

Minutes of a meeting of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at County Hall, Glenfield on Wednesday, 17 September 2014.

PRESENT

Mrs. R. Camamile CC (in the Chair)

Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC
Mr. D. Jennings CC
Mr. J. Kaufman CC
Mr. P. G. Lewis CC

Ms. Betty Newton CC
Mr. A. E. Pearson CC
Mrs. C. M. Radford CC
Mr. R. Sharp CC

Attendance.

Mr. R. Blunt CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Heritage, Leisure and Arts (minutes 29 and 30 refer)

Mr. D. W. Houseman MBE CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Adult Social Care (minutes 28, 31 and 32 refer)

Ms. Fiona Barber, Healthwatch Leicestershire (minute 28 refers)

Mr. Paul Burnett, Independent Chairman of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children and Safeguarding Adults Boards (minute 27 refers)

Mr. Jamie McMahon, Labour Parliamentary Candidate for North West Leicestershire (minute 29 refers)

Dr. Brian Vollar, Chairman of 'Friends of Snibston' (minute 30 refers)

20. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

21. Question Time.

The Chief Executive reported that no questions had been received under Standing Order 35.

22. Questions asked by members under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).

Miss. H. Worman CC asked the Chairman the following question under Standing Order 7:-

“During the public consultation on the libraries issue the costs quoted for the provision of library services in Ibstock might have been misleading because two years rental of the building was used to calculate the cost of using the library.

Will the Chairman agree with me that in such a sensitive matter as this it is important to have good robust information so that communities seeking to work with the Council can plan with confidence?”

The Chairman replied as follows:-

1. The County Council seeks in all of its consultations, irrespective of sensitivity, to uphold the consultation principles it adopted in February 2014 for engaging residents, service users and stakeholders when reviewing or changing existing services, policies and commissioning arrangements or developing new ones. The principles reflect the Coalition Government's Consultation Principles, aiming to help policy makers and service managers make the right judgements about when, with whom and how to consult. The key principle is that the potential impact of the change or decision on which we consult is proportionate to the scope and type of the consultation undertaken.

The County Council seeks to be clear on what the purpose of the consultation or engagement is and what is within the scope of the consultation. We ensure that we provide the right information so that informed responses can be made. This includes making available relevant evidence underpinning the policy or service change under consideration.

2. In respect of the recent consultation on libraries and the specific issue raised regarding Ibstock Library I understand that the Lead Member for Heritage, Leisure and Arts provided an earlier response in respect of this matter as follows:

The proposals that the County Council consulted on were for the County Council to continue running the 16 most used libraries (who between them account for around 75% of usage) and to work in partnership with communities to support them to run the 36 remaining libraries.

The proposals were therefore based on usage, not on relative costs or efficiency of individual libraries. So, the proposals relating to Ibstock library were clearly not in any way based on the actual or relative costs of issuing books there – so to say we have been misleading the public is incorrect.

On the matter in question, the figure comes from information we provided, in response to requests received during the consultation, to groups potentially interested in running the library in partnership with the County Council to give them an overview of the actual running costs of providing a library in that location. For this we provided the actual financial transaction data for the most recent financial year 2013-14.

As I understand it, during 2013-14 we paid the rent for both 2013-14 and outstanding rent for previous years – which indeed leads to the rental costs shown not being reflective of annual costs. This information was clearly provided as a guide only and the accompanying guidance note makes it clear that the Council assumes it will continue paying rent where this applies, so that this anomaly would have been of little consequence to those interested in taking over Ibstock library. In any case, as soon as the figure was queried, we were able to clarify where the figure came from.

The consultation closed on 7 July 2014, and work is now underway to analyse the results of the survey, the public meetings, petitions and other responses in preparation for a decision by our Cabinet on the 19 September 2014 on the best way to proceed.

Miss. H. Worman CC asked the following supplementary question:-

"Thank you chair for your response. I am grateful for your acknowledgement that the Ibstock library figures were not quite accurate. This Committee is looking into the wider issue on how we move forward with library provision and the Cabinet is set to ask officers to review the measures used in which library's continue to receive funding.

The reply focuses on usage not on efficiency. Would the Chair not agree that cost effectiveness is a good measure and should also be used in deciding whether or not a library should continue receiving funding? "

Having been invited by the Chairman to respond to the supplementary question the Director of Adults and Communities indicated as follows:-

"The County Council is currently proposing to undertake further work on alternatives in making conclusions and will take into account the comments that have been made today."

23. To advise of any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent elsewhere on the agenda.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

24. Declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to declare any interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

No such declarations were made.

25. Declarations of the Party Whip in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16.

There were no declarations of the party whip.

26. Presentation of Petitions under Standing Order 36.

The Chief Executive reported that no petitions had been received under Standing Order 36.

27. Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children/Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2013/14.

The Committee considered a report from the Independent Chairman of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children and Adults Boards which provided members with an opportunity to scrutinise the Annual Report of the Safeguarding Children and Adults Boards and to consider any points that it wished to draw to the attention of the Cabinet.

The Chairman welcomed Paul Burnett, Independent Chairman of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children and Safeguarding Adults Boards (LRSCSAB), to the meeting for this item.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) Members commended the report which was very comprehensive and would better allow the LRSCSAB to work towards the agreed areas for improvement as outlined in the Board's Business Plan;
- (ii) Whilst there had been no response received from the Probation Service in relation to the recent Safeguarding Adults Board Compliance Audit, it was explained that the Probation Service had recently undertaken a restructure and operated across a wider area than the Leicestershire Board, covering nine Boards throughout the region. The Probation Service would issue a regional response to all nine Boards;
- (iii) The Committee noted that there had been an increase in domestic abuse. However, the County Council was seeking to reform funding in this area through Preventative Services and the Committee queried whether this would have an impact on safeguarding work. It was explained that focus would be on effectiveness of investment as opposed to the amount invested. It was noted that effectiveness did not always reflect the amount of money invested;
- (iv) The Committee queried the robustness of governance in place for the transition from Children to Adult Services. It was explained that the LRSCSAB had been combined to better align children and adult services and that work was being undertaken with young people with disabilities to ensure better transition to Adult Services. Further engagement was being sought with service users and would be fed into the Board's Business Plan;
- (v) The LRSCSAB had been engaging with PREVENT, which brought together local bodies to develop and implement effective actions to make communities safer. Working with PREVENT would better ensure that programmes interlinked. The Committee was advised that PREVENT had been responsive in working with the Board and had been invited to report to the Board on its work.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the draft Annual Report 2013/14 for the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Board be noted;
- (b) That the comments now made be drawn to the attention of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Board.

28. Annual Adult Social Care Complaints and Commendations Report 2013/14.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adults and Communities which provided a summary of the complaints and commendations for Adult Social Care Services commissioned or provided by the Adults and Communities Department in 2013/14. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 9' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr D W Houseman MBE CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Adult Social Care, for this and other items. Mr Houseman praised the report authors in producing a clear and concise document. He was pleased to note that of the 15,949 service users only 80 complaints had been upheld. It was important for officers to continue to respond to service users and their families as quickly as possible to further

improve services. The 260 commendations received was acknowledgement of the hard work of staff within the Adults and Communities Department.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms Fiona Barber, Healthwatch Leicestershire, for this and other items. Ms Barber commended the report which had built on the work that had been undertaken in the previous year. She noted that there was some discrepancy between the number of complaints received from the districts per 100,000 people and there was a need to better understand how complainants felt about the robustness of the complaints system.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Committee welcomed the report and the level of accessible data provided. Members expressed their appreciation to staff within the Adults and Communities Department for their efforts under increasingly difficult circumstances and reduced resources;
- (ii) It was noted that the number of complaints had gone up year on year since 2007 whilst the number of service users had remained largely consistent. This was due to increased pressure on adult social care which was a national issue that needed to be addressed. The Committee suggested that information on overall service users for previous years and a breakdown of complaints by district would allow for a better understanding of complaints received. Officers would undertake to include this information in next year's report;
- (iii) It was noted that Community Care charging had accounted for 25% of all complaints and were also the most likely to be upheld. It was explained that problems had been experienced with inaccurate data which had led to inaccurate invoices being generated. A number of actions were now being progressed to generate improvements in this area. A new computer system had now been installed which would link to Field Work Teams and the Customer Service Centre (CSC) to ensure information was more joined up and accurate;
- (iv) Where there was a complaint made against an external provider this would be dealt with by the provider in the first instance. The County Council would only get involved where a complainant was not satisfied with the response received. The provider retained ownership of the complaint but it could be reviewed by the County Council or the Care Quality Commission (CQC) where it was a compliance issue.

RESOLVED:

That the Annual Adult Social Care Complaints and Commendations Report 2013/14 be noted.

29. Outcome of the Consultation on Proposals for Changes in the Delivery of Library Services.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adults and Communities to be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 19 September 2014. The report set out the outcome of a consultation on proposed changes to the delivery of library services in Leicestershire required to make the necessary savings in line with the Medium Term

Financial Strategy (MTFS) and sought approval from the Cabinet regarding the way forward. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes, marked 'agenda item 10'.

The Committee's attention was drawn to a typing error within Appendix H of the report, 'Summary of stakeholder comments'. Under 'Councillor Nick Brown, Leader of Braunstone Town Council', in the notes section it stated "30 out of 38 agree with this resolution to oppose the proposal at annual town meeting". The 30 should have read 38 as the decision was unanimous.

The Chairman noted that the Committee had received written representations from a number of stakeholders regarding the consultation. Copies of these representations having been circulated to members of the Committee are appended to these minutes, as follows:-

- An alternative proposal for the reorganisation of Leicestershire Libraries – Cllr Stan Coates and Mountsorrel Heritage Group;
- Comments on the Proposals from:–
 - a. Linda Marshall, Chair of Governors Fleckney CE Primary School;
 - b. Geoffrey Smith, Trustee of the Old Quorn School; and
 - c. Jamie McMahon, Labour Parliamentary Candidate for North West Leicestershire.
- Letter and Petition containing 32 signatures from members of Enderby U3A Group;
- Submissions for Desford and Markfield Community Libraries – Mr D A Sprason CC, Local Member.

With regard to the two submissions from Desford and Markfield, the Director advised that it was the County Council's view that these could not be regarded as Expressions of Interest since they did not meet all of the requirements of the statutory guidance, under the Localism Act, but that the Council would, as already stated in the report, continue to work with those who made the submissions and report back to the Cabinet in November.

With the consent of the Chairman, Jamie McMahon, Parliamentary Candidate for North West Leicestershire, addressed the Committee.

Mr McMahon welcomed the proposal in the Cabinet report to undertake further work on the proposed changes including responding to the challenge about the basis used to identify the 16 main libraries. Mr McMahon advised that as a result of the current proposals four out six libraries in North West Leicestershire were at risk of closure. He urged the local communities in Measham, Ibstock, Castle Donington and Kegworth to use the proposed further time available to work with the Council to protect and improve their libraries.

The Chairman thanked Mr McMahon for his contribution.

Mr. R. Blunt CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Heritage, Leisure and Arts thanked all those who had participated during the consultation. He was delighted with the level of public interest already expressed in becoming involved in running community libraries. Noting the range of opinions and the issues raised during the consultation, he would be requesting the Cabinet to allow additional time for more detailed consideration before coming back to the Cabinet in November. This included:

- the commissioning of an independent organisation, Red Quadrant, to report on the implications of the challenges made to the rationale for proposing full council funding for 16 libraries;
- receiving the advice of a Scrutiny Review Panel on the infrastructure support package for communities who would wish to manage their libraries;
- further work to be undertaken by officers to consider the suggestions made during the consultation before presenting a final model to the Cabinet at its meeting in November.

He went on to advise the Committee that having visited both Warwickshire CC and Hammersmith and Fulham library services recently, which had both implemented a community library model, he had received feedback that the County Council offer was a generous one. Further engagement with community groups in exploring the local running of their library service would be undertaken once the community library model and infrastructure support package had been agreed.

Arising from discussion the following points were noted:-

- i) Members understood the need for the proposed reduction in opening hours across the 16 major libraries in order to help meet the required MTFs savings and welcomed the fact that an Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment had set out an improvement plan to mitigate any impact that a reduction in opening hours may have on the identified protected groups within the report;
- ii) Some members had received feedback during the consultation that community groups had found it difficult to progress their proposals initially due to a lack of detail in the proposed infrastructure offer. It was therefore pleasing to note that a Scrutiny Review Panel was proposed to look at this in greater detail and report back to both this Committee and Cabinet in November;
- iii) The remit of the Panel would include consideration of how the proposed infrastructure model could be designed so as to recognise the range of community groups and the differing support requirements that were likely to come forward. There was no intention for a 'one size fits all' model but that any variances to the infrastructure proposals would need to be within the defined parameters and ensure delivery of the required MTFs savings. It was noted that interest had already been expressed by communities looking to manage their individual libraries, but also from groups of communities wishing to explore a federation model which could help in the obtaining of external funding;
- iv) A number of members commented that the remit of the Scrutiny Review Panel should be extended. The Committee was advised that the scope of the Panel was discussed with the Scrutiny Commissioners following a discussion at the Transformation Board.

The Scrutiny Committee welcomed the fact that a number of community groups had already entered into discussions with the County Council and hoped that all 36 communities containing smaller, mainly rural libraries would seize the opportunity for continued engagement with the County Council on this matter.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the outcome of the consultation and its findings, together with representations received at the meeting, be noted;
- b) That the representations and views now made by the Committee be reported to the Cabinet, including that:
 - i) support be given to the establishment of a Scrutiny Review Panel to review the proposed infrastructure support package for communities wishing to operate community libraries;
 - ii) the proposal for officers to undertake further work to consider the suggestions made during the consultation, including a response to the challenge raised about the basis for identifying the 16 main libraries and to present a final model to the Cabinet at its meeting in November for consideration, be welcomed;
 - iii) the proposed 20% reduction in opening hours across 16 major libraries and shopping centre libraries, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted.

30. Snibston.

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Adults and Communities and the Director of Corporate Resources to be considered by the Cabinet on 19 September. The report outlined the outcome and issues arising from the consultation on the future of Snibston, attached two business plans put forward and provided further information on the County Council's offer for Snibston. The report sought approval from the Cabinet to undertake work to allow the Cabinet to be in a position to take decisions on the future of Snibston at its meeting in December 2014. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman noted that the Committee had received written representations from the Local Member, Dr T Eynon CC, a copy of which was circulated to members of the Committee and is appended to these minutes.

The Chairman then invited the Chairman of 'Friends of Snibston', Dr Brian Vollar, to provide a brief submission on the matter.

Dr Vollar congratulated the County Council in presenting the outcomes of the consultation and recommending that a decision on the future of Snibston be delayed to allow consideration to be given to the business plans put forward by the 'Friends of Snibston' and Mr Suleman, Director of Resources at the Derby Museum Trust. He also drew attention to an open letter that had been signed by 1000 visitors to the Snibston museum at the recent miners' gala which had been addressed to the Leader of the County Council, urging the County Council to abandon proposals to close the museum and assist the 'Friends of Snibston' in developing their alternative proposals put forward. He noted that the business plans put forward would now be subjected to formal assessment under submissions of interest put forward under the Community Right to Challenge, as outlined in the Localism Act 2011. However, he was concerned about the terms of the transfer of the site and assets as outlined in the report. He hoped that the County Council would work with the 'Friends of Snibston' to assist them in developing a sustainable and cost effective solution.

The Cabinet Lead Member for Heritage, Leisure and Arts, Mr R Blunt CC, thanked Dr Vollar for his comments and the work that had been undertaken by 'Friends of Snibston'. The decision on the future of Snibston was very complex and, as such, the Cabinet was being asked to grant more time to allow officers to consider all the proposals put forward before any decision be made. He emphasised that any solution agreed for Snibston would need to be viable and sustainable in the long term and hence it was necessary for all parties to be clear of the terms of the transfer.

During the discussion some members of the Committee expressed concern about the process hitherto and reference was made to the work that had been commissioned from external consultants, Winckworth Sherwood and subsequently not made public. It was claimed that this had given an impression that the County Council was not willing to consider or support alternative proposals. It was however recognised that the report now being considered had a different tone and it appeared to recognise the need to work with the 'Friends of Snibston' and look at alternatives and this was to be welcomed. Some members expressed the view that there might be merit in engaging an independent person, preferably from another authority to provide external assurance. The Chairman and a number of members disagreed with the comments above, commenting that this questioned the integrity and professionalism of officers.

The Director and Cabinet Lead Member advised the Committee that:

- (i) The Council would work with the 'Friends of Snibston' and Mr Suleman to get a better understanding of the proposals and provide clarity of the requirements of the County Council. It was important to ensure any proposal to run Snibston was financially viable in the long term;
- (ii) The proposals in the report would also see officers continuing to develop the Council's proposed option in parallel so that when the matter was considered again by the Cabinet an informed decision could be taken;
- (iii) With regard to the issue of external assurance it was reported that the business plans were currently being evaluated and, if considered appropriate, external advice would be sought.

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Mr Jennings:

- (a) That the outcome of the consultation be noted;
- (b) That the receipt of the business plans submitted by the Director of Resources at Derby Museum Trust and the Friends of Snibston be noted and that support be given to the further consideration to whether these should be treated as Expressions of Interests (EOIs) under the Localism Act (Community Right to Challenge);
- (c) That the Committee supports the following further recommendations in the report to the Cabinet authorising officers to undertake the following actions so that a detailed report can be prepared for consideration by the Cabinet in December on the way forward for Snibston:-
 - i. an assessment of the business plans put forward against the statutory framework of the Localism Act and any further work or information that would be needed in relation to these business plans in light of the requirements of the Community Right to Challenge;

- ii. a feasibility study and any early necessary action needed to implement the Council's proposed offer including any revisions that might be required as a result of the consultation responses;
- iii. an Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment in relation to the Council's offer and the business plans now submitted;
- iv. the implications of either option on the collections currently on display and in storage at the Snibston site including proposals for the future management of those collections.

An amendment was moved by Mr Charlesworth and seconded by Mr Kaufman:

That the following be added to the motion:-

"d) That an independent person be sought from another authority to provide external assurance in the consideration of the alternative proposals submitted for Snibston."

The amendment was not carried, four members voting for the amendment and four against.

The motion was put, four members voting for the motion and four against. The Chairman exercised her second and casting vote in favour of the motion. The motion was carried

(The Committee was advised that in line with normal practice the contents of the amendment above, which was not carried, would be drawn to the attention of the Cabinet.)

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the outcome of the consultation be noted;
- (b) That the receipt of the business plans submitted by the Director of Resources at Derby Museum Trust and the Friends of Snibston be noted and that support be given to the further consideration to whether these should be treated as Expressions of Interests (EOIs) under the Localism Act (Community Right to Challenge);
- (d) That the Committee supports the following further recommendations in the report to the Cabinet authorising officers to undertake the following actions so that a detailed report can be prepared for consideration by the Cabinet in December on the way forward for Snibston:-
 - i. an assessment of the business plans put forward against the statutory framework of the Localism Act and any further work or information that would be needed in relation to these business plans in light of the requirements of the Community Right to Challenge;
 - ii. a feasibility study and any early necessary action needed to implement the Council's proposed offer including any revisions that might be required as a result of the consultation responses;

- iii. an Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment in relation to the Council's offer and the business plans now submitted;
- iv. the implications of either option on the collections currently on display and in storage at the Snibston site including proposals for the future management of those collections.

31. Outcome of the Consultation on the Strategic Review of Preventative Services in Leicestershire.

The Committee considered a joint report of the Directors of Adults and Communities, Children and Family Services and Public Health to be considered by the Cabinet on 19 September which outlined the responses to the consultation on the proposed Adults and Communities secondary prevention offer for Leicestershire. The report also sought approval from the Cabinet for the revised offer and co-development of service specifications for the new services. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 12' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman noted that the Committee had received written representations from a number of stakeholders regarding the consultation. Copies of these representations received from the following were circulated to members of the Committee and are appended to these minutes:-

- The Leicestershire County Council Labour Group;
- Mr L Yates CC;
- Shaw Healthcare;
- Residents at Beresford Court.

The Cabinet Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Mr D W Houseman MBE CC, advised the Committee that Preventative Services remained a priority for the County Council and it was seeking to deliver a more focused offer at a reduced cost by providing more unified services and having better integration locally with NHS partners through the Better Care Fund (BCF). He also drew attention to the revised investment for visual impairment which would include the Statutory Sight Register and Specialist Rehabilitation provision that would target those at most risk. Further consideration was also being undertaken with the current provider to ensure the continuation of the Talking Newspaper service beyond its current contract end date of September 2015.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) There was some concern expressed that the level of funding associated with the proposed new model for Preventatives Services would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the community and that the amount of savings outlined could restrict service providers in the level of services that they could deliver and put increased pressure on other organisations such as the NHS. It was explained that the level of funding provided to the County Council was being reduced and, as such, savings had to be identified;
- (ii) Through the consultation and other engagement exercises the County Council was working with key providers to ensure that the new offer for Preventative Services would be deliverable and any associated risks would be minimised. Where the Council did not directly deliver a service it was reliant on providers to provide information to service users and encourage participation in the consultation. The

County Council would undertake to monitor and analyse new service arrangements once in place to ensure effectiveness of new arrangements;

- (iii) The County Council was keen to ensure that providers remained able to deliver services. However, it was recognised that organisations would need to identify alternative funding streams and become more entrepreneurial and self-sustainable in their approach to funding. The Adults and Communities Department was also seeking to identify opportunities to jointly commission services with other departments within the County Council to make better use of resources and ensure a more joined up approach to service provision;
- (iv) It was explained that regulations in relation to the commissioning of smaller projects had changed and there was a need for the County Council to get the right balance between commissioning different sized providers whilst still maintaining best value for money for the Council. The County Council had a large number of contracts with external providers which would need to be managed efficiently to reduce costs;
- (v) Members expressed concern at the length of time that some homeless people remained living at hostels and the future level of funding for homelessness support. It was explained that this issue was proposed to be addressed through implementation of a new model for homelessness support. The District Councils were key partners in working with the County Council to tackle homelessness and would be involved in the shaping of services moving forward;
- (vi) The Committee was advised that identifying the current level of funding for lunch clubs was difficult due to costs being based on the number of people who attended individual sessions in some cases. All current contracts for lunch clubs would cease in 2015 and providers would have to apply for a further two years of funding from a reduced pool available. Engagement had been undertaken with social groups that provided lunch clubs in the form of emails and letters, in addition to a number of lunch clubs being visited by representatives of the Department. Mr Charlesworth CC advised that Age Concern Oadby and Wigston had not received any notification of proposed changes from the County Council. The Director reported that all key contacts should have received communications and undertook to look in to this issue outside of the meeting;
- (vii) It was noted that a number of members had received representations from Vista in relation to the future commissioning of visual impairment services. In light of the issues raised, proposals had been revised and £160,000 would now be allocated to fund specialist visual impairment and dual sensory impairment provision. Specialist equipment services previously provided by Vista would now be delivered in house by the County Council.

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Mr Jennings:

- a) That the outcome of the strategic review of the Adults and Communities Department's secondary prevention services, including results of formal public consultation and the risks highlighted, be noted;
- b) That the recommendations to the Cabinet be supported in authorising the Director of Adults and Communities to implement the proposed prevention offer as set out in the report;

- c) Subject to b) above, that this Committee supports the further Cabinet recommendations for the procurement process for the proposed secondary prevention offer to commence as soon as practicable with a view to new service delivery starting no later than 1 October 2015.

The motion was put, four members voting for the motion and four against. The Chairman exercised her second and casting vote in favour of the motion. The motion was carried

RESOLVED:

- a) That the outcome of the strategic review of the Adults and Communities Department's secondary prevention services, including results of formal public consultation and the risks highlighted, be noted;
- b) That the recommendations to the Cabinet be supported in authorising the Director of Adults and Communities to implement the proposed prevention offer as set out in the report;
- c) Subject to b) above, that this Committee supports the further Cabinet recommendations for the procurement process for the proposed secondary prevention offer to commence as soon as practicable with a view to new service delivery starting no later than 1 October 2015.

32. Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework Performance Report 2013/14.

The Committee considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Adults and Communities which provided an update on adult social care performance during 2013/14 measured against national performance as set out in the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 13' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Committee noted that performance indicators in the bottom or third quartile would be of particular focus during 2014/15 performance monitoring and queried how the Adults and Communities Department would seek to improve these areas. It was explained that the majority of the areas that were performing poorly were listed under Domain 2 'Delaying and reducing need for care and support'. Poor performance in this area had been driven by pressure on the NHS, specifically University Hospitals of Leicester (UHL), and had resulted in the slow development of care packages. Issues were being addressed in partnership with NHS colleagues through the Better Care Fund (BCF);
- (ii) The indicators outlined in the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF) were central to the work of the Department and linked to the priorities of the BCF. The Committee would be able to track County Council performance against ASCOF indicators through the quarterly performance reports that it received.

RESOLVED:

That the update on adult social care performance during 2013/14 be noted.

33. Date of next meeting.

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 4 November at 2.00pm.

[The meeting was subsequently re-scheduled to take place on 17 November at 2.00pm]

2.00 - 5.35 pm
17 September 2014

CHAIRMAN