



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY  
COMMISSION  
ADDENDUM**

**4.00PM, TUESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2010**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
51.	SUMMARY OF OSC INTELLIGENT COMMISSIONING WORKSHOP HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2010	1 - 6
52.	REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF THE IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS	7 - 60
55.	HALF-YEARLY PROGRESS SUMMARY ON THE 2008-11 LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT AND Q2 ORGANISATIONAL HEALTH REPORT	61 - 104



### **Intelligent Commissioning Pilots: Notes of OSC Workshop**

Tuesday 7 December 2010 Jubilee Library Committee Room 1

Councillors Present: Gill Mitchell, Brian Pidgeon, Jayne Bennett, Denise Cobb, Vicky Wakefield-Jarrett and Anne Meadows

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Commissioner, Community Safety (OSC) introduced the Workshop which had been arranged as agreed at 19 October Overview and Scrutiny Commission (OSC) (Item 39).
2. The workshop was an opportunity for Scrutiny Members to comment on the needs assessment and service mapping work to date on the three Intelligent Commissioning Pilots Drug-Related Deaths, Domestic Violence and Alcohol-related Harm. Three full reports had been circulated to the Workshop delegates.
3. The pilot needs analysis and service mapping had now been further developed; both as the basis for commissioning services in the three areas 'for real' from April 2011 and also to inform the framework as a whole for Intelligent Commissioning. Learning from the Pilots will be used by other services across the local authority.
4. The next stages would be to develop outcomes from the analysis work and to make recommendations for commissioning linked with the local authority budget cycle. Scrutiny would have an opportunity to make recommendations on these stages; a report would be brought to 1 February OSC.
5. Powerpoint presentations were made for each of the three areas by Graham Stevens, Co-ordinator, Drugs and Alcohol Advisory Team (DAAT), Eleri Butler (Project Manager, Commissioning Pilots) and Linda Beanlands (Commissioner, Community Safety)
6. Asked about the information already been available on existing services, the Commissioner Community Safety told the workshop that data was collected and the effectiveness of individual services was routinely monitored, although not in as coordinated and consistent a way. As it progressed the Intelligent Commissioning cycle would allow for a more holistic view.

#### **1. DRUG-RELATED DEATHS**

The DAAT Coordinator gave a detailed Powerpoint presentation (circulated to OSC Members) and made additional points in answering questions:

- a) National data was from two sources which adopted different definitions. The Office of National Statistics Needs assessment information was currently based on 2007 figures and would be updated as soon as possible.

## AGENDA ITEM 51

- b) The apparent rise between 2008 and 2009 in the number of drug-related deaths in the City, from 44 to 50, was not out of line with the national trend
- c) One reason for the 'populations at risk' (eg those leaving prison, leaving treatment) could be a lower tolerance to drugs or lower judgement in measuring doses.
- d) The City has a relatively high number of people injecting drugs. Taking into account the large number of injection incidents per day the risks to drug users in the City are large.
- e) Key evidence had been heard by the Dual Diagnosis scrutiny review and is being used in the development of the citywide dual diagnosis strategy.
- f) Treatment services provide good interventions; there is a question on how to retain individuals in appropriate services, reduce the number of relapses and how to track the success of an intervention after exit.
- g) Training for staff in overdose aid is important in helping save lives.
- h) The Harm Reduction group is producing a treatment action plan.
- i) The risks of misuse of drugs needs to be well communicated; management of media is key.
- j) Information from Police, Ambulance Service and Coroners Office are rich source of data to inform preventive measures. Useful websites are listed in the presentation
- k) The needs assessment process has taken 3 months, and has been reported to the Public Service Board. It has been subject to public consultation and challenge with Community and Voluntary Sector involvement.
- l) Nationally there appears to be a rise in the number of drug-related deaths among the 40 – 49 and over-65s age groups but the reasons for this are unclear.
- m) Homelessness was formerly a significant factor in drug-related deaths but is less so now.
- n) Users entering treatment services are assessed and this information is also used to help identify risk factors and inform outreach. Information at Year 9 in schools is important.

The Commissioner, Community Safety noted that Domestic Violence is also known to trigger drug and alcohol misuse. So the Pilots have allowed an interlinking of the 3 pilot areas. This research can be translated to the commissioning recommendations.

### 2. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Project Manager gave a detailed Powerpoint presentation (circulated to OSC Members) and answered questions on the needs assessment and service mapping regarding domestic violence (DV).

- a) DV is a cause and consequence of inequalities.
- b) Data sets had been provided by all statutory services; there had been consultation with CVSF, professionals and individuals, and Local Action Teams.
- c) Analysis of national and local data on DV was a challenge because the available information is not aligned with definitions. The British Crime Survey information had limitations and included only incidents reported to Police.
- d) There are significant gaps in data and under-reporting by victims. Individuals at risk of becoming victims are less likely to be known by agencies.
- e) Victims of DV are more likely to use alcohol and 50% of women contacting health services have experienced DV.
- f) Attitudes (especially children's) can be reinforced in the media that can give the impression that DV is 'OK'
- g) Children in Need funding for awareness and prevention programmes in schools had ended, though this was still a priority.
- h) Few agencies know the disaggregated costs of providing DV services. Members remarked on the high estimated costs of DV crimes and incidents; which do not include preventive measures.
- i) There are significant potential links between child abuse and DV. Leaving an abusive relationship can increase, not reduce, the level of violence.
- j) Early intervention is key and workplaces could be used more, for raising awareness of DV.
- k) DV victims and perpetrators have complex needs; services need to look more at areas of links and gaps in provision.

The Commissioner of Community Safety told the workshop that historically services had not recorded the relationship between DV and alcohol.

This was a pilot 'for real' in its own area as well as a pilot for the framework for Intelligent Commissioning as a whole. Commissioning recommendations were being developed; it was a challenge to fit the process into the budget-setting cycle.

### 3. ALCOHOL-RELATED HARM

- a) The detailed presentation from the Commissioner, Community Safety gave the changing patterns in the availability of alcohol, estimates of the levels of consumption of alcohol, health consequences, crime and disorder and service interventions (see presentation circulated to Members of OSC).
- b) The Commissioner said that data from Primary Care Trust and Public Health sources was rather robust but otherwise there were areas where data is uncertain, incomplete, inconsistent or unavailable, eg trends in licensed premises and flagging of alcohol/ drugs in cases of crime and disorder.
- c) Alcohol in pregnancy, plus links between misuse of alcohol and child protection cases, children calling Childline, nature of parenting and DV are some of the major issues for children and families.
- d) There is a national trend in alcohol-related deaths at an earlier age. Chronic liver disease is worse in the City than the national average.
- e) Interventions were already doing excellent work but there were challenges in early identification, remodelling services and developing skills. Different types of intervention were still being investigated to inform commissioning
- f) The Alcohol Programme Board is chaired by the PCT Chief Executive and work was in progress on four strategy domain groups; prevention, availability, nighttime economy, and early identification/effective treatment and aftercare. Commissioning recommendations would then be brought forward.
- g) There were discussions on how to prevent offending and reduce alcohol abuse, and how drinking habits are developed. The workshop heard that introduction of alcohol to children at a young age did not necessarily reduce harm. Rather it did seem, that the later the onset of drinking alcohol; the less likelihood of serious harm.
- h) Members made suggestions on how a cultural shift could be achieved and discussed minimum pricing, working with retail outlets, licensing powers, and providing healthier activities such as accessible sports and entertainments.

The evidence base on alcohol-related harm needed to be as high-quality as possible and this would take time.

## **AGENDA ITEM 51**

Work was being done to try to gather more information on the resources currently being deployed across the city, to inform the next stage of decision-making. This included cross-referencing for example with the Childrens' Service review. Continuity of investment was also being considered.



**Subject:** **Scrutiny Panel report on the Societal Impact of the In-Year Grant Reductions**

**Date of Meeting:** **14 December 2010**

**Report of:** **Strategic Director of Resources**

**Contact Officer:** Name: Tom Hook Tel: 29-1110

E-mail: Tom.hook@brighton-hove.gov.uk

**Wards Affected:** All

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Commission established a scrutiny panel to investigate the societal impact of the in-year grant reductions following the emergency budget announced by the Government in June 2010
- 1.2 The Scrutiny Panel members were: Councillor David Watkins (Chair), and Councillors Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett.
- 1.3 The Scrutiny Panel report is included as **Appendix 1** to this report.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That Members endorse the Scrutiny Panel report on the Societal Impact of the In-Year Budget Reductions.

**3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Panel held two meetings. Members heard from the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum and from senior officers and budget holders in all the service areas affected by the in-year grant reductions.
- 3.2 Whilst service areas were affected in different ways by the in-year reductions depending on their circumstances the Panel did identify areas of common concern and good practice, in addition to experience with individual funding streams on which to base their recommendations.
- 3.3 The full report and recommendations forms **Appendix 1** to this report.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 A draft version of the report has been circulated to various officers.

#### **5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

##### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The Panel's recommendations relate to funding reductions.

##### Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are none directly for the Overview and Scrutiny Commission

##### Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 The Panel received two completed Equality Impact Assessments relating to the grant reductions; Free Swimming and School Improvement. A key recommendation of the Panel is that EIAs be routinely published with budget papers.

##### Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 None directly for Overview and Scrutiny Commission

##### Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 None directly for the Overview and Scrutiny Commission

##### Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 The Panel makes a recommendation on risk and opportunity management implications.

##### Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 The Panel has highlighted areas of good practice and concern to help inform future spending decisions.

#### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

##### **Appendices:**

1. Scrutiny Panel report on the Societal Impact of the In-Year Grant Reductions

##### **Documents in Members' Rooms:**

1. None

##### **Background Documents:**

1. None.

**APPENDIX 1**



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**Report of the Scrutiny Panel**

**Date: December 2010**

**The Societal Impact  
of the In-Year Grant Reductions**

**Panel Members**

**Councillor David Watkins (Chair)  
Councillor Gill Mitchell  
Councillor Vicky Wakefield-Jarrett**

**Councillor David Watkins  
Chair of the Scrutiny Panel**

## **Chairman's Foreword**

In undertaking this investigation into the Societal Impact of the In-Year Grant Reductions, we were aware that the funding decisions had to be made quickly, with little time to assess fully, the potential impacts of all the possible combinations of funding options.

But we wanted to draw on this experience of an unexpected in-year cut, to take a look at the general process of making funding decisions, to see how impacts of changes in services can be assessed, and to better understand what practical preparations could be made to help deal with future reductions in the context of the new commissioning model.

The circumstances of each of the affected funding streams were generally quite different although we identified areas of common concern and good practice. We have used these to develop our findings and recommendations regarding: early consultations with stakeholders, prioritising and understanding the outcomes of funding, strong partnership working, reporting of equalities impact assessments and risk management consultation, monitoring impacts of changing budgets and close working with the Community and Voluntary Sector.

On behalf of the Panel I would like to thank all the officers and especially the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum who gave their evidence.

## Contents

List of Recommendations .....	5
1. Introduction to the Scrutiny Review.....	5
2. National and Local Context.....	6
3. Practical Preparations.....	7
4. Options for Coping with Budget Reductions .....	8
5. Prioritisation .....	8
6. Consultation and Communications .....	9
7. Advantages of Close Partnership Working .....	10
8. Summary of Findings.....	11
9. Recommendations .....	13
10. Appendices	
A) Chronology of events	
B) 22 July 2010 Cabinet report	
C) Minutes from public meeting 1	
D) Community and Voluntary Sector Forum written submission	
E) Minutes from public meeting 2	

## **List of Recommendations**

1. The Panel recommends that where service changes are proposed early and clear consultation with service users, employees and partners is ensured.
2. The Panel recommends that where not already in existence a clear understanding of priorities for and outcomes of, funding are available for all services. These should be reviewed regularly.
3. The Panel welcomes the strong partnership evident across the city and beyond and recommends that creative ways of strengthening sustainable partnership working on changing budgets be developed.
4. The Panel recommends that Equality Impact Assessments be undertaken for all major budgetary decisions and published as a matter of routine with budget papers. Risk and opportunity management consultation should also be reported.
5. The Panel recommends that the ongoing and longer term impacts of budget reductions should be monitored. The Council and partners need to agree a way to ensure that the impacts of changing budgets are understood.
6. The Panel recommends closer working with the CVSF to help improve dialogue between organisations linked to delivering the SCS priorities.

### **1. Introduction to Scrutiny Review**

- 1.1 The Government announcement of its emergency budget in June 2010 and the rapid in-year budget cuts this necessitated within the Council resulted in the Overview and Scrutiny Commission establishing a panel to look at the societal impact of the in-year budget reductions.
- 1.2 Councillors Watkins (Chairman), Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett served on the Panel, which held two public meetings to hear from senior council officers and the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum (CVSF).
- 1.3 The scrutiny panel focussed on the societal impacts only of the specific grants affected by the 2010/11 in-year grant reductions announced in summer 2010. Arrangements for scrutiny recommendations to Cabinet on the 2011/12 budget proposals will be made as in previous years via the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the Overview and Scrutiny Commission.

- 1.4 Whilst service areas were affected in different ways by the in-year reductions depending on their circumstances the Panel did identify areas of common concern and good practice, in addition to experience with individual funding streams on which to base their recommendations.
- 1.5 The Panel have deliberately undertaken a short focused review in order to ensure recommendations can be considered in time for the 2011/12 budget development process.
- 1.6 The Panel heard evidence from the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum and budget holders on the grants subject to in-year cuts including:
- Department for Education (Connexions, School Improvement, Extended Schools, Playbuilder, subsequently re-instated)
  - Road Safety
  - Local Transport Plan programme capital funding
  - Supporting People Administration
  - Home Office funding and Prevent
  - Housing & Planning Delivery
  - Free Swimming

## **2. National and Local Context**

- 2.1 A £6.2 billion national saving for 2010/11 was announced in an emergency budget in May 2010 as a first step to tackle the national budget deficit. Of this Local Government would contribute some £1.2 billion through reductions in government grants. Further significant steps towards reducing government borrowing were anticipated in the comprehensive spending review.
- 2.2 An announcement of grants reductions by government during the course of a financial year had been unprecedented. It presented significant challenges to the council and partners, not least the timescale within which cuts had to be agreed.
- 2.3 Looking ahead, unexpected mid-year reductions are thought unlikely to recur to the same extent. However most of the existing 120 or so grants currently received by the Council are expected to be merged giving Local Authorities more flexibility with additional responsibility in deciding how the money will be spent.
- 2.4 For Brighton & Hove City Council the in-year reduction in revenue and capital grant funding was around £3.8 million. In common with other local authorities, the Council had to make the in-year spending reductions quickly in order to protect its financial position.

- 2.5 The decisions on implementing the reductions locally were broadly in line with national funding cuts starting from the premise that (unless demonstrated otherwise) where funding had stopped or reduced, the service would be stopped or reduced accordingly.

### **3. Practical preparations**

- 3.1 Most grants are for a time-limited period so in many instances there would have been some thinking around managing with a reduced grant at some future time. In some service areas reductions in local authority funding had been anticipated well in advance, for example this was the case for the Planning Delivery Grant.
- 3.2 Other areas services have been developing alternative service models that will allow a smooth transition following grant removal. This can be seen in the evidence presented by the school improvement team; the removal of funding will merely speed up an existing direction of travel.
- 3.3 The Panel heard that a great deal of work was done on analysing grant funding streams in the period prior to the decision on the in-year grant reductions. Members heard that 90% of CVSF areas of concern as identified by the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum were protected.
- 3.4 Members were told by a number of witnesses that the tight timescales meant that it was not practicable to assess every single funding option and potential impact in the time available on this occasion. There were early discussions with partners when the initial announcements were made (see appendix 1) and the Panel received a summary of Adult Social Care and Housing budget information as an example.
- 3.5 The general approach taken across the council was that unless otherwise prioritised funding reductions for specific grants were kept within specific funding streams. If a grant was cut then the activity stopped, unless deemed a priority, or if alternative funding could be found.
- 3.6 Members heard some examples of action taken prior to 22 July Cabinet, aimed for instance at prioritising front-line services, identifying groups that may be disproportionately affected by cuts particularly in more than one service area, or ameliorating some of the impacts of cuts:
- Developing trust and transparency with communities about sources and aims and objectives of funding to encourage continuity despite service reduction (Prevent)

- Producing Equality Impact Assessments for affected service areas (School improvement, swimming)
  - Agreeing with partners on evidence-based ‘core business’ (Sussex Safer Roads Partnership)
  - Bringing key functions/posts within core budget (Housing and Planning Delivery Grant)
  - Voluntary contributions (by Football Association, Highways Authority to SSRP)
- 3.6 In future reports on proposals for funding reductions the Panel would like to see more evidence of the internal Risk and Opportunity Management consultations taking place.

#### **4. Options for coping with budget reductions**

- 4.1 Panel Members were given examples of how grant reductions could be dealt with:
- Contingency planning
  - Bidding regularly for additional funding
  - Look for ‘softer’ areas where resources might be found or investment deferred between years
  - Bring forward cuts where provision was due to shortly expire
  - Sources of additional income e.g. increasing the scope of speed awareness courses
  - Working with partner organisations e.g. free school sessions
  - Absorb cuts within the full service (Supporting People administration)
  - Utilising existing reserves
  - Reduced but continuing service
  - Ensuring flexibility exists within budgets

#### **5. Prioritisation**

- 5.1 A key thread throughout all of the evidence presented was the need to have clearly identified priorities, for instance whether it is a statutory requirement, or delivers a priority in the Sustainable Community Strategy. Notable examples presented to the Panel were:
- Agreed and ranked priorities with regular review and annual update within the CDRP
  - Revisit ‘partnership core business’, the SSRP took 4 – 5 review meetings June – August
  - Collect evidence to inform prioritisation within a partnership e.g. the SSRP

- Importance of a robust needs analysis
- 5.2 Experience from the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum described to the Panel showed that prioritisation of services can be informed by:
1. Reviewing the monitoring information on the particular service:
    - Assessing the full value of the outputs/outcomes of services, some of which may not be apparent 'on the surface'
    - Assessing the potential impact of cuts – the wider implications may be more far-reaching than they appear e.g. as a result of a domino- effect, especially regarding preventive work
    - Completing an Equalities Impact Assessment
    - Considering the impact on the most vulnerable communities
  2. Information from service providers and service users about:
    - Understanding of outcomes to investment; what services actually do for the level of resources they receive
    - Inputs ; any additional funding levered in, match funding or in-kind support; potential for charging for service provision
    - Outcome chains of the service within the particular organisation e.g. resources pulled in from across the organisation's projects and staff
    - Impact of reduction, eg where the removal of one worker may lead to a reduction in number of hours a centre may be open and the consequences to service users
    - Impact on core running costs of the organisation that may be disproportionately cut – e.g. future viability of the organisation
    - Potential for rationalisation and collaboration across fund holders

## **6. Consultation and Communications**

- 6.1 Evidence presented clearly highlighted that where clear consistent communication between partners existed it was easier to agree priority services and ameliorate budget cuts.
- 6.2 However the Panel also recognised that in cases communication and consultation can be fraught with difficulties. Evidence regarding Connexions highlighted the balancing act needed between being transparent and consulting well with causing unnecessary stress based on rumours and misunderstanding.
- 6.3 Moving to a commissioning system is likely to result in an increase in the number of services delivered externally or in partnership. The Council

should therefore be clear as to its responsibility regarding what is a statutory service, how TUPE and transfers of ownership issues are to be handled and how best to negotiate service changes between organisations. Sufficient expertise needs to exist within the council to facilitate these responsibilities.

- 6.4 Evidence that inconsistent messages had caused confusion regarding Connexions concerned the panel. There was an understanding that commercial confidentiality and contract difficulties especially re TUPE, had further complicated the message regarding Connexions.
- 6.5 Panel Members felt that clearer and public guidance was required the timing for consultations on proposals for service changes. This should be spelt out during decision making process for budgetary changes.
- 6.6 As part of the process of assessing the impact of cuts, meetings of contracted partners / relevant organisations (with representatives of providers and/or service users) could be convened to discuss:
  - What other services are available which might be able to provide alternative support?
  - How might other services be adapted to provide alternative support?
  - How might alternative funding be levered in to fund the service?
- 6.6 The Chief Executive Officer of the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum reported disappointment about the limited information on the in-year changes to Connexions services.
- 6.7 However she said there were positive opportunities where CVSF can help facilitate conversation between sectors around making savings and efficiencies for the future. More dialogue will ensure that all parties understand the situation, understand the cost/value of services, get to grips with the need for generic/specialist services and work together to achieve the best outcome for service users.
  - Cuts processes should be open, transparent and consistent with evidence of cuts being applied (or not) according to a set of clear and objective criteria about need and priorities
  - There should be dialogue with the community and voluntary sector about these criteria before they are applied, in accordance with the principles set out in the Compact
  - Individual organisations threatened with cuts should be consulted about the impact on their service before it is applied
  - Organisations facing a cut in funding should be given at least 3 months notice and with a right of formal appeal to the most senior level of decision-makers

- Where a variation in existing contract arrangements is sought by the funder, this should be achieved by mutual agreement wherever possible
  - A joint Funding Panel, comprised eg of representatives from the relevant public sector and CVSF should review options on community and voluntary sector funding cuts before any final decisions are made.
- 6.8 Members considered the advantages of regular cross-sector meetings on the role of CVS in service delivery, joint impact assessments, understanding of the effect of local authority decisions in CVS and providing information on how to secure contracts.

## **7. Advantages of Close Partnership working**

- 7.1 The advantages of close partnership working were evident from all the evidence received by the Panel; such as:
- Joint decision-making linked with strategic assessments and regular feedback (CDRP)
  - Sharing of information on service needs and outcomes (CDRP)
  - Budget meetings throughout the year (CDRP)
  - Pooled budget allowing more flexible funding arrangements (CDRP, SSRP. swimming)
  - Strong joint working with Primary Care Trust had enabled the reduction in free swimming to be partly offset
- 7.2 Regarding the CVSF's proposal for a Joint Funding Panel and acknowledging increasing recognition of the third sector as a partner in service delivery, the Panel did agree that there was scope to investigate new ways of involving CVSF more closely in reviewing options.

## **8. Findings**

- 8.1 Desk based research shows that no additional information on the potential impacts of grant reductions was available to comparator local authorities when the in-year funding decisions were made. No examples were found, of best practice regarding assessing the funding options quickly.
- 8.2 The Panel found little evidence to show how the potential societal impact of the in-year funding reductions might have been assessed in the time available by this Council or any other.
- 8.3 For the future, in-year funding cuts are thought unlikely to recur; many grants are to be combined and the council is introducing a model of intelligent commissioning.

- 8.4 Despite these changes, coping with the unexpected reductions in the middle of the financial year has provided the Panel with an opportunity to draw out some key factors for future public spending options in terms of transparency, consultation and communication, practical preparations, and partnership working.
- a) Consistent and clear communication with partners, service users and employees is vital. Whilst a balance needs to be struck to avoid undue stress and concern early communication can stop damaging rumours. The Council also has to balance its role as service provider and employer.
  - b) Where in year cuts were transparent and owned by partnerships their effects can be ameliorated.
  - c) Strong partnerships are better able to withstand reductions in funding and retain priority services.
  - d) Excellent examples of innovation and strong partnership working e.g. swimming, road safety, community safety.
  - e) The ongoing and longer term impact of budget reductions should be monitored. The Council and partners need to agree a way to ensure that the impact of changing budgets are understood.
  - f) Equality Impact Assessments should be undertaken to inform all major budgetary decisions. These should be published as a matter of routine with budget papers. Consultation on risk and opportunity management should also be reported.
  - g) Changes to services and funding should to be based on robust needs assessments and understanding of outcomes. Evidence to understand the outcome the funding delivers is paramount.
  - h) External service providers make changing budgets in-year difficult. The implications of suddenly cutting a service, part of which is contracted out, need to properly assessed.
  - i) Support needs to be available to understand TUPE, statutory responsibilities and contract renegotiations.
  - j) Closer ways of working with the third sector will enable greater understanding of risks and impacts of potential spending cuts and help mitigate the impact on the sector and the communities and service users it supports.

## **9. Recommendations**

- 1) The Panel recommends that where service changes are proposed, early and clear consultation with service users, employees and partners is ensured.
- 2) The Panel recommends that where not already in existence a clear understanding of priorities for and outcomes of, funding are available for all services. These should be reviewed regularly.
- 3) The Panel welcomes the strong partnership evident across the city and beyond and recommends that creative ways of strengthening sustainable partnership working on changing budgets be developed.
- 4) The Panel recommends that Equality Impact Assessments be undertaken for all major budgetary decisions and published as a matter of routine with budget papers. Risk and opportunity management consultations should also be reported.
- 5) The Panel recommends that the ongoing and longer term impacts of budget reductions should be monitored. The Council and partners need to agree a way to ensure that the impacts of changing budgets are understood.
- 6) The Panel recommends closer working with the CVSF to help improve dialogue between organisations linked to delivering the SCS priorities.



# CABINET

## Scrutiny Panel Agenda Item 52 Appendix B (i)

Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>2010/11 In-Year Government grant reductions</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 July 2010 Cabinet</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Director of Finance &amp; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Catherine Vaughan</b>	<b>Tel:</b> 29-1333
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>catherine.vaughan@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Forward Plan No. CAB17416</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Note: The special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 7, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act as amended (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the report could only be finalised following the Council meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2010.

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.2 The Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government announced details of 2010/11 in-year grant reductions for all local authorities on 10 June. These totalled £3.55m for Brighton & Hove City Council covering both revenue and capital grants. There was a further announcement of a reduction in grant received from the Department for Culture, Olympics, Media and Sport on 17 June. On the 5 July the Secretary of State for Education announced reductions to the Education Capital programme relating to the Building Schools for the Future and Academies programme as well as high level reductions in the End Year Flexibility (EYF) allocations. Further details of the EYF allocations were announced on 14 July.
- 1.3 Cabinet on 17<sup>th</sup> June noted the details of the in-year grant reductions and agreed principles for dealing with the reductions and a timetable for decision making. A report was taken to Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July in accordance with that timetable for noting and comment. A summary of those comments and how they have been considered in the preparation of the recommendations has been included in this report. All the proposals contained in this report are considered to be within the remit of the Cabinet to agree as they are consistent with the Council's budget and policy framework.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes the comments made by Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July and how they have been considered in the preparation of this report.
- 2.2 That Cabinet agrees the expenditure reductions set out in paragraphs 3.14 – 3.21 required by the in-year grant reductions announced by the government.

- 2.3 That Cabinet agrees the use of alternative sources of funding as set out in Appendix 1.
- 2.4 That Cabinet agrees the Children and Young People Cabinet Member Meeting make decisions as required on changes to the Education capital programme as a result of the End Year Flexibility reductions.
- 2.5 That Cabinet agrees the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting make decisions as required on changes to the Environment capital programme as a result of the End Year Flexibility reductions for the Playbuilder programme.

### **3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**

#### ***Government announcements***

- 3.1 The Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne announced on 24 May 2010 that £6.2 billion in-year savings would be made in the national budget for 2010/11. Local Government would contribute about £1.2 billion towards the overall target through reductions in government grants although very little detail of which grants and the impacts on individual authorities was given. In order to assist local authorities make the savings additional freedoms and flexibilities were given to authorities with the removal of the ring-fence around £1.7 billion specific grants allowing grant monies to be re-allocated according to local priorities. Again no details were given about which specific grants are affected.
- 3.2 The announcement on 10 June by the Minister for Communities and Local Government Eric Pickles set out details of £1.166 billion savings in 2010/11 local authority grants.
- 3.3 On 17 June the Secretary of State for Culture, Olympics, Media and Sport announced that the resource funding for the governments free swimming programme would cease on 31 July 2010. Details of the actual reduction in grant were received on 6 July which confirmed a reduction of 65% (£0.125m) of the grant funding originally due for 2010/11.
- 3.4 On the 5th July the Department for Education announced reductions to the capital programme. Brighton & Hove will not now be able to enter the Building Schools for the Future programme. The announcement confirmed the Brighton Aldridge Community Academy will not be affected by the reduction in the capital programme however the proposed Academy for Portslade is under discussion and a decision is awaited on any capital allocation for this scheme. Further information was received on 14 July relating to the reductions in the End Year Flexibility allocations and the impact where known has been included in appendix 3. Discussions with the Department for Education are ongoing and new information continues to emerge.

#### ***Interim action taken to minimise the financial impact***

- 3.5 Since the first announcement in May Officers have been preparing information on all the specific and capital grants the council receives in order to assist with the

decision-making process. This analysis has been refined to reflect the detailed list of government grant reductions and the commitments entered into to date.

- 3.6 A temporary moratorium has been placed on entering into any new spending commitments on all government grant funded services and on the transport capital programme until a revised funding package has been considered and agreed.

***Comments made by Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2010***

- 3.7 The roles and responsibilities of Council and Cabinet in relation to budget decisions are set down in legislation and relevant statutory guidance as well as the Council's own constitution. The combined effect of Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 and the Council's Budget and Policy Framework Rules mean that:
- The responsibility for making budgetary decisions on executive functions rests with the Cabinet unless the proposed expenditure or saving is outside the budget and policy framework.
  - If a proposed expenditure or saving is outside the budget and policy framework, then the approval of full Council is needed.
- 3.8 The in-year budget reductions are of real significance to the Council and the City and therefore merited a debate at Full Council. The comments made during the debate at Council are summarised below along with an explanation of how they have been considered in the preparation of this report.
- 3.9 The Full Council debate covered a wide range of issues including the national economic position and policy perspectives on how this should be addressed and openness and transparency in decision making. Some specific projects were mentioned during the debate, in particular those funding from the Youth Capital Fund. This report sets out the proposal to protect existing commitments in this area by replacing the lost grant funding with monies from the one-off risk provision. The following amendments to the report were agreed by Full Council:
- That in recognition of the huge investment that the Third Sector brings to city service delivery to residents in terms of funding, in-kind support and volunteer time, it be noted that service provision stands to be more adversely affected by the withdrawal of grants and contracts; and
  - That in regard to the above, any change in service as a result of these in-year cuts must be subject to a rigorous impact assessment prior to any decisions being made. This assessment to involve the organisations providing the services that are best placed to demonstrate the impact of their work and service users in the wider community who will have strong views about the support that they need and want.
  - To request the Overview & Scrutiny Commission and relevant Scrutiny Committees undertake a full scrutiny examination of the in-year reductions to fully assess their impact.

- 3.10 An urgent discussion will be held with the Chair of the Community & Voluntary Sector Forum on the impact of these proposals on the Third Sector and an oral update will be provided to Cabinet.
- 3.11 This report will be considered as a late item by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> July and an oral update on the discussions will be provided to Cabinet.

***Principles for dealing with the reductions and proposals***

- 3.12 Principles were agreed by Cabinet on 17<sup>th</sup> June for dealing with the grant reductions, in particular setting out the nature of those decisions that would be consistent with the council's existing budget and policy framework and the nature of any decisions that would require approval by Full Council.
- 3.13 Since the Cabinet meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> June further work has been undertaken to determine what factors would be taken into consideration when prioritising the areas for grant reductions. These include:
- the extent to which funding has already been spent or is contractually committed;
  - the deliverability of specific proposals to reduce expenditure for example in terms of complexity or lead in times;
  - proposing as far as possible a fair distribution of grant reductions across the council and its partners including the community and voluntary sector so that no single agency has a disproportionate impact; and
  - anticipating the national policy direction and how the requirements being placed on local authorities in certain areas might be reduced.

***£1.580m reduction (24%) in Area Based Grant (ABG) funding received from the Department of Education (DoE).***

- 3.14 There are a number of areas of work funded by ABG where the government is signalling changes in policy direction and long term reductions in funding which the council needs to anticipate and respond to. There are summarised below:
- **Connexions service - £500,000 reduction**  
There are strong indications that the government will move from a Connexions service in its current form and shift responsibility for statutory information advice and guidance (formerly known as Careers guidance) directly to schools. It is likely that the rest of the grant will be vulnerable in the longer term. The reduction anticipates this change while protecting that element of the service that we assume will continue. This will mean de-commissioning some of the targeted services provided and this will impact on both council and community and voluntary sector provision. This reduction is in addition to the £200,000 reduction in spend on the Connexions service agreed as part of the budget setting process for 2010/11.
  - **School improvement £435,000 reduction**  
A fundamental shift in the local authority's relationship with schools is expected which will be matched by long term funding reductions particularly for the local authority's school improvement function. The local authority's role will become more strategic and its operational service will be focused on

schools with the greatest need (ie low levels of attainment or in an Ofsted category). The proposed reduction in ABG will therefore be managed as part of an overall review of the CYPT's school improvement function to ensure a core offer is available to schools in need and will involve consulting with schools about the viability of offering a buy back service. This review will include the management of the reduction of central support for the National Strategies which are due to end in March 2011 anyway.

- Extended schools £48,000 reduction  
We anticipate that in the future the government will only fund the childcare element of extended schools funding through local authorities and it will be up to schools to determine what their extended offer should be. The proposed reduction of 15% in this area is considered to be a reasonable interim step.

Further savings have been identified as follows;

- Children's Fund grant allocation has £167,000 uncommitted
- A review of 14-19 provision following the council taking on responsibility from the Learning & Skills Council in April this year has resulted in £30,000 efficiency savings.
- £115,000 can be achieved through releasing projected underspends against the grant funding, not recruiting to existing vacancies and smaller efficiencies savings.

In addition £195,000 of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be used to protect all of the funding currently in ABG for the Autistic Spectrum Condition support service , speech therapy services and a learning mentor in the Behaviour & Attendance team. A further £90,000 of DSG has been earmarked to support ABG reductions as a whole.

***£105,000 reduction (26.5%) in Road Safety Grant Revenue plus £88,000 in Road Safety Grant Capital (100%)***

- 3.15 This overall 40% reduction in grant will be passed on to the Road Safety Partnership who will need to reprioritise within the reduced funding available. Given the severity of the reduction, discussions are now underway with West and East Sussex County Councils, Sussex Police Authority and Her Majesty's Court Service and Sussex Safer Roads Partnership, to determine the future viability of the Partnership and implications of the pan Sussex road safety programme. Proposals will be developed by the end of July.

***£30,000 reduction (7.8%) in Home Office funding and £56,000 reduction (29%) in Prevent Grant***

- 3.16 These savings will be achieved through a combination of additional income, efficiency savings and a reduction in specific projects to be agreed in consultation with the community.

***£164,000 reduction (100%) in Supporting People Administration***

- 3.17 The government's expectation is that Supporting People Administration could be incorporated into the administration of other related activities. In the short term this will be funded from an underspend that is created through low utilisation/voids in some services, re-charging and also an additional saving that was created due to decommissioning a service earlier than planned. £119,000 of the reduction will be funded from underspends in the Supporting People welfare grant and the remaining £45,000 from the Housing Strategy revenue budget. There is no reduction in any current funding levels for any of our Supporting People services in this financial

year so there will be no impact on existing services. As part of the planning for the 2011/12 budget consideration will be given to how the administration of Supporting People could be delivered alongside other services to achieve this saving on a recurrent basis.

***£120,000 reduction (100%) in Housing & Planning Delivery Grant***

- 3.18 The original intention of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant was to act as an incentive to local authorities to bring forward housing and prepare the ground for increased delivery but is now considered by the Government to be an ineffective and excessively complex incentive. Therefore on value for money grounds the council will reduce its related staffing expenditure accordingly and consider alternative models for meeting its aspirations in respect of housing numbers.

***£125,000 reduction (65%) in Free Swimming Grant***

- 3.19 This reduction assumes free swimming for Under 16s and Over 60s stops at the end of July. One off funding of £25,000 will be drawn from the risk provision to take this to the beginning of September in order to ensure that free swimming for both age groups can take place throughout the school holidays as this has already been publicised to families and carers. In addition the PCT has committed to provide £38,500 funding to enable free swimming for Under 11s to continue until the end of March 2011 as part of their work on reducing obesity in this age group. A further £8,000 will need to be provided by the Council to put this in place.

***£171,000 reduction (100%) in LABGI funding***

- 3.20 This funding had not yet been committed so there is no impact on services of this reduction.

***£1.240m reduction (76% of Integrated Transport capital grant funding) for Local Transport Plan (LTP)***

- 3.21 This has been a particularly difficult area to make the required funding reductions due to earlier reductions in the LTP programme, contractual commitments, match funding requirements particularly for the projects with Civitas and Cycle England, essential highway maintenance and the need to prioritise road safety.

£431,000 will be saved by deferring projects that have not yet commenced with a view to re-profiling them into future year's programmes should they still remain a priority.

- Final minor works at the North Street Scheme (£42,000)
- New Road/Church Street Scheme (£55,000)
- A 50% reduction in funding set aside for the Queen's Park Safer Routes to Schools Scheme, which is currently out for consultation (£55,000)
- East Street Walking Scheme (£250,000)
- Walking Facilities – Dropped Kerbs (£29,000)

The following capital budgets totalling £115,000 will be removed or reduced:

- Design of future schemes (£35,000)
- Contingency for residual spend on completed schemes (£79,000)
- Other public transport information will be reduced by £4,000 with £2,000 transferred to pedestrian signing and £1,000 accessible bus stops (£1,000)

As this is somewhat short of the funding reduction required alternative funding sources have been identified to safeguard other important pieces of work:

- the Woodingdean Crossroads scheme which is considered essential to maintain effective traffic flows once the Community Stadium is operational through capital receipts funding connected to the sale of land at Park Wall Farm, Falmer (£410,000)
- ensure no cuts to the street lighting budget through use of a windfall capital receipt in relation to successful legal challenge on the coast protection scheme (£150,000)
- a further contribution from the coast protection monies to support the Bridges/Structures budget (14,000)
- fund the statutory Highways Asset Management Plan from revenue resources through reprioritising some minor highways works (£120,000)

The revised LTP programme is shown at Appendix 2.

***Impact of the further announcements in from the Department for Education made on the 14<sup>th</sup> July***

3.22 Further announcements have been made by the Department for Education (DfE), Those in respect of capital have been particularly complex and have been gradually clarified but are not yet necessarily fully understood at the time of writing this report. They have been summarised at Appendix 3. The government is making reductions in co location projects but the Whitehawk Co-location project is sufficiently well progressed that it will not be one of the projects to be cut. The project is on target to meet its aims and will therefore be one of 98 projects to receive continued funding. Most other funding reductions are still being analysed at the time of writing this report. Any further updates will be provided to Cabinet orally at the meeting. In many cases the DfE is withdrawing funding for specific schemes and this will mean they are unable to go ahead. The only area where it is proposed for the Council to provide additional funding to offset the lost grant is the £61,000 reduction in the Youth Capital Fund. It is proposed that the council replaces this grant reduction from its one off risk provision in order to minimise the impact on the community and voluntary sector of the 28 one-off projects funded from this source. If this was not done there is a risk that a significant number of those projects would be unable to go ahead. It is proposed that the relevant Cabinet Member Meetings take any necessary decisions on reductions in expenditure that may be required as a result of this.

***Removal of ringfences***

3.23 It is not proposed to make use of the additional flexibility provided by the removal of ringfences on certain grants because these remain priority areas for expenditure. This means for example that there will be no reduction in planned expenditure on HIV/AIDS support grant.

**Staffing Implications**

3.24 The proposed expenditure reductions result in an estimated reduction of 41 posts across the council. The council is committed to working positively with staff and unions to avoid compulsory redundancies wherever possible through redeployment and has a good track record of keeping compulsory redundancies to an absolute minimum. Funding has been set aside from the risk provision to meet any redundancy costs.

- 3.25 To minimise the impact on staff directorates have been operating vacancy management controls for some time. Human Resources are coordinating the following measures:
- The examination of every post to be advertised as a possible redeployment for staff at risk before other applications are considered.
  - Searches for alternative employment options across the council and externally in partnership with the Trade Unions.
  - Supported trial periods and identification of training needs.

#### ***Summary of funding sources***

- 3.26 A range of alternative funding sources have been proposed above and these are summarised in Appendix 1.

### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 There has been early consultation with the Trades Unions on the in-year grant reductions. Statutory consultation will be required with staff affected and the Trades Unions once the detailed proposals are agreed. Preliminary discussions have taken place with Sussex Police, the Community & Voluntary Sector Forum and the Primary Care Trust on the potential implications for services that are jointly funded. These will need to be continued as more detailed information on implementation is developed,

### **5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

#### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 These are contained in the main body of the report.

*Finance Officer Consulted: James Hengeveld*

*Date: 19/07/10*

#### Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The respective powers of Council and Cabinet in the decision-making process are set out in the body of the report. The details of how the in year reductions announced by the government are implemented in Brighton & Hove is a matter for the City council's discretion. In exercising its discretion, the council is required to act reasonably. This includes a requirement not to fetter its discretion by adopting rigid/inflexible rules or policies, the need to consider the particular circumstances of each service affected, the need to undertake any necessary consultation with those affected where relevant and proportionate given the practical limitation imposed by time. Above all, the council needs to show that it considered all available options with an open mind. The council should also avoid taking any action that involves a breach of its statutory duty or failure to provide services that are mandatory.

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis*

*Date: 19/07/10*

#### Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 Equalities implications have been taken into account when prioritising the areas for grant reductions. An equalities impact assessment on the Connexions Service reduction is in progress to assist with the detailed decisions on implementation.

#### Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The revised LTP programme maintains funding for existing sustainable transport schemes.

#### Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 The small reduction in the funding for Prevent is not considered to have any significant crime and disorder implications.

#### Risk & Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 As part of the process of drawing up the proposed expenditure reductions risk implications have been taken into account for example:
- Considering any legal and contractual implications
  - Considering the implications on wider schemes particularly provided by the community and voluntary sector
  - The lead in times required for delivery of savings

The one off risk provision of £0.5m has been set aside to deal with any residual risks that may arise during the detailed implementation of the proposals and any unforeseen delays.

There is a risk associated with the projected capital receipt from Park Wall Farm as it is subject to negotiation and an agreed sale. £150,000 has already been incorporated into the council's forward projections. Any additional receipt above £150,000 will fund the proposals at Woodingdean crossroads and the remaining windfall income of £338,000 from the Coast Protection legal challenge will be set aside to cover this potential eventuality.

#### Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 Covered in the body of the report.

### **6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S)**

- 6.1 When any decisions are taken on reducing expenditure or seeking alternative sources of funding there are always a multitude of options available. The proposals in this report start from the premise that if funding has stopped or reduced then the service will be stopped or reduced accordingly. Alternatives to this could include proposing savings in unrelated service areas or to consider the use of any available reserves. The former option would restrict the availability of such savings to offset the council's budget shortfalls on its mainstream budget areas both in the current financial year and in the future. The scale of these shortfalls is set out in the reports elsewhere on this agenda in relation to TBM Month 2 forecast for 2010/11 and the 2011/12 budget setting process. The use of any available reserves could only provide a short term solution to an underlying reduction in available funding and would simply defer the need to make difficult choices about the sustainability of the services funded by specific grants. Given the serious financial challenges faced by the Council it is recommended that decisions be taken now wherever possible to reduce expenditure in line with the grant funding reductions.

## **7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 In-year reductions in spending need to be made quickly to match the reduction in government grants in order to protect the council's overall financial position. The scale of the reductions would increase as the year progresses and there are fewer months left in which to make the savings.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

#### **Appendices:**

1. Summary of grant reductions
2. LTP reductions
3. Latest Department for Education announcements

#### **Documents in Members' Rooms**

None

#### **Background Documents**

1. Files held within Strategic Finance section
2. Government announcements on the 24 May ,10 June and 17<sup>th</sup> June 2010 details of which can be found on the Treasury and the Department for Communities & Local Government websites and Department for Culture, Olympics and Sport websites.
3. Brighton & Hove City Council Budget report, Feb 2010.
4. Cabinet report 17<sup>th</sup> June 2010 on 2010-11 in-year grant reductions
5. Council report 15<sup>th</sup> July 2010

Grant source	Grant Funding reduction	Value of proposed expenditure reduction	Shortfall in funding	Source of funding shortfall	Staffing implications
<b>Area Based Grant (ABG)</b>					
ABG from Department for Education	£1.580m	£1.295m	£0.285m	£0.285m Dedicated Schools Grant	Est 36 posts affected
ABG from Department for Transport	£0.105m	£0.105m	0	n/a	n/a
ABG from Home Office	£0.030m	£0.030m	0	n/a	
ABG from Communities and Local Government	£0.220m	£0.056m	£0.164m	£0.164m Underspends in related mainstream budget area and supporting people welfare grant	None in 2010/11
<b>Total ABG</b>	£1.935m	£1.486m	£0.449m		
<b>Other specific revenue grants</b>					
Local Delivery Support Grant	£0.058m	£0.058m	0	n/a	n/a
Housing & Planning Delivery Grant	£0.120m	£0.120m	0	n/a	3 Posts in Planning projects
Local Authority Business Growth Incentive	£0.172m	£0.172m	0	n/a	n/a

Scheme					
Free swimming programme	£0.125m	£0.054m	£0.071m	£0.025m risk provision £0.038m PCT funding £0.008m mainstream budget funding	n/a
<b>Capital Grants</b>					
Road Safety	£0.088m	£0.088m	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integrated Transport Block	£1.240m	£0.546m	£0.694m	£0.164m - £0.338m Coast Protection £0.236m - £0.410m capital receipts £0.120m reprioritising in related mainstream revenue budget area	Deletion of 2 vacant posts 1 redundant post
Youth Capital Fund	£0.061m	0	£0.061m	£0.061m risk provision	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3.799m</b>	<b>£2.570m</b>	<b>£1.229m</b>		

## 22 July Cabinet Item 43 Appendix 2

### LTP CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11

SCHEME	Original Allocation (£000s)	Revised LTP funding (£000s)	Other funding (£000s)
<b>MAINTENANCE</b>			
<b>Completed Works</b>			
Footway Maintenance	50	50	
<b>Committed Spend</b>			
Essential Road Maintenance	200	200	
Highway Asset Management Plan	120	0	120
<b>Rolling Programmes</b>			
Highway Maintenance (carriageway)	160	160	
Street Lighting	150	0	150
Bridges/Structures	50	36	14
<b>MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>£730</b>	<b>£446</b>
<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT</b>			
<b>Completed Works/Spend</b>			
Cycling Routes A23 ATC	150	150	
Other Public Transport Information	20	16	
<b>Commitments to ongoing projects from 2009/10</b>			
North Street	450	408	
New Road/Church Street junction and crossing	60	5	
Pedestrian Signing	0	2	
Accessible Bus Stops	0	1	
<b>Commitments to Casualty Reduction including LAA target</b>			
Road Safety Engineering	272	272	
Safer Routes to School	110	55	
<b>Committed Match Funding and Partnership Projects</b>			
Travel info - cycle counters (Civitas)	13	13	
Bike off (Civitas)	11	11	
Cyclist Signing	0	0	
Cycling Facilities - Cycle parking	110	110	
Travel Awareness	80	80	
Individualised Travel Choices	80	80	
Business Travel Plan Funding	35	35	
Emissions VMS (Civitas)	28	28	
School Travel Plan	25	25	
Walking Network East St	267	17	
Missing Links Funding (ROWIP)	10	10	
<b>Rolling Programme of Works</b>			
Walking Facilities - Dropped Kerbs	29	0	
Easy Access Route (ROWIP)	0	0	
Access to Rail	0	0	
Scoping/design of future schemes	50	15	

**Item 43 Appendix 2**

(including BSG)			
Completion of committed 2009/10 schemes	79	0	
Journey Time Analysis	0	0	
<b>New Construction Works</b>			
Woodingdean Crossroads	410	0	410
<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,289</b>	<b>£1,333</b>	<b>£410</b>
<b>INTEGRATED TRANSPORT &amp; MAINTENANCE SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>£3,019</b>	<b>£1,779</b>	<b>£694</b>

**REDUCTION IN GRANT FUNDING**

**£1,240**

**REVISED BUDGET**

**£1,779    £1,779**

**Latest Department for Education Grant announcements**

Government Department and name of grant	2010/11 Original Grant £'000	2010/11 Revised Grant £'000	Change in grant allocation £'000	% Change
<b>Revenue Grants</b>				
<b>Department for Education</b>				
Local Delivery Support Grant (Note 1)	194	136	-58	-30%
Youth Capital Fund (Note 2)	122	61	-61	-50%
Extended Schools Capital (Note 3)	183	83	-100	-55%
Harnessing Technology Grant (Note 4)	660	332	-328	-50%
Targeted Capital Fund (funded over 2 years) (Note 4)	8,000	7340	-660	-8%
Sure Start (Note 5)	3,801	3,501	-300	-8%
Playbuilder (Note 6)	598	?	?	?
<b>Total Additional Estimated Reduction</b>				

**Note 1: Delivery Support Grant**

The Local Delivery Support Grant is provided to local authorities to help with preparation for the delivery of 14 to 19 Education Reforms. Allocations are based on the number of young people in each authority area and the number of new Diploma lines offered for the first time in each authority. The allocation has been reduced as part of the DfE's scaling back of support for delivery of Diplomas. The providers have been informed of the revised allocation and are confident that the Diplomas can still be provided within this reduced budget.

**Note 2: Youth Capital Funding**

This fund has been used to allocate funding to small groups for one-off capital projects. The government announcement anticipated that local authorities would honour all existing commitments in this area.

**Note 3: Extended Schools Capital**

The impact of this is still being analysed.

**Note 4: Harnessing Technology Grant**

This grant is mainly delegated to schools .The impact of this is still being analysed.

**Note 5: Targeted Capital Fund (TCF)**

TCF funding paid to local authorities not in BSF is to be cut by roughly £660k per LA. This will affect Brighton & Hove as we did receive this funding (£8 million over 2 years). The impact of this is still being analysed.

**Note 6: Sure Start**

The Department for Education has announced its intention to manage down the capital expenditure from the Sure Start Early Years & Childcare Grant. The proposal is to identify any projects not yet fully contracted. In Brighton & Hove, all Children's Centres projects are contracted and the budget is fully allocated. The latest advice is that 3 Early Years projects have been allowed to proceed. However the Bevendean Children's association project can only partially proceed saving £0.14m. A further unallocated contingency of £0.16m has been removed giving an estimated total reduction of £0.3m. All of this is still subject to final confirmation.

**Note 7: Playbuilder**

The original CLG announcement on 10<sup>th</sup> June included the un-ringfencing of the Playbuilder grant but at that time the funding level was unchanged. Originally the intention was that this flexibility would not be used to protect the current schemes under consultation. This was set out at Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July. However, in recent days the Department for Education has instructed local authorities not to incur any future contractual liabilities in relation to Playbuilder. The Council has £0.598m allocated in 2010/11. However the funding is now being cut and this will change the position. The amount of the reduction is not yet known.

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF THE IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS**

**2.30pm 29 OCTOBER 2010**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Watkins (Chairman) Councillors Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett

**PART ONE**

**1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1. Declarations of Substitutes**

Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels or Select Committees.

**2. Declarations of Interests**

There were none

**3. Declaration of Party Whip**

There were none.

**4. Exclusion of Press and Public**

In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

**RESOLVED:** That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**2. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

2.1 The Chairman reminded the meeting that anyone could give information to the Panel in private session if they wished, or to an individual member of the Panel in the presence of a scrutiny officer.

2.2 The Panel comprised Councillors Watkins (Chair) Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett; a fourth Panel Member was not taking part in the scrutiny review.

**3. TO NOTE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO PANEL SCOPING MEETING**

3.1 The Panel noted the information set out for the scoping meeting.

**4. FINANCIAL CONTEXT OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW**

4.1 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services tabled a detailed timeline of significant officer-arranged meetings between the initial announcement of the in-year grant reductions and

the 22 July Cabinet report. Other meetings would have taken place but senior officers had now left the Council so these were difficult to specify. When the initial announcements were made there would have been discussions with partners including the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum , Head Teachers, Police, Heath and Transport.

4.2 It would not have been possible in early June to ascertain the possible impact of the unexpected cuts. The Sussex Safer Roads Partnership information (Item 8 ) gives one example of how reductions were dealt with.

4.3 The Panel noted that the in-year reductions were unprecedented. Decisions were made quickly in response to the grant losses to minimise their impact, this created complications particularly where partners were involved.

4.4 Members asked about the process for assessing risks and how societal impacts could have been understood as the process went ahead. Also, because of the pressure of circumstances, to what extent the reductions were absorbed within internal Council budgets.

4.5 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services pointed out that the circumstances would have been different in different service areas; some reductions would have had direct impact on services. Some of the grant funding was paid direct to partners and in other areas the Council receives the funding and passes it on. Even after 2 months it was still difficult to analyse what impact the reductions would have.

4.6 Most of the grant reductions were direct to the Local Authority but they would have had implications for services provided by other bodies. Some small funding changes would have large impacts.

4.7 Regarding the preparatory work done prior to 22 July, the Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services said that technical officers who had the discussions in their own service areas would be better placed to comment.

4.8 The Chairman said it was important for officers and Members to understand the basis of how the decisions were made, in dealing with any similar circumstances in future.

4.9 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services emphasised that the implications of some grant reductions were clearer than others, in that they applied to a single specific scheme or were already scheduled to be discontinued. Others had far more issues to be resolved; for instance involving employment or service contracts and having wider repercussions on services elsewhere.

4.10 The CEO, Community and Voluntary Sector Forum (CVSF) gave the example of Connexions, stating that there had been no formal opportunity for partners to put forward their views on the impact of cuts. Information that Connexions was 'at risk' had been shared. However ideally there should have been more transparency than there had been time to achieve, she said.

4.11 The CEO CVSF told the Panel that officers were struggling to find information on the outcomes of Connexions. She stressed that this information was important in order to be able to compare and contrast whether a service could or could not be cut.

4.12 Replying to a question from the Chairman on the lead-in time for decision-making the Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services said that time was of the essence; the longer the time taken to decide, the deeper the reductions needed. The Council had decided to make reductions in line with Government announcements.

4.13 A Panel Member suggested there would have been political direction and an early political steer would have impacted on the outcomes. A choice could have been made between accepting the cuts in the service departments or alternatively releasing contingency funds and allowing more time to better understand potential impacts, to take through to the annual budget-setting process.

4.14 The Panel queried the checks and balances that were in place to make such assessments, in the context of the current changes in the officer structure of the Council, the move to Intelligent Commissioning and May 2011 local elections.

4.15 The Acting Assistant Director – Financial Services tabled an example of the information provided to decision-makers during the period following the in-year reductions announcements. He told the Panel that following the Comprehensive Spending Review, grants cuts were not expected to happen again to the same extent. The existing number of grants - around 120 at present – are to be greatly reduced and many merged and incorporated into the general Formula Grant. Funding decisions would therefore be simpler where the grants remain ring-fenced; where grant funds are merged, there will be more local choice and flexibility and a wider debate on funding options.

## **5. REPORTS TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND EXTRACTS FROM THE DRAFT MINUTES**

5.1 The Head of Housing Strategy and Development referred to the report to ASCHOSC on the £164,000 Supporting People Administration grant cut which he said had been absorbed within the programme as a whole. An Equalities Impact Assessment had been carried out. The Supporting People Programme itself was to continue.

5.2 Asked whether the administration element would need to be re-visited in the future the Head of Housing Strategy and Development replied that services for vulnerable people would be monitored with Partners including in health, social care and crime and disorder. An overall benefit of £3.24 had been identified for every £1 spent on Supporting People services locally.

5.3 The Head of Sport and Leisure introduced the report on free swimming and said the two-year grant was aimed at increasing sports participation prior to the London Olympics. The scheme was always intended to end in March 2011. A key health objective for NHS Brighton & Hove is a reduction in childhood obesity and therefore they supported the initiative. There was strong partnership working in this area and with continued funding from NHS Brighton & Hove the initiative continued over the summer holidays and was extended for the under-11s until 31 March 2011. Figures showed significant increases in the number of swims by those aged 16 and under and aged 60 and over, compared to before the initiative started. An Equalities Impact Assessment had been carried out.

5.4 He said it was hoped that despite a reduction in the opportunities to swim free of charge, that more people would have developed a swimming 'habit.' There were discussions about the possibility of a leisure card scheme or continuing the initiative in some form after March 2011.

5.5 He stated that a capital grant had enabled excellent new changing facilities at St Lukes Community Pool.

5.6 The Panel commented that the existing strong joint working with the Primary Care Trust had enabled the swimming grant cut to be offset to some degree. There was a question whether working with groups of GPs in place of the PCT in future, could cause difficulty in reaching joint funding agreements.

## **6. DISCUSSION WITH CHAIRMAN OF BRIGHTON & HOVE COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR FORUM**

6.1 The Chief Executive Officer of the CVSF tabled a paper replying to the main areas of the scrutiny panel questions plus a position statement on public spending cuts following consultation with CVSF member organisations. CVSF had a limited role but there were areas where the Forum could help in working with the Local Authority and intelligent commissioning and help contribute to robust decision-making. The experience for CVSF regarding the in-year reductions related mostly to Connexions for which there had been a £500,000 reduction.

6.2 Main points made by the CEO, CVSF were;

- It is possible to assess a service in advance of a change even when there is a tight timescale.
- This information needed to be reviewed fully before taking a decision. In the case of Connexions there was not enough information to hand on outputs or outcomes.
- It is feasible to seek feedback from service users.
- Services can be prioritised according to whether or not they are statutory requirements or deliver a priority within the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- Equalities impact assessments are key to enable the voice of vulnerable people to be heard, as those people can tend to be most affected by cuts.

6.3 Asked where the relevant information would be held, the CEO said she had been surprised that relevant information was not available to council officers on what was being delivered for the money spent. She was disappointed by the information she found including within voluntary organisations; she argued that this was an area of challenge for all organisations.

6.4 The Panel commented that Local Strategic Partnership indicators such as numbers not in education employment or training (NEETs) and teenage pregnancies would indicate that Connexions was having a positive effect. Needs assessments and monitoring outcomes had to be done better in future, to improve services and resilience to future budget changes.

6.5 Answering a query if CVSF and volunteers were pressurised to cover service areas that had formerly been officer-led, the CEO told the Panel that there had been no formal contact about services relating to Connexions other than contracted organisations should continue business as usual. There had been no discussion around how Connexions or similar services will be adapted to accommodate changing needs or to respond to a likely scenario of increasing needs. Large companies had contracts in this area and the expectation was that smaller organisations would step in, though there was no evidence to show this.

6.6 Changes to this service would impact on young people and the long-term future of the service and it was important not to lose experience in this area. There had been no opportunity to have a dialogue, she said.

6.7 The CEO, CVSF said that cuts could have a disproportionate effect on organisations in the voluntary sector; unless there is adequate formal communication, future plans could not be properly made.

6.8 There was a suggestion that potential impact of a cut should be assessed to give a fuller picture and more robust decision. Cuts might otherwise be perceived as slicing where it seemed easiest.

6.9 The Chair questioned the strength of the Council's overall partnership working process in terms of dialogue and joint decision-making. He referred to evidence given the Autism Scrutiny Panel, of which he was a member, on the role of Connexions in transition from Childrens' to Adults' services. (Autism Panel extract)

6.10 The Chairman remarked that if there is a lack of information on the outcome of services, in cases where funding ring-fence may be removed in future, the local authority will have more flexibility but it would be more difficult to see the basis of decisions.

6.11 The CEO CVSF ended by stating that the In-year cuts provided great opportunities for transparency and new levels of working together. The Voluntary sector could help by investigating the cost of services and could also lever in additional funds. She was of the strong view that there is massive potential in closer joint working, that could easily be tapped.

6.12 The CEO CVSF was asked how to avoid unnecessary alarm when there were countless options in making cuts. In reply she gave the view that it had to be agreed at the start what outcomes were needed – what services had to be protected. When that agreement was in place, openness and early and wide engagement on potential changes would help to reduce damaging speculation.

6.13 A Panel Member remarked that some voluntary organisations seemed to have been given misleading information on different occasions about whether or not the Youth Capital Fund was continuing.

6.14 Asked about the current membership and joint working within the CVSF itself, the CEO said in a difficult economic climate, timely partnerships were being encouraged within the sector. However it could be difficult to facilitate organisations joining together and some of those who do not back this approach could face difficulties. Housing and Youth Services were examples. Small grants could still do much to protect some areas that were most at risk.

6.15 It was especially important to maintain good levels of communications during difficult economic conditions and to understand a changing model of partnership working. This approach would underpin intelligent commissioning.

6.16 CEO CVSF said she welcomed the 19 October Overview and Scrutiny Commission decision to co-opt a member of the CVSF for the purposes of scrutiny of the 2011-2012 budget proposals.

**7. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT; SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

7.1 The Panel asked that Officers attend a future panel meeting to present the Equalities Impact Assessment of School Improvement.

7.2 Members also asked to see EIAs relating to the in-year grant reductions. For example, 'dropped kerbs' in the LTP Capital programme 2010 – 2011 Rolling Programme of working on walking facilities.

**8. UPDATE ON SUSSEX SAFER ROADS PARTNERSHIP (SSRP)**

8.1 The Panel asked that Officers attend a future panel meeting to present the Update on Sussex Safer Roads Partnership.

**9. HOUSING AND PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT**

9.1 The Head of Planning Strategy said that this grant varied from year to year. It had originally been performance-related and based on variable measures. Initially the emphasis was on encouraging prompt development control decisions, and more recently on streamlining plan-making and housing delivery. The grant 2010 – 2011 was to be spent primarily on IT systems to ensure planning processes ran smoothly, helping to improve performance on planning applications and reducing paper handling.

9.2 Latterly grant amounts had become less predictable and the announcements made later (well into the financial year of the settlement) and had already been identified as at risk. Adjustments had been made to reduce reliance on the grant for core activities and ensure permanent posts were incorporated into the core planning budget.

**10. PLAYBUILDER**

10.1 The Head of Financial Services (Corporate and Environment) said there had been a revised allocation to be presented in the next TBM report. Members referred to the original decision involving 22 Playbuilder sites agreed by 23 April Cabinet and asked what had been the basis for deciding on which 11 of the 22 could go ahead. It was suggested that the process for finding a capital shortfall could be an area of learning,

10.2 The CEO CVSF acknowledged that Playbuilder sites were a difficult choice. The CVSF was in a good position to help facilitate discussions through informal networks; for instance in these circumstances though 'Friends of Parks' groups.

**11. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING**

11.1 An informal meeting would be held on 4<sup>th</sup> November at 2pm.

11.2 Meeting in public on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November at 2.30 in the HTH Council Chamber

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

# **CVSF Submission to the Scrutiny Panel on the Societal Impact of 2010/11 in-year budget reductions**

**October 2010**

**Sally Polanski, CEO, CVSF**

## **Introduction**

CVSF called for a full impact assessment of cuts before decisions were made about in-year budget reductions. We are pleased to have the opportunity to contribute to the scrutiny panel's review of this subject. CVSF does not however necessarily have a view on or answers to all the panel's questions for discussion, given the sector's involvement in services may not relate to all areas affected by the in-year budget reductions. A response is given below to the questions where CVSF has relevant knowledge and experience to share or a particular view around process and policy. Also appended is our position statement on public spending cuts which has been developed by our member organisations.

## **A) Response to Scrutiny Questions**

### **1) To what extent can the impact be judged prior to taking a decision? And afterwards? In the short and longer term**

It is viable to assess the impact of a service cut before taking a decision and officers should be tasked with producing a business case in relation to any proposal for cuts. A business case may be a full impact analysis or a more limited review, depending on the time available and nature of the service/cut. The most effective way to achieve this is to:

- Review the monitoring information in relation to the particular service and assess the value of the outcomes/outputs and their impact on service users
- Seek feedback from service users and/or service providers on the service and discuss whether there are savings which could be made
- Complete an equalities impact assessment on the service
- Assess whether the service is a) statutory requirement and therefore a service which cannot be removed or b) delivering on a priority in the Sustainable Communities Strategy and weight the decision-making process accordingly
- Consider the impact on the most vulnerable communities in Brighton and Hove, ie whose voices may not usually be heard – such as older, isolated people, younger unemployed, disadvantaged children or other groups at risk of being disproportionately affected by cuts such as travellers and refugees.

### **2) What are the aims and objectives of the budgets that were affected?**

In relation to the Connexions services:

- The aims of the service are to support young people back into employment, education or training, and specifically to provide careers advice.
- CVSF believes however that the workplans of the voluntary organisations delivering Connexions services have much broader aims and objectives, to support the whole needs of a young person. This would include providing information, guidance and advice and preventative interventions, which would reduce the likelihood of service users becoming homeless, misusing substances, experience poor mental health, having unwanted teenage pregnancies etc

### **3) What are the funding streams affected by the removal of ring-fencing and how does that affect decisions made?**

While CVSF cannot comment on the specifics where ring-fencing of funding was removed, we believe this change can present a challenge to officers when making decisions about reductions/service cuts. While it could be argued that more flexibility in decision-making is a positive factor, officers may lack the necessary understanding of citywide priorities/needs or the relevant information to decide how to prioritise which services should be maintained or reduced, and be pressurised to make decisions around cuts without time to fully assess the impact of funds being moved from one area to another.

### **4) How to deal with joint programmes with partnership organisations, including eg matched funding? / How to ensure groups in receipt of grants via different Council services and/or partner organisations are not disproportionately affected?**

CVSF considers that assessing this wider impact should be a key feature in the decision-making process around budget reductions, as what looks like a sensible cut on the surface may result in much wider impact. Any partner organisation involved in the related services should be asked for a breakdown of information relating to:

- The inputs it contributes to the service, eg any additional funding it levers in on the basis of the funded service or in-kind support
- The outcome chains of the service within the particular organisation, eg in the case of the Connexions service, voluntary organisations add value to the contracted service by providing wider, young person-centred services across a range to issues/themes, pulling in resource from across the organisation's projects and staff
- The impact of any reduction in terms of what wider services/outcomes would be affected, eg in a voluntary organisation the contracted service may allow for there to be adequate staff/user ratio in a youth centre during opening hours. The removal of the contracted service and additional worker

may result in the centre not being able to open for the same number of hours

- The impact on the core running costs of the organisation, which may be disproportionately affected by cuts, eg the future viability of an organisation should be taken into account if possible.

## **5) What has been done in implementing the changes so far? What is happening now?**

Again, using Connexions as an example:

- It is very unclear what is happening now! The contracted organisations have only been advised that they should continue 'business as usual', although it is very evident that the situation is far from 'business as usual'. Meanwhile public information about the process underway around the Council and Prospects provided Connexions services is limited and speculation rife
- While we understand that due process must be followed in relation to legal contracts (both in terms of employment and contracted service provision), it is disappointing that clearer messages have not been given by commissioners/CYPT in relation to Connexions services and that there has not been a discussion with the voluntary sector providers about how service delivery needs to be adjusted to accommodate this significant change in provision
- Voluntary organisations have instead had to look to Council / Cabinet meetings for updates on the situation, where it is understood a recent meeting confirmed the service is to be redesigned following consultation, however no further details on this are known
- A further recent complication has been the closure of Creating Futures and its Connexions service, which we understand is in the process of being transferred to other providers.

## **6) What have been the key issues in making the cuts?**

From our perspective, information lies at the heart of some of the challenges and opportunities around making cuts:

- Evidence of outcome of services must be reviewed to fully understand the impact of cuts. Often service outcomes are not monitored, understood or valued which makes it difficult for officers to assess relative impact of service change, this is particularly true of preventative work often delivered by the voluntary sector. In general the added value of community and voluntary sector service delivery is very badly understood
- Even more basic than this, there is sometimes a lack of raw data about service contracts and their basic outputs
- In terms of the decision-making process around cuts, a key challenge for the Council is to ensure transparency and communication with the sector. In difficult times and when

difficult decisions need to be made, organisational barriers often go up, which is unhelpful as ongoing dialogue is essential.

- Cuts provide an opportunity for and require new types of partnership working. CVSF can help facilitate conversation between sectors around making savings and efficiencies. Dialogue will ensure that all parties understand the situation, understand the cost/value of services, get to grips with the need for generic/specialist services and work together to achieve the best outcome for service users.

The learning from the in-year cuts can be applied to how future cuts are handled:

- There should be evidence of cuts being applied (or not) according to a set of clear and objective criteria about need and priorities
- There should be dialogue with the community and voluntary sector about these criteria before they are applied, in accordance with the principles set out in the Compact
- Individual organisations threatened with cuts should be consulted about the impact on their service before it is applied
- Organisations facing a cut in funding should be given at least 3 months notice and with a right of formal appeal to the most senior level of decision-makers
- Where a variation in existing contract arrangements is sought by the funder, this should be achieved by mutual agreement wherever possible
- Cuts processes should be open, transparent and consistent
- A joint Funding Panel, eg comprised of reps from the relevant public sector and CVSF should review options on community and voluntary sector funding cuts before any final decisions are made

## **7) To help understand potential impacts – how can the effects of reductions be mitigated?**

As part of the process of assessing the impact of cuts, a meeting could be held with contracted partners / relevant organisations (with representatives of providers and/or service users) to discuss:

- What other services are available which might be able to provide alternative support?
- How might other services be adapted to provide alternative support?
- How might alternative funding be levered in to fund the service?

It is also suggested that CVSF be involved in the budget setting process for 2011/12 in order to undertake some of these mature, exploratory discussions early on.

## **B) Public sector spending cuts and CVSF's role**

## **CVSF position statement**

The prospect of severe public spending cuts is well documented and community and voluntary organisations are bracing themselves for tough times. There are going to be some difficult decisions for our partners to make in relation to local statutory sector agencies budgets for 2011/12. This statement sets out CVSF's position in relation to cuts.

### **1. Why is CVSF engaging in the cuts agenda?**

CVSF must use its influence to ensure cuts are well handled, on behalf of local people. Over the years, when money has been coming into our communities, the community and voluntary sector has fought hard for delivery of services and a voice in the city, and it would be wrong of us to retreat now and not use our voice as services are going into sharp decline.

It is unrealistic for us to campaign against cuts given that they are part of a wider national/global funding crisis, increasingly a fact of life and already underway. While engagement in the cuts agenda has drawbacks and could be divisive if the sector allows it to be, non-engagement would leave the sector even more vulnerable.

### **2. How can CVSF campaign against cuts while working in partnership with the statutory sector on a range of projects?**

When there is less money around, partnerships are even more important. CVSF is committed to protecting the community and voluntary sector's interest in relation to cuts, but this does not prevent CVSF from continuing to engage in partnership working and partnership projects/programmes. It is possible and appropriate to combine these roles if handled sensitively. We remain sympathetic to the challenges facing all organisations in relation to the impact of funding cuts.

It is important to maintain ongoing communication and an open dialogue with relevant partners in relation to cuts, to discuss priorities and provide opportunities for working together on minimising the impact of cuts on local services and communities.

### **3. Will CVSF align itself with a political viewpoint around cuts?**

CVSF will not engage in party political debates around the role of the sector or specific priority areas / services on which particular political parties will be campaigning. CVSF will engage with B&H City Council's overview and scrutiny processes around decision-making about cuts.

### **4. What does CVSF want to happen around cuts?**

An impact assessment of cuts must be made before decisions are taken. This assessment should involve service users and providers and scope the added value of community and voluntary sector service design and delivery. In addition to this, decision-makers need to apply consistent and fair principles in relation to the way in which cuts are

handled and ensure that processes and timetables are clear. The Compact between the community and voluntary sector and statutory sectors should be adhered to, particularly the Codes of Practice around Funding and Commissioning and Consultation, if Public Law challenges are to be avoided.

If CVSF believes due process has not been followed or the wrong decision has been made, then in consultation with our members, we will campaign against arbitrary cuts which seem unfair or which to seem to favour the public sector's own services for no good reason. We will log and seek to address any Compact breaches with the Dialogue 5050 Group.

#### **5. What is CVSF asking its public sector partners to do?**

- a. Cuts should not simply be applied across the board (salami slicing). There should be evidence of cuts being applied (or not) according to a set of clear and objective criteria about need and priorities
- b. There should be dialogue with the community and voluntary sector about these criteria before they are applied, in accordance with the principles set out in the Compact
- c. Individual organisations threatened with cuts should be consulted about the impact on their service before it is applied. The impact on the long-term viability of the organisations concerned should also be considered and an equalities impact assessment undertaken
- d. Organisations facing a cut in funding should be given at least 3 months notice and with a right of formal appeal to the most senior level of decision-makers
- e. Where a variation in existing contract arrangements is sought by the funder, this should be achieved by mutual agreement wherever possible
- f. The process should be open, transparent and consistent
- g. A joint Funding Panel, eg comprised of reps from the relevant public sector and CVSF should review options on community and voluntary sector funding cuts before any final decisions are made

#### **6. Which groups in particular risk being disproportionately affected by cuts and what does CVSF think needs to happen about this?**

CVSF will argue the case for those whose voices may not be heard – such as older, isolated people, younger unemployed, disadvantaged children or groups at risk of being disproportionately affected by cuts such as travellers and refugees.

Cuts risk impacting upon small, medium and larger community and voluntary organisations in different ways. CVSF aims to unite members around protecting the interests of the community and voluntary sector in all its diversity, and to avoid splitting the sector into separate parts, which we believe will undermine our collective voice, influence and

service delivery role. CVSF will encourage and support community and voluntary organisations to increase understanding about their value and impact. CVSF will campaign for maximising the role of the community and voluntary sector and for appropriate funding, which means maintaining a mixed economy of grants and contracts.

In particular, CVSF will seek to raise awareness of and lend support to the following issues:

- Smaller organisations have a significant role to play in the city and in relation to emerging policy and programmes around Big Society. Similarly small groups have the right to campaign, if they wish to if this is part of their aims and objectives. This right (and the right not to engage in public service delivery) must be defended.
- Medium sized organisations are often well placed to deliver innovative and targeted services, but these groups risk being squeezed out of the market place, unable to compete for service delivery contracts with larger / private sector agencies. These organisations need support to be protected from cuts as much as possible and to ensure they are ready to respond and adjust to the changing funding environment
- Larger organisations may not be able to sustain the contracts they hold when value for money assessments are undertaken. For example they may be unable to compete with regional or national providers who can provide better economies of scale. Understanding the full value of service delivery is necessary to ensure there is a level playing field in relation to commissioning opportunities

## **7. What can't CVSF do?**

If the scale of the cuts turns out to be as vast as we all fear, then CVSF will not have capacity to campaign against cuts in all service areas. We will focus on protecting the interests of the wider sector in the first instance. Where there is evidence of cuts hitting harder where the community is most vulnerable, then CVSF will seek to lend its support to these particular campaigns.

We will encourage and support organisations where possible to 'campaign', for example by seeking and providing information on processes, advising on different approaches and tactics and signposting to tools and resources such as the Compact and Public Law Project, which may help challenge different aspects of the decision-making process.

Sally Polanski  
[sally@cvsectorforum.org.uk](mailto:sally@cvsectorforum.org.uk)  
01273 810232



**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY PANEL ON THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF THE IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS**

**2.30pm 23 NOVEMBER 2010**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Watkins (Chairman)

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Mitchell and Wakefield-Jarrett

**PART ONE**

**12. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**12a Declarations of Substitutes**

Substitutes are not allowed on scrutiny panels

**12b Declarations of Interests**

There were none.

**12c Declaration of Party Whip**

There were none.

**12d Exclusion of Press and Public**

12.1 Councillor David Watkins the Panel Chairman reminded the meeting that anyone could ask to speak to panel in private session or to an individual member of the panel in the presence of a scrutiny officer.

12.2 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

**12.3 RESOLVED:** That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**13. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 OCTOBER 2010**

13.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

**14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

14.1 There was none.

**15. TO NOTE EXTRACT FROM 22 JULY CABINET REPORT AND MAIN AREA OF PANEL QUESTIONS**

15.1 The information was noted.

**16. TO RECEIVE INFORMATION FROM THE COMMISSIONER, COMMUNITY SAFETY**

16.1 The Commissioner, Community Safety managed the budget on behalf of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). She told the Panel that the CDRP in-year budget reductions and their effects were uncomplicated. This was for two main reasons. Firstly, because the budget was pooled from a dozen or so sources. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 had created Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP) and agreed activities and posts were funded across different sections of funding streams.

16.2 Therefore, when unexpected changes were made to budgets in the middle of the financial year (this was the for the first time ever), this 'cross-patch' pooled funding arrangements that had been in place for many years, made the changes slightly easier to manage than other services as there was some flexibility to 'juggle' funding streams and retain key activities and posts.

16.3 Secondly the main CDRP grant reduction had been from Prevent (violent extremism.) For 2009-2010 the Brighton and Hove CDRP had only just qualified to receive the budget and for the year 2008-2009 had received only part-year funding. This was very new work that had not been undertaken before and would take some time to become established. It involved a Community Engagement post and managerial post with responsibility for leading the hate crime team. Funds had already been set aside for new community initiatives targeted at groups that could be at higher risk of being drawn into terrorist activities.

16.4 The CDRP was open and transparent with community representatives about the sources and purposes of the funding, and how the money was being spent. A Project Board including faith-based groups was established and some work had started to deliver results. Therefore at the time of the cuts announcements in July, community leaders were well prepared and there was agreement on a small reduction in some specific projects (not staff) but enthusiasm to continue joint working.

16.5 Much development time was needed to deliver on new objectives. Some excellent projects were just now at the stage of 'bedding down.' So there was a less dramatic change caused by the funding reduction in this relatively new area of work compared with a reduction to a long established service.

16.6 The other Home Office reduction of £30,000 had not caused negative impact. There was a small contingency fund as a result of bids that were made regularly to the Home Office and the shortfall had been covered by this and by funds allocated to a project to expand Community Safety Services that did not go ahead for practical, not financial, reasons.

16.7 Asked how funding decisions were made, the Commissioner, Community Safety referred to CDRP joint decision-making on priorities, based on year-round strategic assessments on crime and disorder. Budget meetings were held throughout the year and officer recommendations were taken to the Safe in the City Partnership. This was led by the Council's Chief Executive and Divisional Police Commander and comprised senior representation from key partners including the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and the Community and Voluntary Sector Forum.

16.8 The process was linked to financial services and decision-making of the local authority. The Commissioner of Community Safety stressed the importance of ensuring constant feedback on joint decision-making to tie in with local authority corporate decision-making and said that the CDRP do this successfully.

16.9 The Panel was pleased that posts had been saved and that prioritisation was based on needs. Members remarked that there would be no room for slippage in the current financial climate; early prioritisation for newly-funded projects was key.

16.10 There were questions: whether it could be seen as a weakness for a budget to be made up of a large number of different grants, starting and ending at different times; how the anticipated removal of ring-fencing, might impact on services; how to ensure that a particular community was not disproportionately affected by budget cuts in more than one service area.

16.11 The Commissioner, Community Safety said that the well-prepared strategic needs assessment was the 'bedrock' for making decisions on where to invest to reduce crime and increase safety. This was a legal requirement.

In her experience transparency about funding and joint working to build up trust with communities was very important; as evidenced by the management of the 'Prevent' grant reduction.

16.12 The possible implications of less ring-fencing were unknown; there being advantages and disadvantages. Ring-fenced grants can protect and secure activities or projects; non-ring-fencing gives additional flexibility and pooled budgets are appropriate for partnership working.

16.13 The in-year cuts of the CDRP budget had not had an effect on service users. For future budgets including reductions, officers can assess potential impact by applying Equalities Impact Assessments. Officers would always look to achieve the same or better level of service in the face of reduced income. Creative ways of working differently were being developed to achieve joint delivery of shared objectives.

16.14 Replying to questions the Commissioner, Community Safety said that 26% of the CDRP budget comprised pooled funds which included police posts. Partner organisations also faced financial pressures, and joint decisions were made on adjusting spending plans in tandem with the local authority. The 13 clear agreed and ranked joint priorities as set out in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy were subject to annual review.

16.15 The Commissioner, Community Safety was confident that the system and structure for making joint decisions was very robust. Depending on the level of possible future cuts prioritisation could become more challenging. It is helpful to work as a real partnership.

## **17. TO RECEIVE FURTHER INFORMATION ON SUSSEX SAFER ROADS PARTNERSHIP**

17.1 The Road Safety Manager gave information and answered questions under the following item.

## **18. TO RECEIVE INFORMATION ON LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN**

18.1 The Lead Commissioner for City Regulation and Infrastructure said the reduction in the LTP capital programme, announced part-way through the financial year, was difficult to manage. Each budget allocation was built up through a prioritisation process.

18.2 Asked how the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP) had dealt with the budget reductions, the Road Safety Manager outlined the approach.

18.3 The SSRP was funded by Government grant through the three local highway authorities, East and West Sussex County Councils and Brighton and Hove City Council and led by Cabinet members from the three authorities. Other partners are Sussex Police, the Fire and Rescue Services from West and East Sussex, the Highways Agency and HM Courts' Service.

18.4 Most of the funding is from the Area Based Grant paid to local authorities who transfer funds into a pooled budget. This has a 'smoothing' effect and allows for more flexibility. Some voluntary contributions are also received for example from the Highways Agency and the Football Association.

18.5 At the start of the financial year each of the eight partners submitted bids relating to road safety; and priorities for road safety measures, were agreed with a level of flexibility, by the Partnership. Key issues typically differ between towns/cities where pedestrian and bus incidents can predominate compared with rural areas where speeding on country roads is a major concern.

18.6 The average reduction of around 40% in the SSRP capital budget was part of the national aim to reduce the number of speed cameras. The SSRP strategy sub-group met on 16 June, agreeing to act fast to review this year's road safety projects. The impact on groups was taken into account. Contractual and financial criteria were already in place.

18.7 At a further meeting in July, the 'core business' for the SSRP was re-visited; some areas such as certain post-collision remedial engineering could arguably fall outside a road safety partnership remit and was more a core responsibility of the local authority. Means of funding other areas including education training and publicity were also carefully considered.

18.8 The Partnership looked to find areas where funding could be reduced but the service still be delivered, or where a cut in service could be found. Evidence was collected and the process was refined over a series of 4-5 meetings, until the Partnership ratified the plan on 24 August.

18.9 The value of pooling budgets in this way, was highlighted by members of the Panel

18.10 The Road Safety Manager answered questions. Widening the scope of the speed awareness courses, linked to a reduction in the speed threshold, would raise the number of potential clients and help fill the funding gap. He said speed cameras were unpopular and where there was a link with education, enforcement measures were more widely acceptable. The courses were a potential source of income to reinvest in road safety.

18.11 The Central Ticket Office which handles summonses and offers speed awareness courses, was based at Shoreham Police Station.

18.12 Unlike some other partnerships in the UK, the SSRP did not just deal with speed cameras. It has funded relatively small-scale engineering projects including a contribution to a pedestrian crossing within a Safer Routes to School Scheme, and promotes road safety. A good communications team covers campaigns and publicity including press, media and projects in schools. Income cuts for this area could mean a reduction in some types of preventative work.

18.13 Other budget lines had been rationalised to cover the Bikeability training as it is a requirement that Trainers had to be assessed.

18.14 Speed indicator devices (SIDs) that measure the speed of approaching vehicles are now on loan to Sussex Police for use by PCSOs to gather data on vehicle speed, help influence motorist behaviour and give public reassurance. Other organisations such as ESFRS may also wish to use these and a strategy for using SID is being developed.

18.15 The Panel asked about the overall combined impact on children of measures, such as a reduction on warning lights at schools and child pedestrian training. Members heard that there was a programme of warning light replacement; some lights were old and unreliable and others were not needed where pedestrian crossings had since been introduced. Budget lines had been moved to pay for trainers for this financial year but vacancies were being held. Safer Routes to School would be prioritised for next year's proposals.

18.16 Councillor Watkins the Panel Chairman noted that it had taken 3 months – a relatively short time - for mutual agreement by the 8 partners, to retain as much of the services as possible within the new budgetary constraints. He suggested that the agreed initial criteria, pre-planning and successful joint working with and some flexibility, had allowed the Partnership to cope reasonably well with the mid-year cuts. Road Safety Manager Clarke agreed.

18.17 Members asked about the implications of the in-year reductions for the LTP for programme delivery and staff. The Lead Commissioner for City Regulation and Infrastructure said it was difficult to find the level of cuts within a short time. The key required outcomes were looked at; contractual commitments; Road Safety and maintenance; decisions were needed on what to protect and where resources could be found; for example in some of the 'softer' areas such as marketing, car-free-day and updating websites. The matched funding requirements for projects under the Cycling Towns and Civitas were also a main consideration.

18.18 Two full-time posts had been affected this year. Vacancies had been held to soften the impact and proposals were being developed for 2011-2012.

18.19 Asked about the dropped kerb programme, within which a relatively small budget could make a big difference to certain groups, Lead Commissioner for City Regulation and Infrastructure said there is a commitment to this; it would have been part of LTP3 and would now be prioritised in the next financial year. Other funding sources including via developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Funds (CIF) for Shoreham Harbour regeneration, were used to introduce dropped kerbs as a part of other schemes when the opportunity arose. Similarly work on the Walking Network had been deferred rather than cut.

18.20 Work with partners was in progress on additional real-time bus information signs.

18.21 Panel Members were concerned to ensure that Equalities Impact Assessments were carried out to help identify groups that may be affected by budget decisions including in more than one service area.

**19. TO RECEIVE FURTHER INFORMATION ON GRANT REDUCTIONS FROM  
DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION**

19.1 The Lead Commissioner for Schools Skills and Learning gave information to the scrutiny panel on reductions in the school improvement grant. The Equality Impact Assessment had appeared as part of the agenda of the previous meeting.

19.2 Changes in national policy on local authority school improvement function had been anticipated for some years and different ways to continue had been considered for some time. (The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is ring-fenced and based on pupil numbers; it cannot be used by the local authority for school improvement, though local authority work elsewhere does meet the DSG criteria.)

19.3 To deliver this, local authorities have teams of consultants providing curriculum teaching and learning support, linked with National Strategy priorities. This work of this team was due to finish in April 2011 and the decision has been taken to look to bring this forward to December.

19.4 Now schools are to take over school improvement work, with schools supporting each other. There are already examples of this: lead teachers in Maths and English for example are leading in their own schools and in other schools. There are now 25 lead teachers that are deployed to other schools for 15 days per year and this development work could continue.

19.5 Consultations with Human Resources and Unions are in progress. A positive outcome is that expertise in school improvement is being maintained. Redeployment, also involving schools, has meant that staff have gone back into schools and have stayed within school improvement work.

19.6 Asked about the stress on schools and freeing teachers' time to teach children and young people, and impact on society, Lead Commissioner for Schools Skills and Learning agreed that there is a lot of responsibility in schools. But she said that this is an area which is part of all schools' role and where the expertise is, and where, with good management, schools do very well. This was why there had been a 'journey' towards this type of arrangement for some while.

19.7 Answering a query about the reasoning behind the decision and risk assessment of the outcome of the change, the Lead Commissioner for Schools Skills and Learning said the national literacy and maths strategies had been a 'top-down' approach. The Equality Impact assessment that had been provided to the previous Panel meeting (Item 7) indicated that vulnerable children would not be affected. Two consultants were being retained to roll out 'Every Child and Reader' and 'Every Child Counts' in years 1 and 2. Services with East Sussex for travellers and the Children in Care team remained in place.

19.8 The Head of Service, Children and Families told the Panel that changes to Connexions services had also been anticipated. Prior to the announcement of budget reductions, the benefit of the services to groups of children and young people had been looked at; where was the best impact being delivered, especially in relation to employability.

19.9 There were high expectations of the service – Connexions was intended to cover a wide range of services and over time had become ‘all things to all people’. It was found that there was a clear need for general advice services but it was unclear whether Connexions was best placed to deliver these.

19.10 Connexions services were delivered partially in-house (for intensive personal services) and via Prospects, a nation-wide group that provided advice and guidance to schools including Pathways (some based in schools and some in the community.)

19.11 Prospects was found to be more successful in achieving employment for children and young people than in-house staff. Numbers of those not in education employment or training, NEETs formed a national indicator (NI) target for the Local Area Agreement. In-house provision focussed mainly on general support for NEETs but outcomes such as resilience and confidence were not an NI. It was felt that the focus on jobs for vulnerable young people was in general being lost.

19.12 A 24% cut across all the Connexions targeted services would have ‘wiped out’ some areas of services completely. It was important to agree what was needed to be delivered to schools and vulnerable children and young people. An EIA had been completed on the needs of the most vulnerable groups.

19.13 Following the Cabinet decision, it was decided to negotiate a 25% contract variation with Prospects for 2010-2011. Unexpectedly, Prospects rejected this for commercial reasons that were not clear.

19.14 There were legal complications around Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE). Other local authorities were contacted about their own approach.

19.15 Asked about any lessons for the future, Head of Service, Children and Families said there needed to be clarity with service providers about contract terms including changes in services especially for statutory services. TUPE provisions were fundamentally different depending on the service provider; be they profit-making, non-profit or community organisations, social enterprises or cooperatives.

19.16 This was a very challenging situation for the council as employer and provider of services. An open dialogue with service users was impaired by the employer’s duty to safeguard employees.

19.17 Asked about the outcomes of the Connexions service, Head of Service, Children and Families said an evaluation of the impact of local services could be provided to Members.

19.18 There was a need to help all relevant services to work more closely with children and young people. Children asked about Connexions said their main issues concerned accessibility to the service.

19.19 Members asked how the combined impact of service reductions might impact on particular groups, such as disadvantaged children, and how this could be monitored.

19.20 The Head of Service, Children and Families said it was a challenge to understand fully the issues faced by children and young people in the City. An investigation into the success of

reducing teenage pregnancy indicated that a key factor was the attitude of staff providing the services. Staff were engaged and adopted a positive attitude but the impact was not as it should have been.

There needed to be more engagement with young people about the impact of services provided.

19.21 Regarding the design of youth advisory services, the role of school councils (groups of representative students) was key in giving young people more confidence and a better outcome. Individual young people had to be confident to access services and are likely to have closer involvement when working with their peer groups.

19.22 The Lead Commissioner for Schools Skills and Learning reminded the meeting that schools received funding for information advice and guidance services and whilst they should not be over-loaded, they were well-placed to provide help and support including via mentoring. Acknowledging the important work that had been done by Connexions, the Lead Commissioner for Schools Skills and Learning said that schools had also been undertaking this role and would continue to do so.

19.23 A Panel member asked about diversity of provision of advice and services to young people outside school, for example for those who were not fully engaged with school for whatever reason.

19.24 The Head of Service, Children and Families acknowledged that young people had not engaged with a website that had been aimed at giving accessible advice. Young people tended to regard it as an adult-driven 'sop' and did not want to be 'corralled.' Now young people and looked after children had their own website which is more successful and under their own total control.

19.25 So it has been found that advice and services generally have to be self-guided, though some people will want access to other sources. Better opportunities for disadvantaged children were needed and work with partners was on-going. This includes young people who may on the surface seem 'privileged' but may still be under hidden stresses.

19.26 The Chairman thanked the officers for speaking to the Panel about the challenges of the grant reductions, the large changes in hand, and the growing awareness of young people's needs that would contribute to experience for the future.

**20. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION; DRAFT EXTRACT FROM AUTISM SCRUTINY PANEL AND PLAYBUILDER**

20.1 The additional information was noted.

**21. EMERGING THEMES AND NEXT STEPS**

21.1 The aim was to report back to OSC on 14 December.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION

## Agenda Item 55

Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Half year progress summary on the 2008-11 Local Area Agreement (LAA) 2010/11 and Q2-10 Organisational Health Report</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9 December 2010 Cabinet 14 December 2010 OSC</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director, Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name: Andy Edwards</b>	<b>Tel: 29-6823</b>	
	<b>E-mail: andy.edwards@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>		
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

This report was added to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission agenda for noting, at the request of the OSC Chairman.

- 1.1 The report provides Local Area Agreement (LAA) performance information to the end of September 2010. It also provides information regarding the organisational robustness ('health') of some key council operations.
- 1.2 There are two appendices to this report; these contain statistical information pertinent to the Local Area Agreement and the organisational health of the council.
- 1.3 **'Local Area Agreement Summary Report'** (Appendix 1) - The Local Area Agreement forms one strand of a city wide 'contract' which sets priorities for Brighton and Hove and assesses how well we are delivering against these. As this is a partnership agreement the responsibility for some indicators is shared across partner organisation across the city.
- 1.4 **Organisational Health mid year report** - (Appendix 2) Organisational Health Indicators provide monitoring information and report progress about our corporate health, including council tax collection, staff sickness and equality monitoring.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes progress against the 2008-11 Local Area Agreement and our current organisational health.
- 2.2 That Cabinet notes that changes to National Performance Arrangements have been announced by Government; specifically, that LAA performance will no longer be monitored centrally and that the Performance Reward Grant previously attached to targets has been removed

- 2.3 That Cabinet notes that this will be the final LAA, the burden of which has been removed from local authorities.
- 2.4 That Cabinet Members continue to review areas of poor performance and review progress against related Action Plans in greater detail at their Cabinet Member Meetings.
- 2.5 That Cabinet instructs officers to ensure that the Local Strategic Partnership and Public Service Board (and their thematic partnerships) receive the Delivery Plan detailing indicators that are off track, to ensure that actions are taken to meet targets.

### **3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

- 3.1 After a broad and thorough consultation process in 2007, LAA targets were agreed by the Strategic Partnership as the main performance priorities in Brighton and Hove for 2008/11. During this process public sector partners, in collaboration with the third and private sector, agreed to 35 indicators selected from the National Indicator Set. In addition 22 local targets were selected which were felt to be a priority for the city.
- 3.2 The current LAA was set for a three year period and is based on priorities determined at the time of negotiation. Our LAA was signed off by the Government Office for the South East.
- 3.3 The LAA was reviewed at the end of the second year to ensure that it continued to contain appropriate measures for our aspirations and those of our residents. The aspirations of our residents were determined by the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- 3.3 Currently the delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy is monitored through our LAA. A family of partnerships, under the Local Strategic Partnership, are responsible for delivery and monitoring of activity. As such the LAA is a city-wide partnership performance agreement. It is also a statement of intent and aspiration. Each partner organisation also continues to monitor its own performance in key areas.
- 3.3 Performance against LAA targets has been positive, but areas of challenge remain. Discussions about current activity and the future alignment of outcomes as set by the Sustainable Community Strategy are imminent.
- 3.4 The LAA is formed in the main from the National Indicator Set introduced in 2008. Some of the indicators are not refreshed annually. Where this is the case the latest available information is provided. In a few cases the national data sources are still unavailable, whilst in others there is a significant time lag (e.g. some of the economic and sustainability indicators). Following the abolition of the 'Place Survey' a number of indicators can no longer be reported on.
- 3.5 Given the council and its partners' plans to move to a commissioning model of service delivery, and that the basis of this commissioning will be a robust evidence base for local needs and aspirations, the future shared performance agreement for the city will be required to shift its focus.

- 3.6 Revised priorities for any future performance agreement will arise from discussions between partners. This process was agreed by the Public Service Board in April 2010. Any future plans will need to meet national requirements, reduce bureaucracy and effectively support local priorities and joint working.
- 3.7 Cabinet are invited to examine the information at Appendix 1, to check progress and, where necessary, recommend additional action or reporting. Detailed action plans for each target are monitored by the Strategic Partnerships. Colours provide the direction of travel at the time of reporting:

<b>GREEN</b>	Performance is at or better than target
<b>AMBER</b>	Performance is off target and progress against delivery plan milestones unknown or uncertain
<b>RED</b>	Performance is significantly off target
<b>GREY</b>	No judgement possible (targets may be missing or it is the first year for an indicator and so sets the baseline against which future performance will be assessed)

- 3.8 Organisational Health Indicators (Appendix 2) report progress against our corporate health including sickness and equality monitoring.
- 3.9 Organisational Health targets dealing with payment of invoices are managed and reviewed by Finance. Performance on paying invoices to small businesses is subject to improvement work within the council. We are working in partnership with businesses to improve the processes.
- 3.10 Workforce indicators, in particular in relation to employees with disabilities and staff from an ethnic minority receive ongoing close attention. As part of this Human Resources are actively pursuing employment policies and campaigns to increase representation. Please note current changes in HR systems mean progress will be reported later.
- 3.11 The Overview & Scrutiny Commission and its committees play a part in our drive for improvement. Each takes regular reports and review specific areas of poor performance. The Commission and the committees have work plans that take into account areas of poor performance and provide challenge and support to officers and partners to improve performance.

### **Changes to the Reporting Framework**

- 3.12 The performance framework for managing the relationship between Central and Local Government has recently changed substantially. This change is intended to reduce bureaucratic burdens and enable focus on genuine local priorities. All designations of local improvement targets have therefore been revoked and full control of LAA's has been handed to local authorities. The council effectively has the freedom to amend or drop any targets without approval from Government.
- 3.13 LAA performance will no longer be monitored centrally and the 'Performance Reward Grant' has been removed. There will not be a requirement to make a new agreement in 2011.

- 3.14 The National Indicator (NI) set will be replaced in April 2011.
- 3.15 In its place local authorities will be required to report data to individual Government Departments. This will be comprehensive and is likely to be in the region of 1,500 measures; it will include, for example, all financial data, housing, social care and environmental data. Further details will be released by the Department for Communities and Local Government by April 2011.
- 3.16 A process has been agreed by the Public Service Board for beginning to prepare for whatever future requirements are put in place. Any future plans will need to meet national requirements, reduce bureaucracy and effectively support local priorities and joint working.

**4. CONSULTATION:**

- 4.1 The Local Area Agreement 2008-2011 priorities were set in negotiation with the Local Strategic Partnership and the Government Office South East (GOSE).

**5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The removal of the performance reward grant associated with 2008-11 LAA improvement targets was confirmed by central government in the letter sent to Leaders by The RT Hon Eric Pickles MP on 10 October 2010. Although the financial incentive has been removed, the partnership working through the LAA and the performance results support the achievement of budget and value for money strategies.

*Finance Officer consulted: Anne Silley* *Date: 18/11/10*

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The proposals in the report are in line with current requirements. Arrangements for performance reporting will need to be reviewed again to ensure that they comply with the new national reporting requirements, referred to at paragraph 3.15 in the report, when these are available.

*Lawyer consulted: Elizabeth Culbert* *Date: 25/11/10*

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 The performance management framework aims to incorporate monitoring of progress against equalities and inclusion outcomes in the city.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The performance management framework aims to incorporate monitoring of progress against sustainability outcomes in the city.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.5 The management of performance is important and contributes to avoiding the risk that the council's improvement priorities will not be delivered. Progress against performance indicators informs our risk and opportunity management assessments.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.6 Reducing crime and disorder is a central theme of the Corporate Plan and the Local Area Agreement and monitoring progress against these outcomes is a key element of the proposed new performance management framework.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 Cabinet, the Strategic Leadership Board and the Corporate Management Team continue to have regular Performance Focus sessions, this is recognised as good practice and allows for both a regular overview of the organisation performance against the LAA and more spotlighted discussions on areas that require additional discussion. These discussions will feed into the service planning timetable and establishment of a new corporate plan in the future. This is an essential part of the council's performance management framework.

**6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 6.1 The monitoring of the Local Area Agreement is part of the performance management framework. This framework is a corporately defined process.

**7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 The report provides information on progress against the LAA priorities ensuring close monitoring for continuous improvement.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Local Area Agreement Summary Report
2. Organisational Health Report

**Documents In Members' Rooms**

None

**Background Documents**

None



# Local Area Agreement – Summary Report

## Mid-year progress 2010/11



### Key

Ref.	National Indicator number of 'local' reference to enable ease of reference	
Indicator	Description of measure	
Unit	How the indicator is measured: normally either number, percentage of monetary	
Target	The latest target set	
Latest information	Contains the most up-to-date data available to measure the indicator	
Performance	● <b>Green</b>	On target
	● <b>Amber</b>	An area in need of improvement but on track to achieve target
	● <b>Red</b>	Off-track and requires attention
	● <b>Grey</b>	Not able to make a judgement of performance due to lack of information

# 1 Improving Health & Wellbeing

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 39	Number of people admitted to hospital due to alcohol related problems	No.	472.50	457.69	• amber
Comments:	<p>This is the latest available data up to June 2010 and has improved over the same period last year. Compared to the South East and all England average results in 2008/09 Brighton &amp; Hove has higher rates of hospital admissions due to alcohol related problems.</p> <p>The Intelligent Commissioning Pilot on alcohol misuse is taking this and other trend information into account within the needs analysis and service mapping which is informing outcomes and commissioning priorities. These recommendations will be brought forward for consideration by Cabinet in coming weeks.</p> <p>This measures the number of alcohol-related admissions to hospital per 100,000 population.</p>				
NI 51	Children & young peoples mental health services (CAMHS)	No.	16	16	• green
Comments:	<p>We achieved the maximum level during 2009/10. The CAMHS service undertake a self assessment that evaluates performance in 4 areas from 1-4 (4 being the best).</p>				
NI 56d	11 year old children who are obese	%	17.60	16.4	• green
Comments:	<p>Good progress is being made. The action plan that supports this work is the Promoting the Healthy Weight and Healthy Lives action plan. Through the implementation of this plan for children and young people we are delivering a combination of diet, nutrition and physical activity initiatives in a range of settings. These includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community dieticians delivering food growing, cooking &amp; dietary advice,</li> <li>• play and physical activity opportunities for children aged 2-11 in areas of health inequalities</li> <li>• free swimming for under 16s</li> <li>• 20 food outlets including nurseries</li> <li>• schools' breakfast clubs gaining the Healthy Choice Award.</li> </ul>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
	This indicators reviews the percentage of children aged 11 who are assessed as being obese and relates to 2009/10. The comparative national average is 18.9%. The improvement of performance to reach 16.4% is not statistically significant and therefore close attention is required and remains a priority for families, schools & the health service.				
NI 59	Percentage of children's social care initial assessment done within 7 working days of referral	%	77	52	• red
Comments:	<p>Revised statutory guidance was published on 17 March 2010. The revised guidance set out that an initial assessment should be completed within 10 working days of a referral. This is a change from the previous timescale of seven days and the change and came into force from 1 April 2010.</p> <p>To avoid creating instability in the National Indicator Set by changing NI 59 part way through the three year cycle, the indicator will remain at seven working days in 2010/11. While the year-to-date result is 52%, performance across all teams for the month of September is 62% using the 7 day timescale and 79% for the 10 day timescale.</p>				
NI 112	Teenage pregnancies	No.	33	33.1	• amber
Comments:	<p>Since the 1998 baseline, the city's under-18 conception rate has fallen by 32%. Overall reductions in the South East and England are 16% and 15%, respectively.</p> <p>The rate of under-18 conceptions locally was 33.1 per 1000 girls aged 15-17, a 6% increase compared to the previous quarter but 18% lower than the rate for the same quarter in 2008.</p> <p>The slight increase in the rate was anticipated from trends in the more timely local data: the increase was driven by the doubling in the number of conceptions leading to maternity in Q2 2009; the percentage increase looks large but equates to 16 births compared to 8 in Q1.</p>				
NI 116	Children living in poverty	%	18	20	• amber

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
Comments:	This is measures the percentage of children living in families who are in receipt of out of work benefits. This data is pre-recession and does not provide a picture of current performance. The result is based on information from 2008; this delay is caused by national problems with gathering information and cannot be resolved locally.				
NI 119	People's health and well being	%	82.70		• grey
Comments:	This shows people's perception of their own overall health and wellbeing, recorded using a series of measures to gauge different aspects of their health. This information was to be collected through the Place Survey in 2010 but this has been cancelled so no further data will be available. Despite this, work continues locally to address this issue.				
NI 123	Stopping smoking	No.	314.6	220.9	• red
Comments:	Although the first few months of this year are below target this is expected to improve as the year progresses. This shows the number of adults per 100,000 population who have given up smoking for over 4 weeks whilst receiving support from the NHS Stop Smoking Service. The actual number of people who have quit so far this year is 475. This result and target is for July 2010; more recent information will be available in December 2010.				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 130	<p>Direct payments</p> <p>This is a key priority for the city, a cross-partnership board was established and has been meeting regularly to oversee delivery of three key workstreams for the self Directed Support Strategy. The provisional result for September 2010, while short of the Brighton &amp; Hove target of 30% does meet the national target of 18%. Direct payments, also sometimes described as Self Directed Support, offer people and those who care for them greater flexibility in the support they want and the way it is provided.</p> <p>The target is being addressed by work to redesign the assessment process enabling service users to have a support plan and an allocation of funding. The main purpose of this project will be to review the needs of current Adult Social Care service users and introduce them to Self Directed Support. This approach will also assist Adult Social Care staff in the culture shift towards Self Directed Support, as well as enabling us to redesign our internal systems to sustain Self Directed Support options.</p> <p>A new governance structure was introduced in early 2009 following a vfm review of the personalisation programme. This established a Personalisation Executive Group which is jointly chaired by the Assistant Director, ASC and the Head of Personalisation and under which five workstreams sit. One workstream covers SDS and personal Budgets Business Processes.</p>	%	30	18 (provisional)	<p>• red</p>
NI 135	<p>Support for carers</p> <p>This indicator shows the percentage of carers who get a 'carer's break' or other specific services following an assessment or review. There is significant data quality work taking place which will further improve performance. We have improved training and support for staff as new teams are created under the Personalisation agenda. This result is up to June 2010, the target is profiled in brackets to reflect the correct position for that point in the year.</p>	%	22 (5.25)	5.3	<p>• green</p>

Comments:

Comments:

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 150	<p>Adults who get support from mental health services that are in paid employment</p> <p>Comments: This data is currently being queried as local recording indicates a higher proportion of people in employment. In 2008/09 it was 3.3%. In 08/09 the South East result was 3.2% and England average was 3.4%. It measures the percentage of adults receiving secondary mental health services who are in paid, self or supported employment at the time of their most recent assessment or review. This represents 30 people in employment out of 885, as recorded on the NHS National Adult Social Care Intelligence Service site.</p>	%	3.3	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>
L11 (NI 54)	<p>Services for disabled children</p> <p>Comments: This indicator has no target as it is the first time it has been measured in this way. In Brighton and Hove parents rated the services received by their disabled child as 58 out of 100 (in line with national average rating). A higher score denotes greater satisfaction with services. Across the 30 local areas with this indicator in their agreements, scores ranged from 55 to 65.</p> <p>Care should be taken when interpreting this indicator, as there have been differences in the way data has been collected nationally.</p>	No.	N/A	58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L12	Percentage of people resolving their enquiries at the adult social care access point	%	90	92.5	• green
Comments:	<p>This is an excellent result for this service and has remained consistently at this level. The Access Point team, based at Bartholomew House, Bartholomew Square, provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a single point of contact for new and existing users of social care services</li> <li>• better information and advice on the full range of care options</li> <li>• a simple assessment process designed to resolve people’s needs as quickly as possible</li> <li>• where needs are more complex, users are referred to the appropriate team for a more detailed assessment</li> </ul>				
L13a	Reducing bullying in secondary schools	%	24	15	• green
Comments:	<p>This result from 2009/10 is a good reduction from 22% in 2008/09. Schools attribute this improvement to the implementation of SEAL (Social and Emotional aspects of learning) strategy, more effective survey delivery and the role of support staff in responding quickly to bullying.</p>				
L13b	Reducing bullying in primary schools	%	26	23	• green
Comments:	<p>2009/10 result, up from 22% in 2008/09. Primary schools where the percentage of children indicating they have experienced bullying in the last year has increased by 5% compared to the previous year will be offered support by the Healthy Schools Team. The overall target has been exceeded by 3%.</p>				

74

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L14	Reduce the number of suicides	No.	12.1	14.6	• amber
Comments:	<p>The numbers above are per 100,000 people, hence the decimal places in the figures. The Intelligent Commissioning Pilot on drug related deaths has identified a potential relationship between the high rate of suicides in the city and drug related deaths. The recommended outcomes and commissioning priorities seeking reductions in the rate of drug related deaths will therefore be considered. The result is based on a three-year rolling average; most recent published data was for 2006-08. 2007/09 data will be published in December 2010.</p>				
L15	Hypertension and cholesterol screening at GP surgeries	%	72.8 (15.3)	14.9	• amber
Comments:	<p>This slightly below target results is probably the result of the time lag of up to six months between the identification of hypertension and getting it under control; for example by addressing lifestyle issues such as exercise. The number of patients on local hypertension registers increased by 6% during the last quarter of 2009/10. The result shown is up to June 2010; we have narrowly missed hitting the target of the clinical management of patients with hypertension (by 0.4%).</p>				
L16	Number of people offered and taking up talking therapies sessions	No.	685	902	• green
Comments:	<p>This measures the number of people with depression or anxiety who have been offered access to psychological therapies. 902 were referred for psychological therapies in the first quarter and of these 510 received them.</p>				

## 2 Improving Housing & Affordability

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 141	Vulnerable people getting help to live independently	%	68	73.3	• green
Comments:	<p>The target has been consistently exceeded throughout the period of the LAA. It measures the number of Supporting People service users who have moved on from supported accommodation in a planned way, as a percentage of the total service users who have left the service. The result is for the first quarter of 2010/11 and represents 272 planned moves out of 371. The rolling 12 month result from June 2009 to June 2010 is 71.6%.</p>				
NI 154	New additional homes provided	No.	570	380	• red
Comments:	<p>The disappointing result is being addressed by Building New Council Homes Tenant Working Group and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Estates Master Plan. Work is being undertaken to identify sites and properties across the City that have potential for development, refurbishment or regeneration. Housing Management Consultative Committee &amp; Cabinet have approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a comprehensive estates master plan in partnership with tenant representatives to inform best use of HRA assets and identify opportunities to build new Council homes</li> <li>• The development of procurement, design and delivery options for new Council housing on up to 800 identified sites</li> </ul> <p>This shows the net increase in homes over the year, taking into account new builds, changes in use, demolitions and conversions. The result in 2008/09 was 721. The result for additional homes is counted at the point that new properties have a roof, not at the point that they are occupied.</p>				

76

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 156	Number of households living in temporary accommodation	No.	333	424	• red
	<p>This shows the number of households living in temporary accommodation provided by the council under homelessness legislation. Work to meet this target is complex and the Administration is determined to improve performance.</p> <p>By creating a Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV), 'Brighton &amp; Hove Seaside Community Homes' (BHSCH) aims to provide additional investment to fund improvements to Council stock. This funding will also support work to meet the needs of those persons to whom the Council owes a housing duty.</p> <p>Comments: The Council will be leasing up to 499 empty council homes to BHSCH. This will enable the Council to receive a capital receipt from BHSCH to benefit the Housing Revenue Account and the improvement of Council stock.</p> <p>Under current guidance these leased homes will count as 'temporary accommodation' for the purposes of NI156.</p> <p>There has been an increase in homelessness presentations to the service and households accepted as homeless this year. This has led to an increase in placements, coupled with fewer social lets. Numbers placed have risen from 316 in March to 424 in September 2010. For context, in September 2008 445 households were living in temporary accommodation.</p>				
NI158	Percentage of non-decent council homes	%	26	33.3	• amber
	<p>This is the percentage of the council's homes that do not meet the government's Decent Homes Standard. There continues to be significant improvement in this area with the proportion failing to meet the standard dropping from the highpoint of 56.6% in 2007/08. The result is for September 2010 and the target for that point in the year is 30.5%. The projected estimate for March 2011 performance is currently 26% and it is expected that we will meet the standard by 2013.</p> <p>From April 2010 a new partnering agreement to manage the repairs contract has been in place and will be in a strong position to deliver the remainder of the Decent Homes programme. The council is committed to creating</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
	<p>communities that are safe and productive and aims help tackle unemployment. This work supports that aim and amongst other things the new contract will provide a training academy with 200 apprenticeships and a kitchen manufacturing workshop.</p> <p>We are working closely with tenants on the creation of a Local Delivery Vehicle (BHSCH) to bring in additional investment to improve Council homes.</p> <p>BHSCH have responded to the financial &amp; commercial offer from BHCC with a proposed investment package of £30.1m to improve Council homes. The Council has accepted BHSCH response to the offer and will be moving to conclude negotiation by financial year end to bring in the funding required.</p> <p>This will allow the council to Lease up to 499 empty Council homes to BHSCH and receive a capital receipt from BHSCH to enable us to continue to improve Council homes.</p>				
L23	<p>Bringing empty properties back into use</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>This relates to private sector empty properties returned to use during the financial year as a direct result of action by the council. We have consistently over achieved on this target previously. The cycle of work and allocation of empty property assistance means that more homes come back toward the end of the financial year.</p> <p>This is the result for the first quarter; performance has been affected by a reduction in the funding available for this work.</p>	No.	39	27	• red

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L24	Reduce the numbers of rough sleepers	No.	10	26	• red
Comments:	<p>This indicator counts the numbers of people sleeping rough in the area. The methodology for counting rough sleepers has changed this year; this result is not directly comparable both to the target and to previous results and will affect the numbers recorded.</p> <p>The annual official rough sleeper count will be at the end of November 2010 which we will report to DCLG. The current figure of 26 is from a 'hot spot' count in June 2010. We are not required to report these to DCLG but choose to count anyway in order to track numbers of rough sleepers in peak summer months. Potentially more people will be included in this November's count than in previous years.</p> <p>Actions to address rough sleeping in the city are contained within the Single Homeless Strategy 2009-14. Key to this are our commissioned Rough Sleepers, Street Service and Relocation Team. Their assertive outreach team engage with rough sleepers as soon as they arrive in the city and get them linked in to housing and support services that can determine their needs. We also provide relocation services for people who have no local connection to the city. We ensure our hostels in the city refer clients to specialist drug and alcohol treatment and mental health services and that there are work and learning services in place to support people toward independent living. Our partnership approach with community and voluntary sector organisations ensures we work together to prevent the people we support from returning to life on the streets.</p>				
L25	Number of home fire safety visits	No.	710.5	718	• amber
Comments:	<p>Although slightly worse than target it is fully expected that an increase in resources available to conduct the Home Safety Visits in the second half of the year will bring this target in on schedule.</p>				

### 3 Promoting Enterprise & Learning

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 79	Achievement of level 2 qualifications	%	80	76	• amber
Comments:	<p>This measures the percentage of young people achieving a specific level 2 qualification by the time they are aged 19. Gaining 5 GCSEs between A-C grades also counts as a level 2 qualification. The above result relates to the 2008/09 academic year. Performance has levelled off, being 76% in 2009 against a target of 80%, a slight decrease from 76.3% in 2008. This is after a period of consistent improvement, from 64% in 2004. The national figure for 2009 was 78.7% and we still compare well with statistical neighbours, whose average is 74.6% for 2009.</p> <p>The CYPT Performance Board has undertaken detailed analysis of GCSE attainment and NEET and will examine the reasons for the levelling off in attainment.</p>				
NI 117	Young people not in employment, education or training (NEET)	%	7.60	8.80	• red

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
Comments:	<p>The latest figures for July 2010 show a percentage NEET rate of 8.45%, slightly up on June 2010 (7.87%) but an improvement on the July 2009 figure which was 8.89%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The draft 16 – 19 Commissioning Strategy identifies a need for additional Foundation Learning and Level 2 provision, tailored to meet the needs of those who are disengaged from education and training through, for example flexible start dates, non-institutional settings and one to one support.</li> <li>- Schools and colleges, working through the 14 – 19 Partnership Board have a critical role in developing and implementing new provision which meets these needs</li> <li>- The ‘On2’ brand has been developed locally as a successor to Entry to Employment (E2E) and Entry to Learning (E2L), providing programmes with flexible start dates through the spring and summer terms 2011</li> <li>- The authority is supporting bids for the European Social Fund 2011 – 13 programme, which is focussed on meeting the needs of those who are NEET or at risk of becoming NEET, with a view to ensuring that the programme reflects local priorities and builds on models that have proved successful.</li> </ul> <p>The annual 16-18 NEET rate is calculated as an average of November, December and January figures. The official 2009/10 NEET figure for 16 - 18 year olds in Brighton &amp; Hove is 8.8%, which equates to an average of 593 young people across the 3 months. The 2008/9 three month average was 7.8%, giving an average of 547 young people. The 2009/10 figure compares to an average rate of 7.0% amongst statistical neighbours and 6.4% nationally. It is worth noting that rates in Southampton and Portsmouth, similar south east cities, are higher at 9.2% and 10.5% respectively.</p> <p>The current economic conditions appear to be contributing to the rise in numbers with many of the NEET group falling out of employment rather than education/training. Since the 3 month average figures were gathered, the 16-18 NEET rate fell to 7.88% in April 2010, equating to 483 young people. This appears in large measure, to be due to time limited initiatives which placed young people registering as NEET in Entry to Employment programmes.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 152	The number of working age people on out of work benefits	No	20,115	24,333	• red
Comments:	<p>Due to the recession the rate of unemployment has been rising but has levelled off in Brighton &amp; Hove since January. Data informing this indicator is lagged by 8 months to real time. This measure reviews the percentage of the working age population who are claiming out of work benefits (unemployed people on Jobseekers Allowance, Lone Parents on Income Support, Incapacity Benefits customers, and others on income related benefits). The information above is for the year ending February 2010.</p> <p>The LAA Delivery Plan and the City Employment Skills Plan sets out in detail actions to improve performance. The full action plan is contained in the City Employment &amp; Skills Plan and is reviewed regularly by the Economic and Learning partnerships.</p>				
NI 163	Percentage of working age people qualified to level 2 or higher	%	77.90	78.90	• green
Comments:	<p>The aim of this indicator is to raise the overall skills of the workforce, a target that has been exceeded. Local information suggests that young people without qualifications are 50% more likely to be employed for a longer time than those with qualifications. The information shown is for the calendar year 2008, which is the latest available.</p>				
NI 171	New businesses started – registration rate	No	63	63.3	• green
Comments:	<p>In the Centre for Cities report for 2010, Brighton was highlighted as having the 6th highest business birth rate (out of 64 other areas – 49.6%) - this is compared with a business death rate of 42.4%. As well as featuring in the top ten for business births we also feature in the top ten for high skilled workforce and knowledge intensive industries – this highlights our high rate of entrepreneurial activity. The information shown is for 2008 which is the latest available. The target has been adjusted to reflect the impact of the recession and a change to baseline</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
<p>information.                      Business registrations are a proxy measure for business start-ups (actual measure is registrations for VAT and PAYE per 10,000 population aged 16 and above).</p>					
L1	<p>Progress towards the development of the Brighton Centre</p> <p>Annually the current Centre generates in the region of £50 million for the city. The proposed redevelopment will improve conference business and income and enhance the surrounding area; including the seafront. The development scheme aims to deliver maximum economic benefit for the city.</p> <p>This indicator is here to enable us to comment on the progress made towards the development of the Brighton Centre. Lead architects have been confirmed and appointments for other members of the design team are underway. Target date for identifying and defining a viable scheme is estimated to be six months after the design team has been established.</p> <p>In order to sustain business levels and develop them prior to any re-development the authority is making some investments which include a new café, new box office, refurbished public spaces, new seating, new audio visual equipment and during 2011 a new frontage will be introduced for the building. These investments are maintaining confidence that the building and the city can continue to accommodate major conferences and events while the re-development plans are progressed and they will continue to support the £732m visitor economy and 14,000 local jobs</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>

Comments:

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L2	Value of the local economy	£	18,500	19,477	• green
Comments:	<p>Brighton &amp; Hove GVA (Gross Value Added) grew at around 3% in the period 2006-7, the South East grew at around 4% and the rest of the country outside of London significantly slower. Brighton &amp; Hove GVA is growing at a faster rate than most cities, and is predicted to continue to do so according to the Centre for Cities Report 2010. GVA is a measure of the value of the local economy. A relatively high GVA per head indicates that the local economy is healthy and productive.</p>				
L4	Improving the Visitor Economy	£M	440.7	693.1	• green
Comments:	<p>Good progress on this indicator is very important as the visitor economy is an important source of employment in the city and attracts significant income. The result represents the total spend made by visitors on their trip to the city in 2008 - this was an estimated £693.1million. From 2007 the methodology used to capture Economic Impact has changed and targets for 2010/11 have been set according to the new source of data.</p>				

## 4 Promoting Resource Efficiency & Enhancing the Environment

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 186	<p>Reduction of Carbon Dioxide emissions</p> <p>The result shown is the percentage reduction of per capita CO2 emissions in Brighton and Hove between 2006 and 2008. This period is used to provide the latest result, though should be read mindful of the fact that there are time lags in obtaining data of up to two years. The council’s approach to addressing progress on this indicator is set out below:</p> <p>Local targets are unmet because the LAA process did not afford time for the project to meet its aims, effectively only giving us one year in which to make real change. However, our achievements compare favourably to national indicators and our reputation and aspirations are high; not least our desire to meet the Leaders commitment to the 10:10 Campaign. Emissions stood at 5.45 tonnes per person in 2007, and dropped to 5.30 tonnes in 2008; we are reducing emissions at a greater rate than the England Average.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Alongside our reputation as a leader in the field we are delivering against several schemes:                      Marketing and implementing the ‘Brighton &amp; Hove Warm-Homes’ scheme - the 2011 Energy Guide has been delivered to 75,000 homes &amp; businesses.                      Establishing a pan South-East energy manager network, holding meetings quarterly chaired by Brighton and Hove, to assist with energy related tasks.                      Maximising sign up to the 10:10 Campaign.                      Promoting other climate change initiatives such as ‘Climate Connections’ and ‘Eco Open Houses’.                      Reducing traffic levels through promoting alternative forms of transport and working with schools and employers to develop travel plans.                      We are reducing CO2 emissions of council housing stock.’</p>	%	12	6.12	<p>• <b>red</b></p>

65

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 187a	Reducing Fuel Poverty in households claiming income benefits (low energy efficiency)	%	12.1	11.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• green</li> </ul>
NI 187b	Reducing Fuel Poverty in households claiming income benefits (high energy efficiency)	%	32.4	32.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• green</li> </ul>
<p>The Administration has set clear direction of travel around improving energy efficiency and maximising investment in partnership with tenants through developing FIT and ESCO models.</p> <p>NI187 measures progress in tackling fuel poverty through the improved energy efficiency of homes lived in by people claiming income related benefits. A fuel poor home is one which needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel to maintain sufficient heating. The main cause of fuel poverty in the UK is a combination of poor energy efficiency in homes, low incomes and high energy prices.</p> <p>The latest information is from 2009/10 and shows the percentage of households on income related benefits for which an energy assessment of their home has been carried out, living in homes with low (a) or high (b) energy efficiency. The survey results for 2010 should be available in December.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>We are working with tenants to consider these energy company investment opportunities, in particular opportunities arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Energy Saving Programme (CESP) - established to target home energy efficiency and renewable energy measures at areas that have been identified as having significant levels of low income households</li> <li>• Feed in Tariff's – where energy companies pay for supply generated by installation of solar PV measures on council owned / tenanted properties and residents benefit from reduced fuel bills</li> <li>• ESCO (Energy Services Company) options to capture benefits of energy generation for the City and it's residents</li> </ul>					

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 195c	Levels of Graffiti	%	6	2	• green
Comments:	<p>Levels of cleanliness are high and the target is being exceeded.</p> <p>A visual inspection on a selection of sample streets is undertaken during a regular survey to determine the levels of unsatisfactory cleanliness. This figure is the latest available and represents the period April to July 2010.</p>				
L26 (NI 185)	Carbon Emissions Footprint of the Council	No.	N/A	33,195 tons (baseline)	• grey
Comments:	<p>At this stage we cannot make a judgement on the level of performance of the council's carbon footprint because the result shown represents our baseline. This information presents the Carbon Dioxide emissions (tonnes) output of our operations and includes vehicle fleet, business travel, our entire business portfolio (excluding social housing), street lights and bollards.</p> <p>The result shown is the estimated volume of total CO2 emissions caused by Brighton &amp; Hove City Council's operations and functions during 2008/09. This is not the result against this indicator; it is the baseline figure on which future reduction targets are based. Subsequent further improvements in data collection / metering may have an impact on comparative performance.</p> <p>Benchmarking against other city councils in the southeast though shows that we have a relatively low level of emissions per employee.</p> <p>When the data for 2009/10 is finalised we are aiming for a 4% reduction over the year, in line with the original target. By signing up to 10:10 however, we are aiming for a 10% reduction in 2010/11, though the 10:10 measurement itself excludes schools' performance, according to nationally determined criteria.</p> <p>Review and revision of the Carbon Management Programme Strategy &amp; Implementation Plan is on track.</p> <p>The Salix fund (Carbon Management revolving loan fund) has been used for projects over the last four years, but following review is to be focused on larger projects, and a number are now being investigated and implemented.</p> <p>We have completed King's House energy efficiency trial, involving staff awareness and switch-off campaigns, linked to improved metering. This work has been used to create a blueprint for a roadshow which can move on to other key council buildings.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
	<p>We have trialled and assessed the viability of energy monitoring software to reduce wastage of energy through using PCs.                      Staff have been encouraged to sign up to 10:10 and to change travel patterns through Staff Travel Plan programmes on cycling and bus use.</p>				

## 5 Promoting Sustainable Transport

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 167	Managing congestion – the average time taken per mile to commute during the morning peak (8am – 10am)	No.	3:38 mins	3:27 mins.	• green
Comments:	This indicator measures average journey time per mile between 8am and 10pm across major routes through the City. This is the result for 2008/09 and is the latest data available. It represents the average journey time per mile (minutes) during the morning peak traffic flows. Managing congestion has resulted in a 10 minute improvement in travel times.				
NI 175	The percentage of people in the city who have good access to GP surgeries by public transport, walking and cycling	%	93%	87%	• red
Comments:	This indicator measures accessibility to doctors' (GP) surgeries based on the proportion of the population within a 10 minute journey time from a surgery. It is noted however, that accessibility within the 15 minute journey time threshold has remained constant from 2008 to 2010 at a very high level of 97%. During the period of this LAA, the PCT has overseen the relocation of a number of smaller, more localised GP surgeries in the Preston and Carden areas to larger sites at 175 Preston Road and Carden Hill respectively. These changes in location, rather than transport provision, are considered to be the main reason for the current level of performance, as most journeys within 10 minutes could only reasonably be expected to be carried out on foot and by bike using existing roads and pavements and no additional routes have been built. In addition, there are now higher frequencies on some of the core bus routes in the city. The result shown is the 2009/10 result and is the latest available.				

## 6 Reducing Crime & Improving Safety

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 17	<p>The percentage of people in Brighton &amp; Hove who think anti-social behaviour is a problem</p> <p>Comments: This information was to be collected through the Place Survey in 2010 however this has been ended, so no further data will be available. Although the collection of data has ceased, work continues to address the issue. Available data on actual anti-social behaviour for the first half of the reporting year shows some improvement. There were 8,512 police recorded incidents of social disorder, of which 1,752 were related to youths. Compared with the first half of 2009/10, youth social disorder is down by about 4%, and adult social disorder has decreased by 0.5%. Social disorder incidents have declined since the summer peak, as also experienced in previous years.</p>	%	32.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>
NI 30	<p>The number of crimes committed by key offenders known to the police (Priority Prolific Offenders)</p> <p>Comments: Nationally it is estimated that 50% of crime is committed by 10% of offenders; the most prolific 0.5% commit 10% of crimes. Reducing both the number of repeat juvenile and adult offenders and their rate and seriousness of offending will have significant benefit to communities in the city. The result and target shown reflect the latest official data for this indicator which is the 2009/10 result. This information is based on the 2009 Cohort and performance was very strong against target. We are awaiting confirmation from the Home Office of the LAA target and baseline figure for the 2010 cohort. From our local count, there have been 93 convictions to date from this cohort with a potential maximum of 143 offences for the first six months. Without knowing the baseline number it is difficult to judge performance, but with the number of offences in the first 6 months being higher than for last year, while the cohort is smaller than previous years, this suggests that the next six months may be challenging.</p>	No.	254	169	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amber</li> </ul>

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 32	Repeat incidents of domestic violence	%	28	25.5	• green
Comments:	<p>Work to prevent domestic violence locally has been recognised as very good in comparison to other areas. Over 100 high risk victims of domestic violence and their children were helped during 2008/09. The Brighton and Hove Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) started in October 2007 as part of a national roll out of the scheme by the Home Office. It meets monthly and looks at approximately 10 very high-risk cases per meeting. In addition to this work there is ground breaking Break4Change programme for young people who are being abusive or violent to their parents or family in initial evaluation shows significant changes in young people's behaviour and improved outcomes for parents and carers. MARAC has also contributed to reduce the risk of serious harm or homicide for victims of domestic abuse and has enabled a more co-ordinated response across all agencies to increase the safety, health and well-being of all victims – adults and children. This result is for the period April to October 2010.</p>				
NI 38	Criminal offences which are related to Class A drug use	No.	0.95 reduction of 5%	0.65	• green
Comments:	<p>Partnership working has resulted in significant improvements in this target. This is the 2009/10 result which is the latest available. The figure represents the ratio of actual against predicted reoffending by Class A drug users (if the number of actual offences was the same as the number of predicted offences this would equal a ratio of 1). This performance is 32% better than the annual target of 0.95. Three prolific and other priority offenders have been identified whose offending is above the predicted level, who are most at risk of reconviction, and who will be targeted intensively. Good progress has been made with Drug Rehabilitation Requirements: the number of commencements for Apr-Aug was 39% ahead of target schedule and, for successful completions, 7% below.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 40	<p>The number of Class A drug users who are in effective treatment</p> <p>The number of drug users in effective treatment is defined as those Class A drug users [opiates and/or crack cocaine] who are in treatment for twelve weeks or more, or who are subject to a planned discharge within twelve weeks.</p> <p>The data shown is the latest available and is for the period April 2010 to end of May 2010, and shows we are performing better than target.</p>	No.	985	1018	<p>• green</p>
NI 47	<p>The number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</p> <p>This is the result for the calendar year 2009 and is the latest information available. Although this is below target it is worth noting that the total number of deaths has reduced. Two people died in 2009 compared with five in 2008. The overall number of people injured fell from 1207 in 2008 to 1105 in 2009 (8.4% reduction).</p> <p>Reductions against DfT 1994-98 Baseline:                      KSI = 12.28%                      Child KSI = 36.36%</p> <p>We are now in a position to make better use of the data to identify patterns &amp; trends and are targeting resources accordingly via education, training and publicity, plus engineering.</p> <p>In partnership with the SSRP (Sussex Safer Roads Partnership) we deliver an ongoing programme of road safety initiatives and campaigns which include THINK campaigns, Share the road, and Brighten up Brighton.</p> <p>We are on course to deliver against child road safety training targets, which includes child cycling and child pedestrian training in schools</p> <p>We have completed a review of speed limits on A &amp; B Class roads and the next phase of review which will include all City roads is just beginning with revised methodology resulting from the Scrutiny report into 20mph speed limits/zones.</p> <p>We are on course to deliver individual casualty reduction schemes at 26 sites and to review current validity of the existing site list and priority order. Work at 13 of the sites is completed, 10 are currently in the planning or build stage.</p>	No.	123	150	<p>• red</p>

NO

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 111	The number of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System (children aged 10 – 17)	No.	122.5	109	• green
Comments:	<p>For the period April to September there has been a 20% reduction in First Time Entrants compared to the same period for last year. Youth Offending Service Triage has had an impact and the Family Intervention Project has also helped in improving this work.</p> <p>This indicator shows the number of young people (aged 10-17) who receive their first substantive outcome from the youth justice system. A substantive outcome is a reprimand, a final warning, or a court disposal for those who go directly to court.</p>				
L 6	The number of assaults leading to less serious injury	No.	3.79	3.73	• green
Comments:	<p>The result and target is the number of these incidents per 1000 people in Brighton and Hove. The actual number of offences committed so far this year is 955 against a target of 971. This target aims for a five percent reduction on last year's offences and this is being achieved.</p> <p>Since April we have not experienced typical month-on-month trends, e.g. some have been the lowest in five years, some the highest in three. Although we continue to see a reduction in assaults with injury, further performance analysis reveals that the ABH element is rising slightly. This is not within the city centre hence not directly attributable to the night time economy, but it does relate to public areas rather than private. There is some anecdotal evidence of increased recording as a result of the new investigative structure (Response Investigation Team) but this requires further examination.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L 7a	<p>The number of arson incidents which lead to major fires</p> <p>The figures shown are incidents per 1000 population. A primary fire is a major fire involving property, casualties or 5 or more appliances. There have been 106 deliberate primary fires in total in Brighton and Hove over the first half of the year, against an annual target of 183.</p> <p>Comments: Although the current performance is slightly worse than target the levels of fire service recorded serious and less serious arson in the first half of 2010/11 are both showing good reductions compared with last year (down 24% and 15% respectively). Following the relatively high levels seen between April and July 2010, numbers in both categories of arson have dropped sharply for the months of August and September. Trends for previous years have seen a decline in incidents during the last 6 months of the year and it is expected that the target will be met.</p>	No.	0.36	0.41	<p>• <b>amber</b></p>
L 7b	<p>The number of arson incidents which lead to less serious fires</p> <p>The figures shown are incidents per 1000 population. A less serious secondary fire is a major fire involving property, casualties or 4 or fewer appliances. There have been 166 deliberate secondary fires in total in Brighton and Hove over the first half of the year, against an annual target of 288.</p> <p>Comments: Although the current performance is slightly worse than target the levels of fire service recorded serious and less serious arson in the first half of 2010/11 are both showing good reductions compared with last year (down 24% and 15% respectively). Following the relatively high levels seen between April and July 2010, numbers in both categories of arson have dropped sharply for the months of August and September. Trends for previous years have seen a decline in incidents during the last 6 months of the year and it is expected that the target will be met.</p>	No.	0.56	0.65	<p>• <b>amber</b></p>

## 7 Strengthening Communities & Involving People

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 4	<p>Percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions in the local area</p>	%	29.4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>
Comments:	<p>This information was to be collected through the Place Survey in 2010 but this has been cancelled so no further data will be available.</p> <p>We are in the early stages of re-commissioning our community engagement, community development and voluntary sector representation work. The commissions will include activity against these outcomes and they will be measured as part of their performance management.</p> <p>Current progress is good and we aspire to improve on this once the new arrangements have been determined. Work continues to improve and develop our democratic processes to ensure and improve transparency and accessibility. We have recently published all council expenditure over £500.00 online in compliance with Government encouragement.</p>				
NI 6	<p>Participation in regular volunteering</p>	%	23.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grey</li> </ul>
Comments:	<p>This information was to be collected through the Place Survey in 2010 but this has been cancelled so no further data will be available.</p> <p>We are in the early stages of re-commissioning our community engagement, community development and voluntary sector representation work. The commissions will include activity against these outcomes and they will be measured as part of their performance management.</p> <p>Current progress is good and we aspire to improve on this once the new arrangements have been determined. Our volunteering strategy and outreach work continues to increase the number of volunteers across the city. We are working with partners to maximise the potential of the Governments 'Big Society' agenda.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
NI 7	Support for a thriving 3 <sup>rd</sup> sector	%	24.8	19.8	• grey
Comments:	<p>The council and its partners help to provide an environment in which independent third sector organisations can operate successfully. This helps to reduce the burden on the state and assists community cohesion and inclusivity. It provides opportunities for individuals to have more say over issues that affect them. This information is taken from the 2008 National Survey of Third Sector Organisations and is the latest available. The next survey will be in 2010.</p>				
NI 11	Engagement in the arts	%	64.2	61.2	• grey
Comments:	<p>This information is taken from the 2008 Active People Survey, which is the latest available. We have the highest engagement with the arts outside London; 45.2% was the national result that year. The next result will be available by March 2011.</p>				
L 17	Percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together	%	86.5		• grey
Comments:	<p>This information was to be collected through the Place Survey in 2010 but this has been cancelled so no further data will be available. Setting this target demonstrates our commitment to community cohesion and reflects the diverse communities that comprise and contribute to the character of to the city. Although this measure is no longer collected centrally progress on delivering and measuring progress across this important area continues through the CDRP, the Police, our Public Safety and Community and Equalities Teams.</p>				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
L 18	Adults taking part in sport	%	22.7	23.2	• green
Comments:	Current results show an improvement in uptake of the adult population participating in sport or active recreation 3 days a week. The result shown is taken from the 'Active People Survey' (APS) 3 which was conducted over the financial year of 2009/10. This is just above the national average, coming 171 out of 354 all England authorities. The next data will be released in January 2011.				
L21	Community engagement in local libraries	%	100	100	• green
Comments:	This indicator shows progress made against the delivery of all the actions in the LAA Delivery Plan to engage communities with local libraries. Currently all elements of the plan are progressing as expected so the result is assessed at 100%. These include targets on the number of physical and virtual visits, new stock added, the number of library members, customer satisfaction levels, programs to support children's reading (Bookstart) and many others.				
L22	Number of school children on organised museum visits	No.	15,876	13,802	• amber
Comments:	Our target of 15,876 up until September 2010 is adjusted to take into account seasonal fluctuations (i.e. school holidays etc). Work continues in this area with the intention to reduce inequalities for children and young people, improve the cultural offer and learning opportunities, and improve local engagement with the city's museum resources.				



## APPENDIX 2



***Brighton & Hove City Council***

***Organisational Health – Mid Year Progress Report 2010/11***

***Appendix 2***

## Key

Ref.	National Indicator number of 'local' reference to enable ease of reference	
Indicator	Description of measure	
Unit	How the indicator is measured: normally either number, percentage of monetary	
Target	The latest target set	
Latest information	Contains the most up-to-date data available to measure the indicator	
Performance	● <b>Green</b>	On target
	● <b>Amber</b>	An area in need of improvement but on track to achieve target
	● <b>Red</b>	Off-track and requires attention
	● <b>Grey</b>	Not able to make a judgement of performance due to lack of information

**Note:**

The indicators listed below have not been included in this report as we are in the process of migrating information between the old and new HR and Payroll Systems and also building the new organisational structures. The data available is currently held on different systems and reporting on that data could well be misleading. A report will be provided for the next quarter and a retrospective report covering this quarter will be provided, thus ensuring there is no long term loss of quality data.

BV011a – Percentage of the top 5% of earners that are women

BV011b – Percentage of the top 5% of earners from an ethnic minority

BV011c – Percentage of the top 5% of earners with a disability

BV016 – Percentage of employees declaring they meet the Disability Discrimination Act

BV017a – Percentage of staff from an ethnic minority

These are all important indicators for the authority and despite the lack of accurate performance information the ongoing work to support these, such as the workers forums, continues.

## Organisational Health

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
BV002a	<p><b>The level of the Equality Standard for Local Government to which the authority conforms</b></p> <p>We achieved level 3 on the old Equalities Standard in March 2009. The assessment system has since been revised and this is now equivalent to achieving level 2 on the new Equalities Framework. We are now aiming for the new top level 3 – Excellent, which we are committed to achieving by December 2010.</p>	No.	3.00	2.00	• amber
BV008	<p><b>The percentage of all supplier invoices that are paid within 30 calendar days of receipt</b></p> <p>Good progress has been made in achieving this target is being made. During quarter 2 46,061 invoices out of 49,712 were paid within 30 days (92.66%). The cumulative result of 92.98% represents 97,183 invoices out of 104,523 being paid within 30 days. Analysis of the invoices that have been paid late shows that there has been a problem with unauthorised care packages for Adult Social Care clients. Colleagues in Adult Social Care have been addressing this problem during the year, and their hard work should be reflected in improved performance during Quarter 3.</p> <p>Other work that is expected to improve payment performance in the longer term includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction of Intelligent Scanning for paper invoices.</li> <li>• The introduction of the Electronic Care Management System for Adult Social Care.</li> <li>• Improvements to the Carefirst/Authority Financials interface.</li> <li>• Finance and the Energy &amp; Water team are reviewing processes for the payment of Southern Water Invoices (32% of which are paid in over 30 days)</li> </ul> <p>Note that the reported figures exclude a utility provider with whom we have had significant problems processing electronic</p>	%	94.00	92.98	• amber

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
	invoices. If these were included then the cumulative performance for the year would stand at 88.66% and the result for quarter 2 would be 89.05%. There are a number of improvement actions being undertaken such as revisions to our contract specification for subsequent energy suppliers, to ease the impact of electronic invoices.				
<b>BV008</b> Local	<b>Percentage of invoices from SME (Small or Medium Enterprises) and individuals that are paid within 10 working days of receipt</b>	%	<b>80.00</b>	<b>73.89</b>	<b>• amber</b>
Comments:	<p>Good progress on achieving this target is being made. In Quarter 2 at total 16,439 of the 22,586 invoices were paid to SMEs within 10 days i.e. 72.8%. Of the 47,310 invoices received so far this year, 34,957 have been paid within 10 days (73.89%). In Q2 2009 this indicator was performing at 41.53% representing just over 11,500</p> <p>The council recognises that cash-flow is all important to small businesses and although not all payments are yet paid within 10 days, we have taken the following actions to support small businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the biggest problems is identifying which of our suppliers is a small business - all services have therefore been instructed to indicate on the invoice when a supplier is a small business on the invoice to ensure priority processing in the Central Payments Unit;</li> <li>• Calls from small businesses who are chasing payment are prioritised and invoices processed as a matter of urgency – however, monitoring of calls shows that this is only very occasional;</li> <li>• Small Suppliers are being advised through various media to ensure that they only supply goods and services to the council on receipt of an official Purchase Order (PO) and, most importantly, quote the PO number on their invoice – this is by far the best solution and dramatically speeds up the payment process.</li> </ul> <p>Further work to be undertaken both in terms of communications and ensuring compliance with procurement processes that will help us improve further.</p>				
<b>BV009</b>	<b>Percentage of council tax collected</b>	%	<b>55.98</b>	<b>56.11</b>	<b>• green</b>
Comments:	The council is in a good half-year position with collection rates being 0.13% above target. The service is continuing to implement service improvements and performance is on track for meeting targets.				

Ref.	Indicator	Unit	Target	Latest information	Performance
<b>BV010</b>	<b>Percentage of non-domestic rates collected</b>	%	<b>60.09</b>	<b>61.16</b>	• <b>green</b>
Comments:	Good progress is being made in respect of this target. The trends in business rates collection are quite volatile as national and local economic factors can determine customers paying patterns, particularly in a period of recession. The combination of a deferred payment scheme and increased small business rate relief would both potentially have a positive effect on the collection percentage, although the latter will only truly kick in from the 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter. The team is also completely on top of its workload and is being more proactive in its collection this year which will also contribute to what, by normal standards, is a significant improvement in collection between the two years.				
<b>BV012</b>	<b>Number of working days / shifts lost due to sickness absence (excluding schools)</b>	No.	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.81</b>	• <b>grey</b>
Comments:	The result shown is inflated due to open ended sickness where a sickness start date is present but as yet no end date. The number of these incomplete records in the data lessens as more sickness end dates are entered onto the system. When the self service element of the new HR system is live (Feb 11) this should reduce/eliminate the impact of open ended sickness records distorting performance reporting. In the interim HR will run a process to follow up and close all instances of open absences on the system and provide a more accurate result in time for Cabinet.				
<b>BV156</b>	<b>Percentage of authority buildings open to the public with all public areas suitable for and accessible to people with disabilities</b>	%	<b>80.00</b>	<b>77.50</b>	• <b>green</b>
Comments:	This indicator will achieve the 80% target by the end of the financial year. The total number of buildings currently open to the public in Brighton & Hove = 160, of these 124 are considered under DDA legislation to be accessible. The increase from 76.4% at the end of quarter 1 to 77.5% at quarter 2 10/11 is due to a number of factors, some buildings are no longer being classed as public buildings and completion of improvement works for example the refurbishment of St Luke's swimming pool including access improvement works means that it is now an accessible public building.				