

# **Appendix B**

## **Category B Proposals**

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Alternative Use of the Dedicated Grant for Schools

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to charge expenditure currently funded by the County Council to the Schools Budget. School funding is determined by the national arrangements under which the Schools Budget is provided by a ring-fenced grant, the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The distribution of this funding is determined by the County Council with advice from the Schools Forum and within the parameters set by the Government. The schools budget provided by the DSG consists of two parts:

- a) the funding delegated to schools known as the Individual Schools Budget (ISB)
- b) funding for services for children managed directly by the Authority known as the Non-ISB.

The ISB is distributed to schools in the form of delegated budget shares in accordance with the County Council's local funding formula. The centrally managed budget comprises provision for schools and pupils that is not delegated. It includes pupil referral units, non-maintained early years provision and out-of-county special educational needs (SEN) placements.

In 2006/07 the definition of the Schools Budget was broadened to provide some additional but limited flexibility with regard to combined services, where a combined service is a service partly funded from the Non-ISB & partly from other budgets of the Authority.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

9,763

NET  
£000

7,163

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
3330	0	0	0	0	<b>3330</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

46%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

Service users will not face any direct change in service delivery as the proposal involves charging a range of budgets to the Schools (Non-Invest to Save Budget) Budget, which is funded by Government grant for educational activities not directly provided by schools.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Potential impact is to be discussed further at the autumn meeting of the Schools Forum.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Charging expenditure currently funded by the County Council to the Schools Budget will enable savings to be made without any reduction in service delivery. The Schools Forum must agree to the expenditure being charged to the Schools Budget and the educational benefit derived from the expenditure is broadly proportionate to the contribution from the Schools Budget. Subsequently, more flexibility has been introduced with the possibility of charging to the Schools Budget expenditure on prudential borrowing, termination of employment costs, the schools' specific contingency, special educational needs transport costs & educational psychology costs. Again, the Schools Forum must agree to the expenditure being charged to the Schools Budget and there must have been consequential savings to the Schools Budget.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Children and Young People's Grant Aid - currently held within Children and Young People's Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal will reduce the Children and Young People's budget for grant funding to voluntary and community sector organisations over a 4 year period. This proposal complements the cross cutting proposals on grant funding.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

529

NET  
£000

529

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	40	40	40	40	<b>159</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

30%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Reductions in funding will be tapered carefully. Some organisations funded by the grants help release some of the pressures on struggling families. Without the support they provide, increased pressure would fall on the department's services - areas already under considerable strain.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The capability of some organisations to operate depends on the cumulative funding decisions of the Council and its partners such as the NHS. Therefore, coordinating internal grant aid decisions so that there is not an unforeseen double impact on organisations will be a key part of taking the proposal forward.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Again, there is a risk that reduced funding from one department could lead to an organisation becoming unviable and not able to fulfil contracts awarded by another Council service area. A co-ordinated approach is an essential feature of developing the proposal.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

CYPS currently provides funding of over £500K to a range of voluntary and community sector organisations. Although this is permitted through the Council's financial regulations, it is not a statutory responsibility. Tapering the reduction over a four year period rather than ceasing the funding from April 2011 would allow the affected groups time to seek alternative forms of funding.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Review of Funding Arrangements for Joint Use Facilities

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to review funding arrangement for the provision of joint use facilities. The current joint use budget consists of funding for contractual commitments relating to contributions to district councils (£875k) and other funding to support the ongoing provision of joint use facilities at Nottinghamshire schools (£689k).

It is proposed that from the 2011/12 financial year schools with joint use sites will receive funding for the contractual commitments element as part of their formula budgets and make payments direct to district councils. This will result in funding for these costs being shifted to the dedicated schools grant. It is also proposed to reduce the remaining joint use budget by a further £88k in 2011/12 through containing expenditure on contributions to essential maintenance. Following these proposals the total budget for joint use in 2011/12 will be approx £601k. It is proposed to review the future management of this with key stakeholders and colleagues in Communities Department, Property Services and elsewhere within CYP in order to identify the best approach to managing this ongoing budget provision and seeking to make further efficiencies. On the successful conclusion of this review the proposal would be to delete the post of partnership consultant within CYPS.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,564

NET  
£000

1,564

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	1018	0	0	0	<b>1018</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

65%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

1.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

1.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

By seeking to put in place new arrangements to maintain the level of service beyond 2013, it is hoped to avoid any direct impact on service users.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

It will offer greater longer term financial security to district partners in terms of contributions from sums allocated to joint use schools via the Local Management of Schools (LMS) formula. Joint Use schools will have a broadly neutral financial position and will be able to work directly in partnership with district councils in the future provision of services to pupils and the community. The future funding of the curriculum elements of Joint Use will be a cost on the overall Schools Budget equating to about 0.2% of current funding levels. However, this will help to secure access to shared facilities needed for curriculum delivery, e.g. joint use pools utilised as part of the primary swimming programme.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Continuation of facilities for pupils and the community will support the wider sport, physical activity and health objectives of the County Council.

Reductions in centrally retained Joint Use funding will impact on the ability to contribute to exceptional maintenance items in collaboration with Property Services.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Joint Use agreements with each district council were established in 2001 and are due to expire in March 2013. These have helped to support a planned reduction in County Council joint use contributions from approx £3 million in 2002/03. However, a point has now been reached where the sustainability of current arrangements beyond 2013 is under question. Schools choosing to opt for Foundation status also puts into question the current central funding arrangements.

Contractual commitments relating to contributions to district councils (£875k) relate to all schools delegated responsibilities in respect of joint use areas that are essential to curriculum delivery. Historically these costs have been funded outside of the schools budget but there is a strong argument that this should have been funded from within the dedicated schools grant since this was introduced. This change will help to deliver a shift in psychology towards joint use provision in Nottinghamshire by delegating funding and moving towards the relationship for the management of joint use provision being between district councils and schools. With a much reduced level of local authority budget provision for joint use remaining it makes sense to review the best way of managing this in the future.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Reduction Programme for Children and Young People's Health Promotion Work

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to substantially reduce the number of health functions undertaken by the Department as this is a non statutory service. There are currently a number of health functions provided across the Department. These functions include frontline health promotion work, workforce development, consultancy support and advice to schools, joint commissioning & strategic planning. All the work currently provided is delivered in partnership with the NHS.

As a result of implementing this proposal:

- a) All in-house functions will cease and key functions which reflect local needs assessments & evidence based practice will be outsourced. A total of £60K will be retained to fund this out-sourced activity e.g. C-cards to help prevent teenage pregnancies.
- b) Joint commissioning activity with Primary Care Trusts will continue as and when appropriate and some budget will be retained to support this activity
- c) The Area Based Grant allocations to the PCT for Healthy Schools and the Children's Mental Health Partnership Manager will cease.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

724

NET  
£000

625

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	Total
£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
0	553	0	0	0	<b>553</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

88%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

13.00

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

13.00



## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

Children and Young People will have less access to information about health, local services, and how to protect themselves from taking risks with their health. They will be less involved in the development, delivery and evaluation of health services and health activities in a range of settings. There will be fewer options for teenage parents for accessing training or employment.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be no central point of contact for partner organisations e.g. teen pregnancy. There will be less specialist support for schools and other settings. Organisations will need to be more self sufficient in researching and delivering health promotion activities.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There will be no central point of contact regarding Children and Young People's health and health issues. This work cannot be sustained by the Healthy Communities Team within Adult Social Care and Health if plans to close this service are approved. The Communications team and the Customer Service Centre team will need to pick up more work e.g. information for Children and Young People, parents/carers and responding to media requests following an incident or a crisis.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

By ceasing non-statutory frontline delivery services and outsourcing activity based on evidence and need, the Department will be able to focus on strategic commissioning to improve outcomes for children and young people. There will be clearer accountability for these services within health and more opportunities for the Third Sector to contribute towards this type of service provision. This proposal compliments health promotion reductions being proposed within other departments within the Authority.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Youth Offending Service Cost Reduction Programme

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal covers the reorganisation of the Youth Offending Service (YOS), the preventative provision services and a reduction in operational management costs. There would be a reduction in the provision of preventative work around youth crime and Anti Social Behaviour (ASB). This would be achieved by raising the thresholds for intervention within the YOS prevention team. Further savings would be made by reducing the management establishment. This change will result in a significant reduction in activity in relation to locality partnerships to ensure managerial oversight of operations. Volunteer recruitment/development would be tendered out to achieve a wider pool at a reduced cost. Education functions would be reduced with a more strategic approach to engagement with education providers. Work to address behaviours related to offending in schools would be phased out and will become the responsibility of individual schools and their police links through Safer Schools Partnerships. There will be a reduction in mental health services which are commissioned.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

634

NET  
£000

634

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	452	146	30	1	<b>630</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

99%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

19.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

14.6

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Availability of specialist parenting support will reduce. Direct assistance for young people in the justice system disaffected from school or not in education, training and employment will be reduced. Care has been taken when planning re-investment to ensure issues of equality, particularly in the rural North of the county, have been addressed. Those young people with mental health issues will wait longer for a service. Users of the service will not be disproportionately affected on the basis of their race, ethnicity, culture or gender.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be significantly less attendance at partnership meetings and no deputising in the case of absence. Thresholds for referring cases for crime prevention work will increase and so accessibility will reduce. Specialist parenting programmes previously available will cease and stakeholders will need to make new arrangements should they want to access these types of services. Support to schools in dealing with behaviour issues will be significantly reduced in future years.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The provision of statutory services provided by the Council will not be affected.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Many of the proposed changes are driven by financial necessity. The reduction in operational management costs and the transfer of funding to mainstream posts are deliverable and should deliver the same or better outcomes at a lower cost. Some of the thinking is based on a move towards a more advanced co-production model using other statutory partnerships (such as School Behaviour and Attendance Partnership (SBAPs) and utilising increased numbers of volunteers.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Connexions Service within Children and Young People's Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce the year on year funding base for the Futures Service, within the context of a fundamental review of the current operating model for the company. Futures delivers careers advice and wider information, advice and guidance provision to 13-19 year olds across Nottinghamshire, mainly via schools, and also supports schools and business partnership activity, and 16-18 education funding. Connexions is a major constituent division of Nottinghamshire Futures, a wholly owned company of Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council.

This proposal describes a total overall reduction in funding of more than 40% in the period to 2014-15. It should be noted that the proposal for the 14-19 strategy team also contains approximately £130K worth of additional Futures reductions.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

6,066

NET  
£000

6,066

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
496	705	601	418	392	<b>2612</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

43%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

There will be reduced access for young people to obtain independent advice and guidance services.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Partnership activity with business partners may be reduced in scope. As the Company is jointly owned with Nottingham City Council, the active engagement of the City Council in the planned review is essential. There will be a reduction in support services to schools.

OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No impact

8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The shrinking revenue base of the County Council to 2014/15 will require a fundamental review and potential reshaping of the current Nottinghamshire Futures company. The company is wholly owned jointly by the County Council and Nottingham City Council. The need for change is exacerbated by changing national policy priorities, which have recently seen 16-18 education funding changes which were introduced by the previous Government reversed, and which are likely to see the introduction of an all age careers service.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Internal Audit - Charging for schools audits

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Internal Audit Section currently provides an audit service to schools. This involves carrying out an audit at primary and special schools every 5 years and an audit of secondary schools every 3 years. It is proposed to charge schools for this service on an "insurance" style basis i.e. there will be an annual charge to smooth out the cost over the period covered by the audit. Based on the 2010/11 Audit Plan figures, a charge of £250 per day for 428 days would generate income of £107,000. The proposal assumes around a 68% take up by schools.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

568

NET  
£000

468

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	73	0	0	0	<b>73</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

16%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

14.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

There will be less money to spend on other educational services.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Nil

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Nil

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal would generate more income. In recent years the time spent on schools has been cut, with reduced frequency of coverage and reduction of coverage and testing during the audit. The audit risk assessment for schools shows that audit coverage is still required and this is reflected in a number of irregularities in schools each year, and a large number of recommendations arising from audits. Schools are required to have internal audits and it is sensible that they should bear the costs.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Rights of Way: Redesign of Service

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

1. Cease all promotional and development activity for Rights of Way (ROW), saving £60k and two full time equivalents (FTE). This means not actively developing new routes in line with current Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). No further promotional activities will be undertaken i.e. no new promotional or explanatory literature, no guided walks / rides, no presence at shows and events. Opportunity will be lost to promote the service on the internet.
2. By providing a much lesser standard of management and maintenance of the County's extensive rights of way network, five FTEs can be saved and the working budget reduced by £50k. Such an initiative will require a service review of the remaining areas of work.
3. By reducing the throughput of claims and other statutory obligations related to the upkeep of the Definitive Map and Statement, the legal document underpinning ROW work, two FTEs can be saved from that element of the team.
4. A reduction of staff and budget will necessitate a change in working arrangements, particularly as the Council's role as an enabler, helping partners to deliver the service on the ground, will have to change. There will be a need to explore new development opportunities for other community groups and service users to implement some of the work currently undertaken by the team. This may be seen as an extension of existing partnership arrangements already running, including the Parish Paths Partnership, albeit that such an arrangement will need proper management in order to comply with legislative requirements. Because of the existing arrangements in some parishes, it may be possible to extend the scheme to embrace other aspirations to involve the community in other local delivery of County Council services outside of Rights of Way.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

	GROSS	790	NET	776
	£000		£000	

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	Total
£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
0	310	0	0	0	<b>310</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

40%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

20.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

10.0



## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

Paths that are inadequately maintained and managed will impact on all users - walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and other vehicle users. Applicants and claimants for orders to add, divert, close, modify status or create paths will have to wait much longer for an outcome. Landowners will also have to wait much longer for changes to the network to be processed. Formal working with Parishes will have to be significantly reduced.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Paths are used by a variety of user groups - eg British Horse Society, local riding schools, cycling groups, ramblers, off-road trail bikers etc - all of whom will have a reduced quality of network to enjoy. Paths are currently upgraded wherever possible to meet Disability Discrimination Act compliance eg replacement of stiles with kissing gates. Routes may not be surfaced nor adapted for wheelchair / child buggy use. District Councils will be affected through the planning system where path alterations are needed as a consequence of planning decisions.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Development at schools and other County Council establishments often requires changes to the path network involving the making of legal orders. This will be affected if staff are not available to process the orders.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The cumulative savings are £310k, resulting from less staff resources to maintain the existing network and to keep the Definitive Map up to date. There is also an expectation that volunteers will help support the running of services previously provided by the Council.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Highway Safety: Service Review

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Reduction in highway safety by reducing the existing staffing structure by five posts in the areas of management & administration . This is subject to consultation on the new structures which are proposed within the Council. A second element of this proposal is the reduction in the Camera Partnership budget.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

2,699

NET  
£000

2,566

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	669	0	0	0	<b>669</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

26%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

35.6

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

5.3

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Service users will receive a moderated service consistent with the resources available.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Revised arrangements will need to be put in place with for example the police, fire and ambulance service to mitigate impacts.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduction in response times and reduced support for joint working initiatives.

### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To generate a saving on Highways Revenue spend whilst limiting impact on service users and performance.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Waste Management: Cessation of discretionary performance and recycling credits paid to District Councils

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Cessation of payments of "performance credits" to district/borough councils (WCAs - Waste Collection Authorities) for dry recyclates delivered to the Mansfield Material Recycling Facility (MRF), and cessation of discretionary recycling credits made to community groups and charities.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

560

NET  
£000

560

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	560	0	0	0	<b>560</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

The service will be unaffected from the user perspective.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Waste collection authorities will need to consider what level of service can be provided within the budgets available to meet the needs of their residents.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No impact.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

These are discretionary payments made by the County Council. Performance credits are paid to WCAs for material delivered to the Mansfield MRF in order to incentivise them to ensure participation and quality levels are maintained. However, this is not the key driver; they are already incentivised to do this through other reward grants and their own internal drivers. The County Council performance credit payments have not led to improvements in WCA performance since being introduced in January 2009.

Nottinghamshire County Council has a duty to consider making recycling credit payments to community groups and charities, however, we do not pay them where other arrangements (such as the WCA kerbside collections) are already in place. Furthermore, private sector collection organisations are paying charities and community groups low prices for the material in the knowledge that the income will be supplemented by recycling credits.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Local Bus Service: Reduction in Supported Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to reduce council funding to the transport network. Currently, the commercial sector provides 90% of the bus network within the county and the County Council provides the remaining 10%. This 10% is delivered through 260 contracts, carrying 4 million passengers per year at a cost of £6.6m per annum to the County Council. National accessibility calculations give Nottinghamshire a score of 97% which means that the provision of public transport is one of the best across the country. In the light of the financial pressures on the Council, the current subsidised bus network is unsustainable and new approaches to providing non-statutory transport services are essential. In addition, from April 2011 responsibility for running the Concessionary Fare Scheme will become the responsibility of the County Council. The scheme currently costs approximately £9.5m, however, it is not yet known if the funding will be transferred in full to the County. If not, further budget pressures will be placed on the local bus service budget.

Reductions can be achieved through withdrawing non-statutory school transport (£400k) withdrawing support for low performing services (£600k) mainly evening and Sunday services.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

7,317

NET  
£000

6,610

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	1000	0	0	0	<b>1000</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

15%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

There will be less opportunity for members of the public to travel by public transport to leisure, shops and amenities. Flexibility on times and service frequencies will be reduced and in some cases passengers may have to travel using connecting services. This may lead to increased journey times and higher fares, especially in rural areas where opportunities for travel are less than in urban areas. Evening and weekend travel may be severely restricted particularly in rural areas. Some members of the public may not be able to easily access council services using public transport.

It is not possible at this stage to predict the impact on different sections of the community. All routes are currently being surveyed and along with other data will give accurate information on performance of services and operators. All services can then be scored and using Performance Management Framework (PMF) to demonstrate the impact on services which cannot be retained within the new budget. Travel to work and training will continue to be high priorities for the revised services. The integration of routes and efficient use of resources across the day, including provision for children with special educational needs and vulnerable people who receive services from Adult Social Care & Health services, will be essential. Once the survey programme is complete it will be possible to prepare and evaluate solutions on an area by area basis using the comprehensive Mobility Strategy. All proposed solutions will be subject to public consultation.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Bus operators may need to revise their commercial networks and review their own resources and business plans to accommodate a reduction in County funded services. Greater emphasis may be placed on community transport provided by the third sector to provide alternative service. Despite the small reduction in funding for community transport schemes, new ways of providing services will be explored to build capacity within the third sector, reflecting the increased role which voluntary providers can now undertake.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

A reduction in the provision of public transport may have an impact on staff who travel around the County for work using public transport

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale behind this proposal is to refocus the existing services to meet the Council's policy objectives which is to provide access to work, training and key services such as primary health care services. This proposal either removes or reconfigures services that do not currently meet these key policy objectives. The re-focusing of the service will achieve significant revenue savings.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Catering, Cleaning and Landscapes Services: Service Redesign

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Following the trading services baseline review exercise it was proposed that the services provided by Catering, Cleaning & Landscapes should be market tested. The baseline exercise was conducted when the full National Job Evaluation (NJE) support was being provided by the Authority. A three year recovery strategy had been agreed to return the service to a breakeven position and this commenced in this financial year (2010/11).

This was to be achieved by a combination of price increases and/or service redesign. However with further consideration, recognising the budget pressures facing the Council and a better than predicted 09/10 year outturn it is now possible to achieve full cost recovery and £500k net budget return to County Council by financial year 2012/13.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

33,511

NET  
£000

30,711

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
734	1374	458	-98	-90	<b>2378</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

8%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

1582.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

62.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Quality will be maintained as would the support for the local economy . Customers will benefit from some cost reductions but in parts some prices will be increased but remain at very competitive levels.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Schools will see a modest increase in some costs but against benchmarks they will still receive value for money and cheaper services than those available in the market place.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

National Job Evaluation (NJE) costs which are funded by the County Council (£1.8m) will be recovered through a combination of increased efficiencies and price increases, therefore there will be no ongoing subsidy from the County Council and there will be a cash dividend to the County Council of at least £500k per annum starting in 2012/13.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale is that as a trading service, this service should be provided at no cost to the Authority and should seek to generate an operating surplus for the Council. The rationale also assumes that the Authority wants to provide an effective and efficient support service to schools and other County Council users.

The market testing exercise will determine whether in the future, the service should be retained in-house or whether greater efficiencies can be achieved by out-sourcing this service. In the interim, the service is committed to delivering a break even budget by April 2012.



## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Sports & Arts Service: Grant Aid Reductions

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal needs to be considered in conjunction with the proposal in respect of Service Review and Reductions in the Arts & Sports Services. This proposal identifies £115k of the total savings planned for these services.

In the year 2011/12 the following reductions are proposed:

- (a) reduction of the Major Arts Grant to Nottingham Playhouse by 25% - saving £31,000
- (b) a reduction in the Strategic Arts Grants and Community Grants of 43% resulting in a single remaining fund of £42,500. It is proposed that these two Arts Funds are rolled into one Community Fund with a maximum award of £5,000
- (c) reduce the two Sports Funds by 40% realising a saving of £26,000. A further £15,500 will be found from other sources.

Whilst reducing the number of individuals and clubs supported, the County Council will continue to support this sector. These reductions to the Total Grant Aid represents a 40% cut in line with the overall cuts required of the services.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

290

NET  
£000

290

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	115	0	0	0	115

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

40%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

The audiences and participants of the current arts grants awarded to Cantamus Girls Choir, Jazz Steps, Magdalla Opera and Newark Music Club may experience reduced provision. Sports Club members will experience a reduction in qualified staff and thus a reduction in opportunities to engage in sport.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Those organisations which have received arts funding will no longer be able to rely on the historical levels of Nottinghamshire County Council funding. New applications will be encouraged and will be considered on their artistic merit. Nottinghamshire County Council funding will be more strategically targeted. Applications for support for individual athletes is historically over-subscribed and the reduction will increase the number of unsuccessful individuals. Groups and clubs in both sports and arts may require additional support in investigating other avenues for fundraising.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Members and other departments may experience an increased demand for financial support from local sports and arts clubs seeking alternative funding.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Arts & Sports Service has been charged with reducing its overall budgets and a review of the Grant Programme is an intrinsic part of this process. There are other funding streams which may support future funding requirements, e.g. Member budgets, and the Local Investment Fund.

The current arts grants represent 23% of the 2010/11 budget (£225,000) of which nearly 50% goes to Nottingham Playhouse. In sports, the grants budget represents 7% of the total budget (£65,000).

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Libraries and Archives: Remodelling Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The re-modelled service would provide four levels of service across the current library network of 60 libraries – efficiencies will be achieved by reducing opening hours and by revising the service offer. 28 smaller libraries with less than 35,000 visits per year would be developed as Community Partnership Libraries\* and opening hours for these services may be reduced. Total savings of £3.306m will be made including a staffing reduction of around 83.4 Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) posts. Actions will include :

1. Restructure and reduce strategic and operational management
2. Reduce number of qualified librarians
3. Reduce administration and support staff
4. Reduce frontline staffing linked to reduced opening hours and mobile libraries
  - Level 1 – up to 20% reduction
  - Level 2 – up to 50% reduction
  - Level 3 – to provide 8 - 10 hrs opening per week
  - Level 4 (mobiles) reduce fleet to 3 mobile libraries and introduce a monthly timetable
5. Reduce development budgets
6. Reduce bookfund by up to 75%
7. Establish full cost recovery for the Records Management Service
8. Review the City Council Service Level Agreement (SLA) in year 2
9. Ensure full cost recovery of prison and hospital services
10. Reduce opening hours in Archive offices by 1 day a week

\* List of 28 Community Partnership Libraries - current opening hours per week (as detailed below) would be reduced to 8 - 10 hours per week as a core offer:  
 Annesley – 10, Balmoral – 19, Bilsthorpe – 20.5, Blidworth – 29, Burton Joyce – 31, Carlton Hill – 29.5, Carlton in Lindrick – 28, Clipstone – 19, Collingham – 20, Edgewood – 17, Farnsfield – 20.5, Gedling – 21, Gotham – 12, Huthwaite – 19, Inham Nook – 14.5, Jacksdale – 22, Ladybrook - 37, Langold - 20, Lowdham – 17.5, Misterton – 18.5, Rainworth – 17, Selston – 31.5, Skegby – 24.5, Sutton-Bonington – 14, Sutton on Trent – 13, Toton – 36.5, Tuxford – 24, Woodthorpe – 17.5

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

15645

NET  
£000

13284

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	2710	380	216	0	<b>3306</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

25%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

336

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

83.4

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

Libraries and Archives have high levels of regular use, mainly by local people. The reduction in opening hours and the lower levels of resources will impact on all users. In level 3 libraries, there will be a perception of a greater loss of service, but this actually impacts on a small overall number of library users. Cessation of some services like mobiles, daily newspapers in level 3 libraries and higher charges will be immediately visible. The 75 % reduction in bookfund (which will increase the average stock age from 5.4 years to 21.5 years) and librarian capacity will impact on core quality and scope of the service.

The profile of library users is very close to the community it serves. However, the use of some services, for example the internet, is heavier by those who do not have access or require support from library staff. Reductions in mobiles and level 3 libraries are likely to impact more on the elderly and those more geographically isolated. Increased charges will require removal of exemptions which tend to be applied to the over 60 age group.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Libraries and Archives work with many other organisations from universities to very local community groups. Our capacity to work together will be reduced. Accommodation/space often provided at low cost will require higher charges. Work with other public sector bodies, voluntary groups and the cultural sector as a whole will be reduced also.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Libraries and Archives work across services of the county council. The services range from simple distribution of information to proactive involvement in campaigns, e.g. school registration online, budget consultations, elder abuse reduction. Reading development work is supported by Adult Social Care (e.g. stroke victims) and Children and Young People's Services (e.g. looked after children) has been acknowledged nationally. Libraries also provide face to face contact, on line information and support to access County Council and other public services. This key aspect of the service is dependant upon accessible facilities and well trained staff. Larger libraries also provide touch down opportunities for Council officers who are away from their bases. There is a link with the Council's Ways of Working improvement programme and property rationalisation.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

There are 6 key drivers for change

1. Need to reduce expenditure by £3.3 m (i.e. 25% of the service budget)
2. Requirement to maintain a network of 60 static libraries
3. Meet the Council's aspirations to exploit libraries' customer contact potential
4. Meet the Government's priorities for libraries including - digital inclusion – supporting people in the online world, 'Big Society', health and education etc.
5. Maintain quality where there is benefit to learning, literacy, children/young people, the isolated and to the heritage and cultural life of Nottinghamshire.
6. Ensure Council meets its statutory duty as library authority

The re-modelling of the service must meet those 6 key drivers, especially the budget reduction target while keeping libraries open for business.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Conservation: Restructure of Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To restructure the Conservation Service to provide a basic 'intelligent client' function for internal specialist conservation advice to all departments to ensure that day-to-day operations, plans, programmes and projects comply with the relevant heritage, conservation and planning legislation. The revised service will also provide basic maintenance of the County's Historic Environment Record (HER).

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,162

NET  
£000

1,013

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	381	381	0	0	<b>763</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

75%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

33.8

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

27.8

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Reduced access to the Historic Environment Record for all external service users. District, town and parish councils, community groups and individuals will need to identify other sources for advice on conservation and heritage issues. External conservation and heritage partnerships, projects and events will need to secure any support they need from other sources.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Critical link will need to be maintained between the Authority and organisations such as English Heritage and Natural England. Existing conservation / regeneration partnerships will need to secure funding from alternative sources.

**OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

The Council's capacity for tree inspections will be significantly reduced. The revised service will provide basic support for decision making within the County Council covering ecology and limited advice on archaeology and historic buildings.

**8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?**

To provide an "intelligent client" function for conservation specialisms and to manage the County's built and natural heritage.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Country Parks: Restructure of Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To restructure the Country Parks Service to give a more efficient and focused management of Rufford and Sherwood whilst retaining a capacity to support main visitor events e.g. Robin Hood Festival, Earth & Fire Ceramic Fair, and limited management of other Council greenspace sites.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

4,224

NET  
£000

1,518

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	144	215	359	0	<b>718</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

47%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

100.7

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

33.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Sherwood and Rufford tourist attractions will benefit from a refocusing of activity on the main sites and a reduced range of peripheral activities elsewhere whilst protecting the Robin Hood Festival and the Earth & Fire Ceramic Fair.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be limited maintenance of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monument (English Heritage) at Rufford and reduced capacity to deliver High Level Stewardship Scheme at Sherwood Forest Natural Nature Reserve (Natural England).

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Consideration would have to be given to alternative longer term management and operation of other country parks, e.g. Bestwood and Cotgrave.

The service will only be able to offer limited support to other country parks.

**8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?**

To ensure that the principal country parks, Rufford and Sherwood, remain available to the public, though with reduced maintenance and supervision. To retain the major public facing events.

This proposal also provides an opportunity for the County Council to review how best to secure the management and development of Country Parks in the future.



## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Reduction of Grant Aid to Citizens Advice Bureaux

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce core funding to the 7 Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx) in Nottinghamshire by £200K (67%) in 2011/12.

There are 7 CABx in Nottinghamshire located in the areas of Broxtowe, Ashfield, Mansfield, Bassetlaw, Newark, Ollerton and Nottingham. Funding from the Council finances CABx property, management, supervisory and training costs and is also used as a lever to attract initiative funding.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

300

NET  
£000

300

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	200	0	0	0	<b>200</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

67%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Reduction in grant funding will require CABx to review their current level of service provision and the number of Bureaux and outstations.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduction in grant funding from the County Council will place a greater burden on other organisations and other agencies (districts and PCTs) to support provide advice services.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

A reduced CABx will transfer demand to other areas of the County Council such as Trading Standards, Welfare Rights, Adult Social Care and Health Department at a time when funding for these existing services is threatened.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The overall CABx grant aid budget is currently c.£300 K per annum and is sourced from the Community Safety Portfolio budget. It is an entirely discretionary spend on a non-statutory function made to an external service provider. Therefore, this expenditure can be quickly reduced, however, there are significant risks attached. In addition to the County Council, the CABx also receives funding provided by a mix of other funders including district councils and Primary Care Trusts.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Community Safety: Commissioning Budget

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to reduce the Safer Communities Commissioning Budget by £754k in 2011/12, from £1338 k to £584 k. This will result in reducing funding to support the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) by approximately half and reduction or cessation of initiatives such as Emergency Planning Community Resilience, Galleries of Justice; Gypsy and Traveller liaison. It will also mean reduction or cessation of funding to partners, Police, district councils, voluntary sector etc for initiatives to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,338

NET  
£000

1,338

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	754	0	0	0	<b>754</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

56%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

-

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

-

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

The proposals have been designed to protect high priority front line services for domestic violence, victims and witnesses and to allow the County Council to respond to priority issues.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The proposals will have an impact on CSPs as they are partially funded by the Council. The reductions may impact on staffing and lead to the cessation of services and projects.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The proposals have been designed to protect the impact upon services, particularly in relation to safeguarding vulnerable victims and witnesses.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

In anticipation of the budget challenges faced, an evaluation and re-prioritisation of the community safety budget has been undertaken. As a result of this, specific Community Safety initiatives will cease and others will remain with reduced funding. Consequently the £754k reduction proposed can be achieved whilst ensuring high priority activities are protected and delivered. However, it will also reduce the Council's ability to respond to other lower priority community safety issues.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Refocus Partnership work

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to respond to the new Government's localism agenda by restructuring the Nottinghamshire Partnership and changing the role of Member Forums. Savings will come from changing the role of officers engaged in supporting Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) and the Nottinghamshire Partnership.

It is proposed to refocus the work of the partnership team on the emerging localism agenda and away from its previous work as outlined in the Local Area Agreement. This will involve withdrawing financial and officer support from district LSPs, and restructuring the Nottinghamshire Partnership to act as the focus for partnership activity across the County and the promoter of place-based budget opportunities. Member Forums would be revised and strengthened as the focus for the delivery of the localism agenda.

There are currently 10.5 Full Time Employees (FTE) involved in supporting the Nottinghamshire Partnership and the County Council's engagement with LSPs. The proposal is to delete 6.5 FTE and realise savings of £288k.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

748

NET  
£000

748

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	288	0	0	0	<b>288</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

39%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

10.5

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

6.5

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

The refocused strategic work should lead to improved outcomes and efficiencies in localities.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The refocused approach could be embraced by other organisations or it could be seen as the County Council disengaging from existing structures and a lack of interest in the issues.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There will be reduced capacity to support any continuing work with LSPs or in localities. There would be no co-ordination of the Council's engagement with LSPs. The overall implications for the County Council will depend on the final shape of the Government's localism agenda and the level of resourcing required.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Political priorities and the emerging agenda nationally will change the Council's expectations of partnership working, although until the decentralisation and localism bill is published the requirements on the Council will be unclear. The Local Area Agreement (LAA) comes to an end in March 2011 and is unlikely to be replaced. Work around extending the 4Uth festival is more appropriately positioned in Children & Young People's Services.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Review of Efficiencies within Debt Recovery Service

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to outsource the legal aspect of debt recovery work, currently undertaken by two legal officers within Legal Services to a private sector agency. On its own the proposal is expected to produce only limited savings. However, there is scope for reducing the number of debts that arise with a knock-on to the legal aspects of debt recovery – this proposal will be developed in conjunction with the Business Management System (BMS) with a view to eliminating debts at source and where they arise dealing with them expeditiously.

(NB: This proposal contains no "net budget" figure as Legal Services operates as a trading organisation and therefore assumes a zero net budget).

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS £000	<input type="text" value="3,193"/>	NET £000	<input type="text" value="-"/>
---------------	------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------------------

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	25	25	0	0	<b>51</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

SERVICE USERS

None

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale for the proposed change is to reduce staff overheads together with administrative costs associated with the current systems for debt collection by outsourcing this work. Debts broadly consist of two types: a) sundry debts e.g. overpayment of wages b) the collection of care charges. This proposal should be considered in conjunction with any business case for the outsourcing of responsibilities undertaken by primary income and credit control section. The purpose of outsourcing is to reduce the number of officers and associated costs involved in the recovery of debts and to seek to establish a cheaper, more effective and more efficient system of debt recovery.



## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

De-commissioning of Service Level Agreement with Disability Living Centre

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

De-commissioning of service currently provided by The Disability Living Centre (DLC).

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

102

NET  
£000

102

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	102	0	0	0	<b>102</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Service users in the south of the county will not be able to access the DLC to obtain low level aids and adaptation equipment. In future, low level aid and adaptation equipment will be provided at occupational clinics which will operate across the county.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The DLC is jointly funded by the City Council, City PCT and County PCT. The withdrawal of NCC funding will impact on other partners who fund this service.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Disability Living Centre provides an information, advice, assessment, demonstrations and education resource primarily related to items of equipment to enable independent living. The service targets support to people who are not eligible for services and therefore it is a discretionary service. All partners are currently reviewing their support to the service. The Council is currently developing county wide occupational therapy clinics which will be more cost effective in providing low level equipment. People will also be able to have an assessment for basic equipment through the Customer Service Centre and through the Council's reablement service.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Reduction in HIV and AIDS Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to reduce the funding for some specialist social work and community care officer time. Any need for an assessment or provision can be provided through mainstream services rather than through a specialist service.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

64

NET  
£000

64

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	32	32	0	0	<b>64</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

2.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

2.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

No impact as service users will have access to the mainstream service if they have eligible social care needs.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

This is former grant funding, which is no longer ringfenced. Since the service was created, modern medicine has developed and the condition is better controlled.

Service users will receive support from mainstream services if they have eligible social care needs. In the future, personal budgets will give people increased choice and control to purchase services they need.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Review of Occupational Therapy Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Efficiency savings can be realised through:

- Improved procurement of the Community Equipment Services
- Withdrawal of loans to top up Disabled Facilities Grant adaptations
- Increasing the number of people seen through Occupational Therapy (OT) clinics and having assessments through the Customer Service Centre.

This proposal will target OT resources and improve efficiency by reducing the number of home visits

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

6,145

NET  
£000

2,241

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	243	0	0	0	<b>243</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

10%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

60.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

3.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

In future, service users will receive an assessment in the most appropriate setting.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There may be pressure on district council budgets as the County Council will no longer consider applications to 'top up' Disabled Facilities Grants

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The effective re-tendering of community equipment services will realise savings of £70k per annum. Disabled adults can be assessed more efficiently through the use of OT Clinics and through a telephone service provided by the Customer Service Centre. This will reduce the need for three community based OTs and will realise savings of £123k per annum. A further £20k saving will be made as result of reduced travel time on the part of OTs.

The award of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) is the responsibility of district councils and the 'top up' of DFG provided by the Council is entirely discretionary. A reduction in awarding this discretionary grant will save £30k per annum.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Reduction in Community Care Spend

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce the community care budget by £2m through reviewing the support packages of existing service users and meeting the needs of new service users in a more cost effective way, through the use of personal budgets.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

25,000

NET  
£000

25,000

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	1000	1000	0	0	<b>2000</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

8%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Service users and social care workers will have to be creative to fund affordable solutions to meet needs of both current and future service users.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There may be a possible increase in demand on community and voluntary organisations to provide support if service users are no longer eligible for social care services.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale is three-fold:

1. There is some evidence that when people arrange their own support plan they choose cheaper alternatives to meet their outcomes rather than using historic services which often do not offer value for money.
2. The Council will be obliged to closely review allocations made for personal budgets, in order to manage within finite resources.
3. By maximising the use of preventative services, such as community based services provided by the voluntary sector, and by increasing the use of assistive technology, aids and equipment, it is anticipated that people will not need care packages of the size they currently receive.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Adult Care Financial Services (ACFS) - Review of discretionary services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Adult Care Financial Services (ACFS) levies charges on behalf of Adult Social Care and Health (ASCH) services where appropriate and makes payments to providers and direct payment recipients. In addition, ACFS takes on appointeeship and receivership roles for a small number of service users who lack mental capacity.

It is proposed to:

- i) move from gross to net payments for third party contributions and nursing care payments.
- ii) review the requirement to undertake appointeeship and receivership services currently completed by the client money team within ACFS.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,479

NET  
£000

1,479

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	8	75	0	0	<b>83</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

6%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

52.5

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

10.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Administration of third party payments by care homes may lead to higher and more frequent increases in care home fees which would impact on the the service users' personal allowance entitlement.

People subject to Appointeeship orders are likely to experience increased charges, as solicitors are able to charge more for the service than the local authority. Solicitors may only be willing to act as appointee where people have sufficient funds and therefore some service users may find it difficult to find someone to take the role of appointeeship.



#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) will be required to administer payment of registered nursing care contributions directly to care homes.

Responsibility for invoicing service users for third party payments and recovering these charges will transfer to independent sector care home providers.

Partnership working with the Pension Service would need to be reviewed as they currently collect financial information to enable charges to be levied.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

This proposal would have positive and negative impacts on other parts of the Council the positives will be a reduced need for income and credit control as the debt collection work will no longer fall on the Council and there will be improved cash flow experienced by the Council. On the negative side, the Council will lose £20k per annum income from PCTs if it ceases to make payments to care home providers on their behalf and the ACFS team may experience an increase in queries and default payments.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The rationale behind this proposal is that while the statutory services provided by ACFS will remain un-changed, those services which are discretionary should be reviewed and reduced.

The services provided by this team which have discretionary elements include:

- payment of registered nursing care contributions on behalf of Primary Care Trusts
- administration of 3rd party payments to care homes who levy fees in excess of Nottinghamshire County Council's funding levels;
- appointeeships and receivership, where the Council manages money for people who lack mental capacity to do this themselves and where it benefits the Council to do so (e.g. to ensure that charges can be collected).

At present, approximately 520 third party accounts are administered by the County Council. In future, people who are unable to open bank accounts themselves will be supported by an increased number of direct payment support services.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Purchasing & Marketing Management Unit: Staffing

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Purchasing and Market Management Unit (PMMU) is responsible for Adult Social Care and Health (ASCH) procurement and contract management. It monitors 32 home care providers and over 300 Older Peoples, Learning Disability and Physical Disability care homes as well as care, support and enablement services for younger adults. This amounts to contracts to the value of £170m per annum. There are currently 32 home care providers delivering approx 28,851 hrs of home care per week at a cost of £302,397.52 p.w. This activity is monitored by PMMU. PMMU also monitors 2,447 placements for older adults and 757 placements for vulnerable adults.

The proposal is to reduce the PMMU budget by £108k, which corresponds to the proportion of discretionary team activity identified in the service baseline review. This will result in the loss of three Quality Development Officer (QDO) posts.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

763

NET  
£000

763

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	108	0	0	0	<b>108</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

14%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

11.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

3.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

A reduction in the monitoring of quality within care homes will reduce the Council's ability to work with home care and other providers to improve the quality of their services. However, this is a relatively small reduction in the capacity of the service.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduction in team activity requires greater prioritisation. There will also be monitoring and engagement with providers on the quality of procured services.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

NA

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The PMMU baseline review identified the workload categories not directly tied to mandatory requirements.

As a result, it is estimated that this sum can be saved from the PMMU budget by in year staffing savings, streamlining procurement and contract management running costs and by prioritising market and provider quality development activity from April 2011.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Cease Provision of Balance Service

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Balance is a service which offers food safety advice and advice about food and nutritional care to staff within the Council's care homes and day centres. The team also offers training and advice to service users, carers, disabled groups and independent sector care homes.

It is proposed that the service is ceased.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

242

NET  
£000

188

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	188	0	0	0	<b>188</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

7.5

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

7.5

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

There will be no impact on service users at the Council's own day services and residential care homes, as the role of food safety would be transferred to unit managers.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Withdrawal of this service will have a direct impact on independent sector care homes who will be required to undertake their own training around food safety and nutrition advice to comply with regulatory requirements.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

**8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?**

Food safety can be incorporated into the roles and responsibilities of the unit managers.

Audits of the quality of food and nutrition in independent sector care homes will be carried out by the Purchasing and Market Management Unit (PMMU) as part of the role of the Quality Development Officers (QDOs).

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Increase in Adult Placement Scheme

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal will provide an effective alternative to residential care using an "Adult Fostering" model of care. At an average cost of £360 per week this model offers savings for a number of residential placements that are currently made at around £600 per week. The proposal also considers the potential to require a contribution from people using the service, who do not currently contribute toward the cost of board, lodging or care.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

266

NET  
£000

266

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	0	75	38	38	<b>150</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

56%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

An increased number of service users will be able to access breaks in a family environment, providing people with increased choices and flexibility.

Service users will receive a financial assessment in line with those carried out for other chargeable services if a charge is adopted.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be a reduction in the number of long term placements in the independent sector.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

If Nottinghamshire were to commission Adult Placement as an alternative to residential care at the national average of 63 placements per annum, the additional placements would reduce current expenditure by £150K per annum. Further, the introduction of a board and lodging charge for people in Adult Placements would generate additional income to Adult Social Care and Health (ASCH).

In order to achieve the savings within this proposal, further adult placement carers will be required. It may be possible to recruit additional carers as staff with care experience could consider alternative employment options. The financial remuneration for this service provision is likely to require review.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Reduce Expenditure on Learning Disability & Mental Health Community Care

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

It is proposed to reduce commissioning expenditure for people with learning disabilities, autistic spectrum disorders and mental health problems by £5million over 4 years. The major saving is anticipated via the Learning Disability Community Care Budget which presently stands at £49m (gross).

Savings will be delivered following assessment and review of care packages, reviews of care costs and maximising income to ensure value for money/best value whilst ensuring that the quality of services is maintained.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

49,000

NET  
£000

35,000

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	1281	1281	1281	1281	<b>5124</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

15%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Service users of learning disability and mental health services will be reviewed to ensure value for money services are being commissioned to the right level to meet need. There is no anticipated risk to the quality of care, however some people may receive reduced care provision where needs can still be met.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Independent providers of services will be required to deliver efficiencies as funding passed onto them will be reduced.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A



## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Efficiencies will be achieved through a planned re-assessment of care packages:

- Review of all care packages and residential care placements to determine need and value.
- Testing of new residential care placements against the Care Funding Calculator.
- Review placements in high cost residential care homes outside Nottinghamshire, to find more cost effective alternatives within the County.
- Establish Assistive Technology options to save staffing costs.
- Review of Care Support and Enablement provision for existing Supported Living services.
- Rigorous examination of any new packages of care against eligibility criteria and priorities.

Also included in this proposal are:

- Reduction in Community Care Mental Health Budget by £150k by reviewing existing care packages.
- Reduction in Community Care Asperger's Budget by £100k by reviewing existing care packages.
- Reduction of in-house Supported Living services - there are in the region of 90 tenancies presently supported by this service (10% of the market).

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Budget Reductions within Learning Disability Teams

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To make the following budget reductions within the Adult Social Care & Health (ASCH) Learning Disability teams:

- i) Reduction of employee costs for the learning disabilities teams, Asperger Team and the New Lifestyles Team through replacing agency staff with permanent employees and reviewing the ratio of qualified social workers to unqualified Community Care Officers (122k)
- ii) Reduced accommodation costs through moving out of expensive rented accommodation into Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) buildings (55k)
- iii) Reduced development budgets which are attached to the community teams (20k)
- iv) Reduction in the Supported Living miscellaneous budget (£10k).

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

4,403

NET  
£000

3,383

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	207	0	0	0	<b>207</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

6%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

The proposal requires careful attention; the Council needs to ensure that its legal obligations in respect of safeguarding, commissioning and reviewing are met, alongside other legislative requirements.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A reduced capacity to attend multidisciplinary meetings to consider continuing health care funding may impact on effective working relationships with health colleagues.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

a) Staffing budgets - There are three teams (North, South and Central teams) along with the Asperger and New Lifestyles Team which currently employ a number of agency staff to assist with assessment demands. There are currently 60 full time equivalent posts - qualified/unqualified staff - in the 7 Community Learning Disability Teams. Reducing agency spend and better utilisation of employed staff will generate savings.

b) Accommodation spend - The current rental costs at Chadburn House are high. A move to Council owned/managed accommodation or negotiated reduction in rental costs at Chadburn House is recommended. This would have no significant impact on front line services.

c) Development budgets - reduction is recommended as above with no significant impact on front line services.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Budget Reductions in Mental Health Services

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

A number of funding reductions are contained within this proposal:

a) Reduction in budget for Mental Capacity Act (MCA):

- Mental Capacity Act / Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS) training (budget reduced by 33%) = £5k saving
- Reducing DOLS communication budget = £30k total saving
- Out of county supervisory budget (reduced by 50%) = £5k saving
- MCA Reserve budget cut completely = £58k saving
- Reducing funding by 50% to deliver a pay-as-you-go arrangement:
  - DOLS representatives = £12.5k pa
  - DOLS mental health assessors = £7.5k pa
  - Appropriate adult service = £12.5k pa

b) Reduction in budget for Mental Health Act:

- Approved Mental Health Practitioners (AMHP) back fill for post-qualifying (PQ) course (reducing number of people undertaking training by 2/3rds) = £24.5k savings
- AMHP course practice assessors will have 2/3rd less activity from above = £3k savings
- Backfill to support PQ1 candidates (withdraw all funding) = £4.5k saving
- Training from mental health grant training (withdraw all funding) = £34k (this is linked to a 0.5 Full Time Equivalent post).

c) It is also proposed to save staffing costs through Local Implementation Network posts totalling £66k.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

457

NET  
£000

457

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	262	0	0	0	262

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

57%

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

1.0

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.5

## 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

### SERVICE USERS

Mental Health Policy and Practice - No direct impact predicted although policy and legislative standards will need to be adhered to.

### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Mental Health Policy and Practice - As the City Council are jointly commissioning some services, close partnership working is needed to implement the proposed changes.

### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Mental Health Policy and Practice - No impact predicted.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

These services include a service manager and budgets for approved mental health professional training on the Mental Capacity Act and the Mental Health Act. The proposal for cost reductions would involve reducing training (including multi-agency training for the Mental Capacity Act and best interest assessments), taking out staff cover arrangements and reducing funding of various services. Having implemented the new legislation and having provided extensive training for staff, this service can now be reduced.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Welfare Rights - Cease Service

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To cease the Welfare Rights Service. In future, welfare rights information and advice will need to be accessed via other channels. It is proposed that the closure of the service is phased so that outstanding work can be completed before the service closes.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,022

NET  
£000

1,022

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	450	450	0	0	<b>900</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

88%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

28.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

28.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Members of the public will be unable to receive benefit advocacy / appeal tribunal representation by Nottinghamshire Welfare Rights Services. Enquiries to the Council will need to be signposted to other organisations for support and assistance.

#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The loss of welfare rights support to local voluntary and community sector organisations will require these organisations to look elsewhere for specialist advice and information services.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

- 1) The Welfare Rights Service currently supports the Customer Service Centre (CSC) through training, consultation and online information plus referrals for complex casework and representation. The CSC will need to find an alternative source of advice and information in the future.
- 2) The closure of the service could result in less benefit gains and resultant loss of income from chargeable services. This risk will be mitigated by ensuring that members of the public are signposted to other advice agencies
- 3) Reduction in the support provided to social work teams, through training and information, will reduce the knowledge and skills of front line workers unless this advice is sought from other agencies.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Benefits advice can be provided through the Customer Service Centre, voluntary organisations and on line support. Benefits advice is also available through the Department of Works and Pensions.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Cease Healthier Communities Service

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to cease the Healthier Communities Service.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

187

NET  
£000

187

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	187	0	0	0	<b>187</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

4.8

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

4.8

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Ceasing the service will remove the capacity to provide specific support and help to service users to make healthier and safer choices in their daily life.

Lack of access to information and/or knowledge is a barrier to healthy choices. Lack of motivation to change, or confidence to do so, inhibits they way in which the most vulnerable can access opportunities to make healthier choices.

Service users will lose access to non NHS lifestyle health advice which fosters good health and supports activities such as chair based exercises for the elderly and disabled; advice on, and funding of, home safety equipment for vulnerable families with children under five.



#### OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The service leads on the administration and co-ordination of the Nottinghamshire Health and Well Being Partnership Board [H&WBP] and the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment [JSNA].

Work will be required with partners (including both Primary Care Trusts [PCTs], District Councils, the Voluntary sector and organisations like the Fire and Rescue Service) to look at alternative support, in light of Government proposals for upper tier local authorities to take the lead for statutory health and wellbeing partnership boards from April 2011.

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) and Nottinghamshire PCT jointly fund a co-ordinators post, which sits within the Healthier Communities Service. It is envisaged that the Public Health Service will be located in the County Council to fulfil these responsibilities.

#### OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Currently, the service works closely with colleagues in Human Resources (HR) on employee health and wellbeing, Trading Standards on under age and illicit sales of tobacco and alcohol, maintaining a falls care pathway for elderly service users, and works with key services on reviewing and co-ordinating the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Cessation of the service will result in most of these activities not being pursued.

Government proposals suggest that additional resources will be transferred to local authorities to undertake their new health role, however, it is not yet clear what this means for the organisation.

#### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The service works with communities and individuals to promote aspiration and independence through signposting and helping vulnerable service users to take individual responsibility for their own good health and wellbeing.

Although this service is valued, it is not a statutory service and therefore can be ceased. It is recognised that this service currently contributes to a much larger public health function, provided within health, which may in the future be transferred to Nottinghamshire County Council.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Linkage Services/Notts 50+ Service: Service Reductions

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The total budget for the Linkage Team including preventative services and commissioning staff members is £986,739 for 2010-11.

The areas identified for budget savings are the following:

- |    |                    |                 |  |
|----|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| 1. | 4 Resource Centres | £68,231         | (Retford, Stapleford, Forest Town, Kirkby) |
| 2. | Gardening Scheme   | £20,604         |  |
| 3. | Shopping Service   | £30,397         | (Mansfield)                                |
| 4. | Activity Friends   | £71,400         |  |
|    | <b>Total:</b>      | <b>£190,632</b> |  |

This proposal should be read alongside the other proposals which relate to Linkage services.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,265

NET  
£000

986

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	0	190	0	0	<b>190</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

19%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

0.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

0.0

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Service users will no longer have access to the four services identified for closing. Every effort will be made in 2011-12 to develop alternatives for older people for those services that are to be ended, eg supermarket home-based shopping schemes, existing luncheon clubs, probation service, community services will all be explored as possible options for replacement of service. Older people in customer surveys regard as particularly important the provision of the shopping and security gardening services.

## OTHER ORGANISATIONS

1. Resource Centres are funded solely by the Adult Social Care & Health (ASCH). The loss of the four Resource Centres will affect 12 jobs in Retford, Stapleford, Forest Town and Kirkby, with subsequent loss of volunteer capacity. The Resource Centres are open 1 day a week and an average attendance is 47 older people for each. If members of the Resource Centres were to be asked to pay for their attendance it is estimated that it would cost them approx £7 for a half day session, assuming current cost. The groups who host the Resource Centres will be to some extent dependent on their funding from ASCH.

2. Security Gardening Scheme – this will impact on income for the Supported Employment Team. The current hourly rate charged for older people for Golden Gardening is £15.90/hr per gardener if the older person is not in receipt of benefits. If in receipt of benefits the charge is £11.70/hr. Older people receive on average 1hr gardening per fortnight.

3. Shopping Service (Mansfield) – this will impact on one Age Concern worker in Mansfield with subsequent loss of volunteer capacity. 287 older people have accessed the shopping scheme in Mansfield over the last year. A previous attempt by Age Concern to involve supermarket home delivery in the service did not prove successful.

4. Activity Friends is modelled on a Loughborough University British Heart Foundation programme designed to help older people achieve a healthier lifestyle by making decisions about incorporating more physical activity into their lives. Older people are recruited and trained as 'Activity Friends' volunteers who reach out to their peers in the local community to encourage and support them in participating in some form of physical activity.

## OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

This is a discretionary service. Funding will be targeted on Linkage services that meet the priorities of the County Council and partners.

Linkage services are multiply funded by NHS Bassetlaw and NHS Nottinghamshire. This constitutes over £180,000 investment in mainstream funding from NHS Nottinghamshire and over £58,000 mainstream funding from NHS Bassetlaw. In addition the seven district councils are in total investing over £248,000 in the Handy Persons and Adaptation Service (HPAS) and First Contact Signposting Schemes. The Fire and Rescue Service is also contributing to First Contact and HPAS.

In 2011-12 the Linkage Team will explore alternative options for the services that are proposed for closure, to meet the needs of the older people who will no longer be receiving these preventative services, eg supermarket home shopping, existing luncheon clubs, probation service, community service orders, voluntary car schemes. Approved Gardening services are available through the Trading Services Buy with Confidence scheme.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Linkage Service/Notts 50+ Service: Staffing Reductions

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The total budget for the Linkage Team including preventative services and commissioning staff members is £986,739 for 2010-11. This proposal is to reduce staffing within the team and should be read in conjunction with other proposals relating to the service.

### 3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?

GROSS  
£000

1,265

NET  
£000

986

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	Total £000's
0	0	46	15	0	<b>62</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

6%

### 5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?

4.0

### 6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?

1.5

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

SERVICE USERS

None

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

### 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

In 2011-12 the Linkage Team will explore alternative options for the delivery of services that are proposed for closure, to meet the needs of the older people who will no longer be receiving these preventative services, eg supermarket home shopping, existing luncheon clubs, probation service, community service orders, voluntary car schemes.

Following this review, it will be possible to reduce the number of staff in line with the reduced number of services being developed and monitored.

## SUMMARY PROPOSAL

### 1 SERVICE AREA

Linkage Service/Notts 50+ Service: Invest To Save Proposal

### 2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to streamline the current Handy Persons and Adaptation Schemes (HPAS) to provide a more cost effective service co-ordinated via the Customer Service Centre, which would provide a uniform service throughout the County with greater coverage. The installation of minor adaptations to improve someone's mobility, or having small jobs completed at a subsidised rate, are examples of HPAS jobs that enable older people to remain living safely and independently in their homes.

The total cost of HPAS once countywide is forecast to be £438,000 per year (£254,500 = Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC); £112,000 = District/Borough Councils; £71,500 = Health). The total cost of this more efficient scheme would be no more than the current handyperson and preventative adaptation schemes.

<b>3 WHAT IS THE BUDGET?</b>	<b>GROSS £000</b>	<b>123,000</b>	<b>NET £000</b>	<b>95,000</b>
------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	---------------------	---------------

### 4 WHAT ARE THE GROSS TOTAL SAVINGS?

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	Total
£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
0	96	152	256	296	<b>800</b>

WHAT ARE THE TOTAL SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?	<b>1%</b>
--	-----------

5 WHAT ARE THE CURRENT STAFFING FTE?	<b>0.0</b>
--------------------------------------	------------

6 WHAT ARE THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS FTE?	<b>0.0</b>
---	------------

### 7 WHAT IS THE IMPACT ON?

#### SERVICE USERS

Development of Home Improvement Agency (HIA) services will substantially increase countywide service capacity enabling many more older people to access housing related preventative interventions quickly. There is good evidence that by preventing avoidable injuries and falls and by improving the fabric of the property, older people are able to live longer within the community.

## OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A number of organisations support proposals to expand this service:

- a) Fire and Rescue want to utilise the countywide service delivery model to deliver their home safety checks to vulnerable older adults and fit any identified smoke alarms that are required.
- b) Victim Support has requested that the model be used to deliver home security interventions to victims of crime.
- c) Mansfield District Council have offered funding to ensure home security interventions are offered to their residents.

## OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The increased take up of the preventative services will reduce future demand on all Adult Social Care & Health (ASCH) services by enabling more older people to remain living safely and independently. There is potential for this service to take on the installation of simple adaptations for Fair Access to Care eligible service users as a fast track for people while waiting for an Occupational Therapy assessment and the installation of large adaptations.

## 8 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The development of preventative services will allow service users to remain living independently and to continue to make a positive contribution to their local community. Currently, access to services provided by the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) is patchy across the county and there is variability in terms of the range, capacity and quality of preventative services available. The proposed changes will provide a robust standardised infrastructure that will enable the delivery of housing related preventative services countywide. By using the Customer Service Centre to co-ordinate the provision of services, customers will also have substantially improved access. The model will deliver better value for money as it vastly reduces the back office costs present in the current model and reinvests the savings into increased interventions.

The Care Services Efficiency Delivery (CSED) agency has already suggested that a refocusing of HIAs within Nottinghamshire should be a priority development area. National evidence demonstrates that home adaptations and practical support is one of the high impact initiatives that reduce future crises for older people.