 follow-up report.	Kenny Mackay, Strategic Commissioning Manager (Mental Health)
Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) 2019/20	To provide the Committee with an opportunity to review its input into the RPPR process for 2019/20 and suggest improvements to the process.	Becky Shaw, Chief Executive
Prevention and Integration and impact on Adult Social Care.	At its meeting on 1 st October, the Committee discussed the areas of prevention and integration and their impact on Adult Social Care. The Committee would like to understand more about these issues and it was therefore agreed that this	Keith Hinkley, Director of Adult

	would be added to the agenda as a discussion item for the People Scrutiny Committee meeting taking place on 7 March 2019.	Social Care.
Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) Annual Report	To update the Committee on the work of SACRE, with the report to include a further update on secondary school performance in relation to the requirements of the National Curriculum and Religious Education.	Roy Galley, Chairman of SACRE/ Stuart Gallimore, Director of Children Services
20 June 2019		
East Sussex Local Safeguarding Children Board Serious Case Reviews	A report outlining the findings and outcomes of Serious Case Reviews undertaken by the LSCB during 2018/19.	Independent Chair, East Sussex Local Safeguarding Children Board
Annual Review of Safer Communities Performance, Priorities and Issues	To update the Committee on performance in relation to Safer Communities in 2018/19 and the priorities and issues for 2019/20 that will be highlighted in the Partnership Business Plan.	Kay Holden, Interim Assistant Director – Planning, Performance and Engagement
19 September 2019		
Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report	The Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB) Annual Report outlines the safeguarding activity and performance in East Sussex during the previous financial year, as well as some of the main developments in place to prevent abuse from occurring. The Strategic Plan sets out the aims and objectives of the SAB and is refreshed each year.	Independent Chair, East Sussex Safeguarding Adults Board
East Sussex Local Safeguarding Children Board	Presentation of the annual report of the Local Safeguarding Children Board.	Independent Chair, East Sussex Local Safeguarding Children Board

Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) 2019/20	The Committee will start the process of examining the Departmental Portfolio Plans and budget for the 2019/20 financial year.	Becky Shaw, Chief Executive
14 November 2019		
Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) 2020/21	The Committee will continue the process of examining the Departmental Portfolio Plans and budget for the 2020/21 financial year.	Becky Shaw, Chief Executive



Scrutiny Review Terms of Reference Document

Scrutiny Review	Support for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children
Responsible Committee	People Scrutiny Committee
Author	Stuart McKeown
Version	1.0
Date	27 November 2018

1 Background

1.1 At its meeting on 1 October 2018, the People Scrutiny Committee discussed issues relating to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC). Members had previously been informed that this is a challenging area for the Children's Services Department and that input from the Committee would be welcomed. As a result of this discussion, it was agreed to appoint an Initial Scoping Board to gather evidence and report back to the Committee.

1.2 The Scoping Board met on 26 October 2018 and discussed evidence presented to them by the Children's Services Department. Written background material was also circulated to the Board. This included the following items:

- 'Seeking Support: A guide to the rights and entitlements of separated children' - a guidance document produced by the Coram Children's Legal Centre
- An ESCC briefing note on Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children
- Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children Update 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2018 – Corporate Parenting Panel report

1.3 The main issues discussed by the Scoping Board were:

- **Placement Capacity.** The Board heard that the numbers of experienced providers of supported housing, supported lodgings and foster placements for UASC within the local system is not sufficient to meet demand. As a result, the Council currently place a significant number of UASC in either 'out of county' provision or in other expensive in-county provision. There is also a particular concern regarding the potential impact of a discovery of a large group of UASC (spontaneous arrival). In this context, the Department explained to Members that there is a gap between the grant allocation from Government per young person and the funding that is required to support each UASC. Consequently, a sudden increase in UASC numbers would have significant financial implications for the authority and its ability to support these vulnerable children and young people. Members will probably be aware of the recent incident regarding the discovery of 11 UASC at the port of Newhaven. Such incidents demonstrate the unpredictable nature of the pressures UASC can place on the Department and the need for increased capacity.
- **Diversity of capacity.** There is also a need to increase the diversity of providers of UASC placements in East Sussex. Having placement options that provide a greater mix of people from differing ethnic, social-economic and

cultural-religious backgrounds could help UASC with the process of adjusting to a new country. There is also the potential that such placements may decrease the chances of a UASC absconding (see the next bullet point below).

Furthermore, there is a geographic element to this issue, as the majority of providers are in the urban coastal strip. The availability of provision in other parts of the county could help increase the chances of placements being offered that better fit the needs of individual UASC.

- **UASC who abscond.** Despite the Council's best efforts, UASC sometimes abscond after being placed in a temporary placement on arrival. As a corporate parent, the Council are concerned about these incidents since these children and young people are Looked After. There is interest therefore in further developing the Department's current strategy regarding how such occurrences might be reduced.
- **Work Experience and other related opportunities.** The Board also heard that UASC have equivalent status to other Looked After Children. As a result the Council, as it would for any other Looked After Child, is seeking to develop the opportunities it can offer for UASC to have access to careers advice and work experience opportunities.

2 Scope of the Review

2.1 Through the initial scoping exercise, the Board considered the following themes:

- The existing resource limitations for working with UASC and the consequent impacts this has.
- How Members could have a role in providing advice and help to prepare their communities to receive and support UASCs.
- How Members could help explore and develop capacity in the Voluntary Sector to build support for UASCs.

2.2 On the basis of the initial scoping work, the Board concluded there would be benefit in undertaking a formal Scrutiny Review of issues relating to supporting UASC. As a result, the Board agreed it would recommend to the People Scrutiny Committee that a Scrutiny Review Board is established.

2.3 Members recommend that the Scrutiny Review should explore the following **key lines of enquiry**:

- How can the Department develop its strategies regarding:
 - both increasing and diversifying the capacity and range of its providers of accommodation for UASC; and
 - delivering work experience and other related opportunities for UASC?

2.4 The Scoping Board also considered the role of the local Member. Members have a well-developed knowledge of their local communities and will have a network of contacts which include local businesses, organisations and community groups. The Board therefore recommend exploring a further line of enquiry:

- What is the potential for Members to help with raising awareness and support for UASC in their local communities, including generating more enquiries from a wider range of people interested in becoming a provider of:

- accommodation for UASC; or
- work placement opportunities?

2.5 This will include consideration of the type of tools and advice Members might need to assist in this way.

3 Review methods

3.1 It is anticipated that the Review Board will review documentary evidence, question witnesses and undertake research in order to gather evidence to inform its recommendations.

4. Review Organisation and Responsibilities

4.1 Initial Scoping Board

The initial scoping for this review was undertaken by Councillors Field, Webb and Whetstone.

4.2 Review Board

The Review Board is: *to be confirmed by the People Scrutiny Committee*

The Chair of the Review Board is: *to be confirmed by the People Scrutiny Committee*

4.3 The Review Board is responsible for:

- making decisions regarding the scope and direction of the review;
- monitoring and control of the overall progress of the review;
- agreeing where Board members will undertake evidence gathering activities as required by the review;
- considering and providing challenge to all evidence presented to it; and
- developing and agreeing the final report, including the findings and recommendations of the review.

5 Scrutiny Review Support

5.1 Support for the review will be provided by the Member Services Team to:

- manage the review process;
- undertake research as agreed by the Board;
- draft the final report.

5.2 The Lead Officer who will support the review from the Member Services Team is Stuart McKeown, Senior Democratic Services Adviser. Their role is to manage the review, ensuring its aims and objectives are met and that the final report is delivered to the People Scrutiny Committee within the agreed timescales.

6 Scrutiny Review Completion

6.1 When the review has been completed the Lead Officer will co-ordinate the production of a final report outlining the findings and recommendations for agreement by the Review Board. Once agreed, the Review Board will present this to the People Scrutiny Committee for it to agree the recommendations.

6.2 The report will then be presented to Cabinet for comment and County Council for approval. Progress updates on how the recommendations are being implemented by the Department will be presented to the People Scrutiny Committee in due course (usually six and twelve months after the review has been approved by County Council).

7 Review Timetable

7.1 Based on the initial scoping of the Review, the Review Board aims to submit the final report to the People Scrutiny Committee at the meeting to be held on 7 March 2019.

7.2 An initial timetable of the meetings and activities required to complete the review is outlined below. [*The number of review board meetings is not fixed and there can be more or less depending on the nature of the review. The Review Board will agree the number and content of the meetings and review activity*].

Activity	Timescale/Date
<u>Review Board Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider initial evidence • Review lines of enquiry/terms of reference • Agree further evidence gathering/requirements 	December 2018
<u>Review Board Activity/Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence gathering 	January 2019
Draft Scrutiny Review report and finalise findings and recommendations of the review.	January/February 2019
<u>Final Review Board Meeting to agree Report</u> Review Board meeting to agree draft report, findings and recommendations with input from key officers.	February 2019
Deadline for Report Dispatch	27 February 2019
<u>Report to People Scrutiny Committee for agreement</u>	7 March 2019
Report to Cabinet	23 April 2019
Report to Council	14 May 2019

EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL'S FORWARD PLAN

The Leader of the County Council is required to publish a forward plan setting out matters which the Leader believes will be the subject of a key decision by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet member in the period covered by the Plan (the subsequent four months). The Council's Constitution states that a key decision is one that involves

- (a) expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the expenditure of the County Council's budget, namely above £500,000 per annum; or
- (b) is significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions.

As a matter of good practice, the Council's Forward Plan includes other items in addition to key decisions that are to be considered by the Cabinet/individual members. This additional information is provided to inform local residents of all matters to be considered, with the exception of issues which are dealt with under the urgency provisions.

For each decision included on the Plan the following information is provided:

- the name of the individual or body that is to make the decision and the date of the meeting
- the title of the report and decision to be considered
- groups that will be consulted prior to the decision being taken
- a list of other appropriate documents
- the name and telephone number of the contact officer for each item.

The Plan is updated and published every month on the Council's website two weeks before the start of the period to be covered.

Meetings of the Cabinet/individual members are open to the public (with the exception of discussion regarding reports which contain exempt/confidential information). Copies of agenda and reports for meetings are available on the website in advance of meetings. For further details on the time of meetings and general information about the Plan please contact Andy Cottell at County Hall, St Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1UE, or telephone 01273 481955 or send an e-mail to andy.cottell@eastsussex.gov.uk.

For further detailed information regarding specific issues to be considered by the Cabinet/individual member please contact the named contact officer for the item concerned.

For copies of reports or other documents please contact the officer listed on the Plan or phone 01273 335274.

FORWARD PLAN – EXECUTIVE DECISIONS (including Key Decisions) –1 November 2018 TO 28 February 2019

Additional notices in relation to Key Decisions and/or private decisions are available on the [Council's website](#).

Cabinet membership:

Councillor Keith Glazier - Lead Member for Strategic Management and Economic Development

Councillor David Elkin – Lead Member for Resources

Councillor Bill Bentley – Lead Member for Communities and Safety

Councillor Rupert Simmons – Lead Member for Economy

Councillor Nick Bennett – Lead Member for Transport and Environment

Councillor Carl Maynard – Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health

Councillor Sylvia Tidy – Lead Member for Children and Families

Councillor Bob Standley – Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability

Page 78

Date for Decision	Decision Taker	Decision/Key Issue	Decision to be taken wholly or partly in private (P) or Key Decision (KD)	Consultation	List of Documents to be submitted to decision maker	Contact Officer
13 Nov 2018	Cabinet	Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (Cabinet) To consider an update on the Council's Core Service Offer and the Medium Term Financial Plan	KD		Report, other documents may also be submitted	Jane Mackney 01273 482146
19 Nov 2018	Lead Member for Transport and Environment	Allocation of the 2018/19 Community Match Funding to a number of community led local transport schemes To seek approval of the proposed allocation	KD	Draft circulated to all Members, and cross party Member Panel to consider draft	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Sarah Valentine 01273 335274

		of match funding to a number of community led transport improvement schemes		schemes.		
19 Nov 2018	Lead Member for Transport and Environment	<p>Highway Policy Review Seeking agreement to proposed changes and updates to Highway Service policies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset Management Policy and Strategy • Drainage Policy • SCRIM and Skidding Resistance Policy and Procedure 		Internal consultation with relevant ESCC and highways service teams.	Report, other documents may also be submitted	<p>Stephanie Everest 01273 482644</p> <p>Mathew Jasper 01273 481847</p>
27 Nov 2018	Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health	<p>Six-monthly update on progress with implementation of ASCH Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources decisions made at Cabinet on 26th June 2018</p> <p>The Lead Member will receive an update on progress with the implementation of the Adult Social Care and Health RPPR decisions for 2018/19 as agreed at Cabinet on 26th June 2018. The Lead Member will be asked to consider and comment on the progress made. Kir</p>			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Kirstie Battrick 01273 482016
29 Nov 2018	Lead Member for Communities and Safety	<p>Petition - 20mph speed limit and investigations to road structure at Farmlands Way, Polegate</p> <p>Petition from residents of Farmlands Way, Polegate calling for reduced speed limit and the road structure to reduce vehicle speeds and minimise noise and vibrations in surrounding properties.</p>		<p>Local Members</p> <p>Lead Petitioner</p>	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Kelly Burr 01273 482824

10 Dec 2018	Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability	Peacehaven Heights Primary School - new Special Educational Needs facility To determine the statutory notice in relation to a proposal to establish a special educational needs facility at Peacehaven Heights Primary School		Local Members	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Gary Langford 01273 481758
11 Dec 2018	Cabinet	Annual Audit Letter 2017/18 To consider the Annual Audit Letter			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ola Owolabi 01273 482017
11 Dec 2018	Cabinet	Council Monitoring: Quarter 2 2018/19 To consider the Council Monitoring report for the second quarter of the financial year 2018/19 as part of the Council's Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) budget monitoring process.			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Jane Mackney 01273 482146
11 Dec 2018	Cabinet	Looked After Children's Services Annual Report 2017/18 To consider the performance of the Looked After Children's Service for 2017/18			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Teresa Lavelle-Hill 01323 747197
11 Dec 2018	Cabinet	Treasury Management Annual Report 2017/18 and mid year report 2018/19. To consider a report on the review of Treasury Management performance for 2017/18 and the outturn for the first six months of 2018/19, including the economic	KD		Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ola Owolabi 01273 482017

		factors affecting performance, the Prudential Indicators and compliance with the limits set within the Treasury Management Strategy.				
18 Dec 2018	Lead Member for Communities and Safety	Update on the Libraries and Parking Partnership Update requested by the Lead Member following a question at the County Council meeting of 16 October 2018.			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Stephen Potter 01273 336520
21 Jan 2019	Lead Member for Transport and Environment	High Weald Management Plan To present the High Weald Management Plan 2019-2024 for adoption	KD	Public consultation has already happened	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Virginia Pullan 01273 482639
22 Jan 2019	Cabinet	Conservators of Ashdown Forest Budget 2019/20 To consider the Conservators of Ashdown Forest budget for the financial year 2019/20.	KD	Local Members	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ian Gutsell 01273 481399
22 Jan 2019	Cabinet	Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) 2019/20: Draft Council Plan To consider the revenue budget, savings proposals, capital programme and draft Council Plan for 2019/20.	KD		Report, other documents may also be submitted	Jane Mackney 01273 482146
22 Jan 2019	Cabinet	Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 To consider the Treasury Management Strategy for the financial year 2019/20.	KD		Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ola Owolabi 01273 482017

24 Jan 2019	Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability	To approve the DSG (Dedicated Schools Grant) Budget for 2019/20. The DSG allocations are notified to the Local Authority in December and the DSG budget requires approval.			Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ed Beale 01273 337984
24 Jan 2019	Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability	To Approve the ESCC Funding Formula for 2019/20 After consulting with East Sussex Schools and Academies, approval is now being sought from Lead Member to change the ESCC Funding Formula factors for 2019/20.		All ESCC Primary and Secondary Schools / Academies	Report, other documents may also be submitted	Ed Beale 01273 337984
26 Feb 2019	Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability	Admission arrangements for community and controlled schools in East Sussex 2020-21 To consider the final admission arrangements for 2020/21	KD		Report, other documents may also be submitted	Jo Miles 01273 481911

Report to:	People Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	27 November 2018
By:	Director of Adult Social Care and Health
Title:	Update report on the implementation of locality working
Purpose:	To provide an update on locality working within the East Sussex Better Together (ESBT) area, to highlight progress made so far and next steps in the context of financial recovery

RECOMMENDATIONS

The People Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

- **note and comment on** progress made and the need to prioritise our health and care workforce on implementing key measurable improvements to integrated community services to support financial recovery, in partnership with General Practice and the Voluntary Community Sector (VCS).
 - **note and comment on** our intention to review locality working arrangements in 6 months to collectively agree what will add further value in managing patient flow, care coordination and proactive case management, and the contribution of our localities to achieving system wide financial sustainability.
-

1. Background

1.1 Our ESBT ambition is to create a fully integrated and sustainable health and care system for local people, to ensure that people receive better coordinated, more proactive, joined up care supporting them to live as independently as possible within their local community. ESBT localities have been identified as the key building blocks for bringing together integrated community health and care services that support people differently in the future, and helping to manage demand for acute hospital-based care and patient flow.

1.2 In line with this, our approach has been to take forward Locality Planning and Delivery Groups and Locality Networks as partnerships created to support coordinated and integrated delivery in localities - across public health, primary, community healthcare, mental health and social care services. The Locality Link Worker role was also created to provide the bridge between core health and care delivery, primary care and the wider network of support in communities.

1.3 Our current ESBT partnership environment is complex as we seek to achieve financial recovery, and 2018/19 continues to be a challenging year as we strive to balance our system deficit. As a result of our health system being in special measures, a number of reviews have taken place to diagnose where the best opportunities lie for financial recovery and future system sustainability. These reviews have been undertaken by Carnall Farrar, PricewaterhouseCoopers PwC, Deloitte. In addition, NHS England and NHS Improvement jointly have covered a range of specialist, acute, community and primary care services.

1.4 This has resulted in our current work to reset our ESBT programme of work, and the supporting governance arrangements, to provide a clear focus on the priority changes we need to make to drive the above operational improvements in our localities - across our core community health and care system, and with partners in General Practice and the voluntary and community sector. This includes setting the critical milestones for delivery in the next 6 – 18 month period together with Key Performance Indicators to provide clarity about what we need to achieve together and how we will measure our progress.

1.5 In this context and informed by these independent reviews of our system, our critical operational focus for locality working in 2018/19 and 2019/20 is to better enable:

- Performance management of patient flows
- Oversight of care coordination and proactive case management
- The contribution to be made at a local level to achieving system wide financial stability.

2. Locality Planning and Delivery Groups (LPDGs)

2.1 Six ESBT LPDGs were established across our ESBT localities, and have now been meeting for a year. In the last year each LPDG has met at least six times, with some meeting ten times. The six ESBT LPDGs cover Eastbourne, Hailsham, Seaford, Hastings and St Leonards, Bexhill and Rural Rother. Initially their broad remit was to:

- Influence and inform the planning and delivery of local services
- Foster closer partnerships between providers and multi-professional teams to promote the co-ordination and integration of services locally
- Oversee the quality and quantity of care and support services within a locality to deliver improved outcomes for the local community
- Determine local priorities, focussing the use of resources where it makes biggest impact
- Identify opportunities to improve access and achieve more effective outcomes for local people

2.3 Attendance has been relatively consistent across all 6 localities, including representation from primary care, voluntary sector, mental health services, housing providers and integrated locality team (ILT) managers. Since their inception, additional members have been invited to join the LPDGs including independent care providers. A wide range of additional guests have attended the meetings to inform the groups about relevant services and projects for their locality.

2.4 In addition to raising awareness of local services and projects, each LPDG has focused on some key areas of interest pertinent to their locality. Some of these include:

- Bexhill – support to care homes and community health and wellbeing hubs
- Eastbourne – working with HSCC to develop social prescribing pathways and local roll out of IROCK
- Seaford - support to young people with mental health needs and addressing frequent GP attenders
- Rother – increased awareness of what is available to local communities with a specific focus on ESCIS.
- Hastings – focusing on wider well-being services and piloting a weekly ILT-led Multi-Disciplinary Team meeting focusing on adults with a range of complex physical, mental health and social care needs resulting in a high use of services.
- Hailsham and Polegate – developing a co-ordinated approach to self-care

2.5 Towards the end of the first year of operation the LPDGs undertook a review of what has been achieved and how the groups can best utilise the progress made moving into the next year. With the exception of Hailsham who are yet to have this discussion, all LPDGs recognised the value added by the unique membership of the groups which had brought a much greater awareness of services and schemes being provided in the locality. In addition, some LPDGs felt that real progress has been made in tackling some key issues via the new contacts made. To this effect, the LPDGs have agreed to continue to meet but on a less frequent basis going forward.

2.6 As our ESBT approach evolves into a single integrated system our longer-term ambition is that the structure provided by the LPDGs, or something similar, will provide the basis for planning

around the local population's needs and local health and care market capacity. It is recognised that for this to happen we have to first further strengthen our integrated care delivery in communities, and improve our offer with GPs and others.

2.7 Membership of the LPDGs includes representatives from the voluntary and independent sector. Strong links with the emerging 'Locality Networks' (see below), have also been established as a way to bring together a broader base of local people, organisations and communities to share knowledge, insight and experience about their locality and the support provided within it. The Locality Link Worker (LLW) role has an important function as the key conduit between the two forums, as well as reaching into GP Practices.

3. Locality Networks

3.1 Locality Networks were set up in response to feedback from the Public Health Building Stronger Communities engagement process in the Autumn of 2016. As a result ESBT is divided up into six locality networks covering Eastbourne, Hailsham and Polegate, Seaford, Hastings and St Leonards, Bexhill, and Rural Rother. Delivered in partnership with the Voluntary Actions, their purpose is to provide a connection with the broader base of activity, support and services within the locality so that local needs and priorities can be identified and action taken by a variety of agencies to meet those needs. This involves sharing information and resources, building relationships and collaboration, and providing opportunities for mutual support and learning to strengthen community based services.

3.2 In August 2018 a review of the Locality Networks was undertaken to see if they were meeting their intended aim and inform how the networks could be improved. There was unanimous feedback that the network meetings were considered successful and were valued as an opportunity to network, share ideas and learning about what is happening in the local area, and build relationships, partnerships and collaborative working.

3.3 All of the networks can provide examples of positive outcomes and impacts. This ranges from large collaborative projects, such as Seaford Befriending project, to small organisations that had partnered together to provide mutual support (Hailsham Active and Battle Pathways). Some organisations had linked together to provide better services to their clients (Autism Sussex and Rye Community Garden), and many had found out about, and been successful in accessing new funding sources.

4. Next steps

4.1 The complex change to locality working includes the challenge to provide high quality support and services which are accessible, available and affordable. ESBT has recognised that transformation of services to a fully integrated health and social care economy is the best way of achieving this goal. This challenge continues to be amplified as we experience the pressure of population growth and the continuing reduction in resources available.

4.2 Given the current local focus on NHS financial pressures, and informed by the reviews undertaken by Carnall Farrar, PWC, Deloitte as well as NHS England (NHSE) and NHS Improvement jointly (NHSI), we have a clear understanding of where the best opportunities lie for system financial recovery and future system sustainability. Key to this has been reconfirming our commitment to our ESBT model of integrated community health and social care services, and our critical priority of deploying our health and care services in our localities to manage demand and patient flow.

4.3 To deliver this we are in the process of revising and resetting our ESBT plans for delivering further integration, and part of this will mean that our health and care workforce in communities is focussed on implementing the key changes needed to strengthen our integrated care delivery model. A critical part of this will also be to further strengthen our operational relationship with GPs in our localities. This will involve engaging GP colleagues collectively in a dialogue specifically focussed on how we better manage demand and patient flow together, and measure our success as a system.

4.4 The ESBT reset exercise will set out the programmes of work that will deliver measurable change over the next 6 – 18 month period. We will continue to work with our partners in General Practice on the key priorities that will make a difference to the way we systematically manage people in communities to impact on demand and flow, shifting this work into delivery of key projects as part of our reset ESBT programme for community services.

4.5 We will continue to work with our partners in the voluntary and community sector to provide opportunities for information-sharing and liaison through the Locality Networks, and the Public Health-led ESBT programme of work designed to support personal and community resilience.

4.6 As part of this, and to build on recognised achievements to date, we have now moved the Locality Link Worker role into our ASC&H Operational Division. This will ensure that the benefits of this role, in linking with local community based support and help, can be used to best effect to influence and support operational practice aimed at supporting people to be as independent as possible.

4.7 We will review our progress with implementing these objectives for our integrated health and social care model in six months' time, and our wider locality working arrangements, and take a view collectively about the value added through facilitating liaison and information sharing in localities. This will include how we might best support this going forward within our existing organisational structures and resources.

5. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

5.1 This report updates the People Scrutiny Committee on progress with locality working arrangements, and challenging ourselves to work differently in communities, to break down organisational barriers as well as free up more effective and affordable local supports and services. There is evidence that relationships have been improved with some gaps in support and service provision being addressed at the local level as a result, and we will build on these successes.

5.2 Within this, in our context of financial recovery and the challenges and opportunities identified by NHSI/E and others and in line with our ESBT reset, we will shift to a more project focussed way of working in our localities. This is with the aim of delivering the priority operational improvements to integrated community services, in partnership with General Practice, in the next 6 – 18 month timeframe as we journey towards sustainability - and measuring our success at delivering this together.

5.3 People Scrutiny Committee is asked to note and comment on the progress made to date and the need to prioritise implementing measurable improvements to integrated community services in order to support financial recovery, in partnership with General Practice and the VCS. In six months we will be in a position to review our wider locality working arrangements, and collectively agree what will add further value in managing patient flow, care coordination and proactive case management, and the contribution of our localities to achieving system wide financial sustainability.

KEITH HINKLEY
Director of Adult Social Care and Health

Contact Officer: Vicky Smith

Tel. No: 01273 48 2036

Email: vicky.smith@eastsussex.gov.uk