

County Council

13 December 2011

Schedule of Business

This page is intentionally left blank

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – 13 DECEMBER 2011

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

- **9.58 am – The Civic Party will process into the Council Chamber;**
- **A Briefing session on Children Looked After will be held for all Members of the Council following the conclusion of the Council Meeting.**

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
1.	1		10:00	Minutes Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 November 2011 (CC1).	
2.	2			Apologies for Absence	Cllr Janet Godden (pm) Cllr Peter Jones Cllr Rodney Rose
3.	2			Declarations of Interest	
4.	2			Official Communications The Chairman reports as follows: (i) Extraordinary Meeting – 20 March 2012;	

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
				(ii) The Chairman has attended 7 repatriations for fallen servicemen since the Memorial Garden was dedicated; (iii) Cllr Peter Jones; (iv) Janet Choldcroft; (v) A listing of Chairman's Events is now available on the website: http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/chairman-council	
5.	2			Appointments To appoint Mrs Kathleen Medlock as the Parent Governor Representative for Primary Schools on the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee.	

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
6.	2			Petitions and Public Address	<u>Petition</u> Mrs Nicky Hancock, Resident of Ardington – Re: withdrawal of Local Bus Service.
7.	2			Questions with Notice from Members of the Public	None.
8.	2	15 mins	10.30	Treasury Management Mid Term Review	(M) Couchman (SEC) Shouler S Armitage S Darke

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
9.	2	30 mins	10.45	Review of the Constitution	(M) Greene (SEC) Seale (AM) Mitchell (SEC) Robertson (AM) L Sanders (SEC) S Mathew S Atkins S Patrick S R Smith S J Godden S Tanner

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
10.	3	20 mins	11.15	Report of the Cabinet Deputy Leader (David Robertson) Children Young People & Families (Louise Chapman) Finance & Property (Jim Couchman) School Improvement (Melinda Tilley) Transport (Mitchell for Rodney Rose)	Q. Fooks, Pressel, Brighthouse (1) Q. Brighthouse (2) Q. Armitage (3) Q. Hudspeth (4) Q. Waine (5) Q. D Turner, J Sanders (6)

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
11.	3	30 mins	11.35	Questions with Notice from Members of the Council (1) Crabbe to Tilley (2) J Sanders to Rose (3) J Sanders to Rose (4) J Sanders to Rose (5) Tanner to Lindsay-Gale (6) Tanner to Lindsay-Gale (7) Tanner to Robertson (8) Altaf-Khan to Tilley (9) Hannaby to Fatemian (10) Hannaby to Fatemian (11) Hannaby to Fatemian (12) R Smith to Robertson (13) L Sanders to Robertson (14) L Sanders to Rose (15) L Sanders to Fatemian	See Annex 2

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
12.	3	20 mins	12.05	Motion From Councillor Arash Fatemian	(M) Fatemian (SEC) Mitchell S Couchman S Skolar S Seale S Patrick S Hannaby S Hutchinson S Stevens
13.	4	30 mins	12.25	Motion From Councillor Janet Godden	(M) Fooks (SEC) Altaf-Khan (AM) Shouler (SEC) Mathew S Chapman S Tilley S Waine S R Smith S Purse S Pressel S V Smith See Annex 1
LUNCH		12.55 pm			

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
14.	4	40 mins	2.00	Motion From Councillor Sarah Hutchinson	(M) Hutchinson (SEC) Brighthouse S Chapman S Hayward S Waine S Mitchell S Harvey S Skolar S Mathew S Patrick S D Turner S Fooks S Pressel
15.	5	40 mins	2.40	Motion From Councillor John Tanner	(M) Tanner (SEC) Hutchinson S Mitchell S Lilly S Skolar S Shouler S Hayward S Wilmshurst S Fooks S R Smith S D Turner S Armitage

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
16.	5	20 mins	3.20	Motion From Councillor Zoe Patrick	(M) Patrick (SEC) D Turner S Mitchell S Lilly S Purse S R Smith S J Sanders S Tanner
17.	6	20 mins		Motion From Councillor Susanna Pressel	(M) Pressel (SEC) Stevens/Darke S Heathcoat S Hayward S Mitchell S Lovatt S Goddard Darke
18.	6	20 mins		Motion From Councillor Larry Sanders	(M) L Sanders (SEC) S Robertson S Armitage S Goddard S Altaf-Khan S Tanner

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
19.	6	20 mins		Motion From Councillor Richard Stevens	(M) Stevens (SEC) Pressel S Heathcoat S Mitchell S Lovatt S Atkins S Goddard

AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Agenda Item 9 – Review of the Constitution - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Larry Sanders

to amend the motion by adding the words:

(d) This Council instructs the Monitoring Officer to amend the Council Procedure Rules so that the Green Group and the independent member are treated on the same terms as the other groups on the Council as regards the order in which motions on notice are included on the agenda.'

Agenda Item 13 – Motion from Councillor Janet Godden - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Shouler

"Council welcomes the Coalition Government's proposal to extend free childcare to disadvantaged two-year-olds by April 2013 and notes that this should benefit around 1,000 infants in Oxfordshire.

Council looks forward to the new arrangements that will improve life chances for these two-year-olds, but notes that many of the county's nurseries and children's centres are currently full. Council asks Cabinet to ensure that sufficient provision will be available in appropriate and local settings for such very young children ***within the funding envelope available*** and to report to CEF Scrutiny if there is likely to be any shortfall."

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

ANNEX 2

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received. The time allowed for this agenda item will not exceed 30 minutes. Should any questioner not have received an answer in that time, a written answer will be provided.

Questions	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR TONY CRABBE</p> <p>During the course of 2011 a review was undertaken, and some measures were introduced by cabinet, to rationalize the cost of School Transport. As a result a reduction was made in the allowable mileage for transport of pupils by private car where no organized School Transport was available. These pupils would otherwise need to be transported by Taxi. The allowable mileage was unreasonably halved from two return journeys per day to one return journey. In certain cases this has meant that parents have withdrawn cooperation because of the failure to compensate for both full journeys. This has resulted in the need to provide a Taxi to transport a pupil to school with a significant increase in cost to the Council. The Council's agreed policy is to provide transport for pupils by the most economical means. Does the Cabinet member agree that, as a result of these recent changes, there is a contradiction in the current policy that needs to be urgently addressed to ensure that unnecessary costly Taxi's are avoided and thereby minimize School</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MELINDA TILLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>An extensive consultation about a revised home to school transport policy was undertaken during late 2009 and early 2010 (not 2011 as stated in the question). The revised policy was predicated upon the need to realise significant savings in the total cost of home to school transport through bringing entitlements to free transport into line with statutory requirements and through introducing greater equity, for instance for different faith communities.</p> <p>A paper was presented to Cabinet on 22nd June 2020 with a comprehensive home to school transport policy which, with the addition of an amendment in the name of Councillor Waine to address concerns about the impact on large families of the revised entitlement to transport on faith grounds, was agreed unanimously. This decision, and the revised home to school transport policy, was reported to full Council on the 14th September 2010.</p> <p>The section of the policy relevant to the question is that which provides for parents to be offered the option of the payment of a mileage allowance instead of the provision of free home to school transport by taxi, contract bus or public service. This offer will only be made where it is the cheapest option and it is likely to remain so; there is no obligation on the parent to accept nor for the Council to enter into such an arrangement. To quote the policy verbatim "Where parents wish to take their children to school and it is therefore possible to avoid the provision of a taxi the Local Authority may agree to the payment of a mileage allowance."</p> <p>Prior to the introduction of the 2010 policy there was a variety of practice with some parents being paid for 4 journeys per day and others only two. The current policy</p>

Transport costs?	<p>provides for two journeys a day to be reimbursed at 40p per mile, one to transport the child to school and one to bring them home. For the overwhelming majority of parents this formalising of the reimbursement of two journeys per day represented no change to what they were previously receiving. In many, if not most cases, the parent is able to combine the journey to school with the journey to work or some other destination. There will be some occasions where reimbursing a parent for more than two journeys per day might be a cheaper option than the alternative of a taxi or some other means of transport. However, to increase the entitlement across the board would clearly increase the overall costs to the Council since there are currently 127 children in respect of whom a mileage allowance is being paid. Of these, few would actually be making four journeys exclusively connected with the 'home to school run'.</p> <p>If a child is entitled to free home to school transport and the parent is unwilling to transport their child on the conditions of the Council's policy, the Council will discharge its legal responsibility to provide free transport by the cheapest alternative. Once a transport service has been provided it can then accommodate additional children at little or no additional cost to the Council, and if there are spare seats these can be offered on a concessionary basis to other children who are not entitled to free transport. The concessionary fares charged will help to defray the additional costs to the Council.</p> <p>There are currently 127 children in respect of whom a mileage allowance is being paid to parents, in every case for two journeys per day. Parents have a right to appeal both against decisions not to provide free home to school transport and against the reimbursement of two rather than four journeys. To date there has been one appeal against the two journeys rule; this appeal was not upheld by the appeal panel of three councillors. There has also been one recorded case of a parent declining to continue to transport their child so obliging the Council to provide taxi transport; the same parent who lodged the unsuccessful appeal.</p>
------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>2. COUNCILLOR JOHN SANDERS</p> <p>How much work has been undertaken by officers in furthering the idea of having a CPZ covering the whole of Oxford City?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Transport is NOT planning a City CPZ.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR JOHN SANDERS</p> <p>If a city-wide CPZ were introduced, will the Cabinet Member give an assurance that the needs of local businesses, shoppers, disabled people, churchgoers and short-term visitors will be considered and will the Cabinet Member consider that day and time restrictions may need to be varied in different parts of the City?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Transport is NOT planning a City CPZ.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR JOHN SANDERS</p> <p>If a CPZ were to be brought in for the whole City will the cabinet member give absolute reassurance to the residents of Oxford that they would not be charged?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Transport is NOT planning a City CPZ.</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member say when the contract with Viridor for an incinerator at Ardley will now be made public? Could she estimate how much waste will be brought in from outside Oxfordshire to feed the 300,000 tonne plant?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR GROWTH & INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Now that the planning permission for the energy from waste (EfW) facility is finally secure, implementation of the residual waste treatment contract is able to proceed. We have successfully closed the financial terms of the contract which will divert nearly all our residual municipal waste from landfill and provide value for money for the council tax payers of Oxfordshire.</p>

	<p>I am happy to say that significant progress has been made in preparing the contract for publication. This is a complex document and we are taking care to balance the release of information with the need to redact genuinely commercially sensitive information. Officers are working hard to prepare the document in liaison with our contractor, and the main project agreement will be ready before Christmas. There are a number of schedules to the contract which will take a little longer and these should be available by mid January.</p> <p>The County Council's Oxfordshire Waste Planning Strategy Consultation Draft, September 2011, included an assumption that 90,000 tonnes per annum of capacity at the Ardley EFW plant would be used by waste from outside Oxfordshire. This assumption will be reviewed in the light of responses received to the consultation and any new information before the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is prepared for consideration by Cabinet and Full Council.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>Does the Cabinet member agree with the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (CPRE) that the amount of sand and gravel to be extracted each year from Oxfordshire should be a maximum of 800,000 tonnes rather than 1.26 million tonnes? What comfort can she give to residents of the Lower Windrush Valley, Eynsham and elsewhere that future workings will not damage the countryside and create unacceptable traffic movements?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR GROWTH & INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>The County Council's Oxfordshire Minerals Planning Strategy Consultation Draft, September 2011 includes a proposal, in Policy M2, that provision should be made for working of sand and gravel at the rate of 1.26 million tonnes a year. A number of the responses that have been made to this consultation include comments on this policy. Some (including the CPRE) consider that the figure should be lower than 1.26; others consider that a higher figure is appropriate. All the points that have been made in the responses to the consultation will be carefully considered, and the figures in Policy M2 will be reviewed in the light of the consultation responses and any new information before the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is prepared for consideration and decision by Cabinet and Full Council.</p> <p>The County Council's minerals planning vision and objectives set out in the Minerals Planning Strategy Consultation Draft, September 2011 include minimising the impacts of mineral working, including impacts on the countryside and impacts from traffic movements. The intention is to come up with a strategy which will provide for the minerals that need to be supplied in Oxfordshire without causing unacceptable environmental or other impact. The consultation draft Minerals Planning Strategy</p>

	<p>includes Policies C3 (Environmental and amenity protection), C5 (Landscape) and C7 (Transport) to ensure that proposals that would have unacceptable impacts are avoided when decisions are made on the location of specific sites for mineral working and on planning applications for particular mineral working proposals.</p>
<p>7. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member accept my congratulations on securing Government funding for the East-West rail link? Will he say how much money has been allocated in each of the next few years, whether there is still a funding gap and when he expects work to start on the new rail link?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DAVID ROBERTSON, DEPUTY LEADER</p> <p>We have had positive announcements about East West Rail in the past few weeks which gives us reassurance that we will finally see the railway reopened by 2017.</p> <p>Whilst it is true that we have taken a massive step forward, it is still too early to say we have definitely secured Government funding. But the Government has acknowledged the strategic importance of East West Rail and has included it in the National Infrastructure Plan announced by the Chancellor in his Autumn Statement.</p> <p>This is a significant achievement for all concerned in the Consortium. The Rail Minister, Theresa Villiers MP, visited Bicester Town on Monday to meet representatives from the Consortium and view for herself the proposals for East West Rail.</p> <p>Before Government funding is formally confirmed, there are two conditions that need to be met by Spring 2012. The first being that there is a satisfactory business case. The Consortium is confident that its business case of £6 return for every £1 invested is sound as this was endorsed in a report by Oxford Economics in the summer. The report also pointed to the prospect that the railway could generate more than £38m a year for the UK economy. These are exceptional figures for a rail project.</p> <p>The other condition is securing local contributions towards the cost of the project. The total scheme is estimated to cost around £270 million but the share of this between Government and other sources has not yet been defined. The Consortium will be working out what a 'suitable local contribution' might be from along the route between Reading and Bedford, although it will probably involve a mix of real money, contributions from the private sector, and partners' expertise, particularly on issues</p>

	<p>like planning, permitted development, environmental assessment, highways, rights of way across the track and the like, along with savings as a result of collaborative working cutting red tape.</p> <p>Provided the conditions have been met, the Government will confirm next summer what funding it will provide to Network Rail after 2014. Network Rail will then work with the East West Rail Consortium to deliver the scheme set out by the Consortium in its November 2011 Prospectus (available on the website at www.eastwestrail.org.uk), subject to the Consortium meeting a share of the costs.</p> <p>If all goes according to plan, we anticipate construction work getting underway in 2015 with train services running in 2017.</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR ALTAF-KHAN</p> <p>It is good news that the Government is investing an extra £4,435.413 in schools' capacity in our area to help fund much needed additional school places. Please can the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement outline how this money will be spent?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MELINDA TILLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>The additional resources are of course welcome but will, inevitably, have to be used to contribute towards the schools' Basic Needs Programme (fulfilment of the requirement to provide places for all children of statutory school age). An additional £10.1m of basic need has been identified in respect of 2012/13. The draft 6-Year Basic Need Programme (including the current year) cost is now estimated to be c. £28.750m (net of external funding and individual projects agreed as part of the capital programme review in 2010/11), identified to provide 1,786 pupil places throughout the County.</p>
<p>9. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>In 2006, Dr. Steven Richards currently Chairman of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Consortium, then chairman of the South East & South West Oxon PCT's professional executive committee, said that "There are too many delayed transfers in the system and we are looking at a model that offers the</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SERVICES</p> <p>There is no easy or permanently lasting solution to the issue of the numbers of people requiring care on discharge from hospital and who may become delayed. Whilst we know that 97% of people go through hospital and are discharged in a timely fashion, the remaining 3% represent a significantly increasing level of activity in our acute hospitals year on year. What Stephen Richards said in 2006 remains true today. The ACE programme, formally started on 7th July this year, is a concerted programme across the whole of Health and Social Care organisations, from the most strategic level to that of individual patients, to get the model of care</p>

<p>right care in the right place at the right time [...] We want to do that with better access for patients to specialist clinicians and a smoother run through the system, quite a lot of which would be in the community and in patients' own homes. "</p> <p>How can members have confidence in the new proposed solution, offering more of the same thing, when the initiative of 2006 brought no lasting results? What is so different now? Why are we repeatedly told that the answer lies in better joint working, when for years we have also been repeatedly told that joint working in Oxfordshire is good, and we were one of the first counties to have pooled budgets for services for older adults?</p>	<p>right, and patients' pathway through the care system, as swift as their condition allows.</p> <p>The programme is not just focussing on the headline numbers, but on a whole range of outcomes which stand for quality of patient care, and which collectively bear on the numbers. There has already been significant progress on quality in the patient pathway, and some impact too on the numbers of delays, which have reduced by some 50 over the past month. But as Stephen Richards said to Scrutiny Committee recently, we are prepared for the numbers to go up before they come down; we are tackling the underlying causes.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>The national and professional press has recently carried worrying stories about older people neglected and mistreated by care workers both in residential and nursing settings and in their own homes.</p> <p>Can we be confident that older people whose care we fund know how to complain and that their complaints are taken seriously? What is the position for people employing their own care assistants on personal budgets?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SERVICES</p> <p>The Council works hard to ensure that people it supports know how to comment on and complain about the services we fund. Over the last four years the number of formal complaints has increased each year from 59 in 2006/7 to 136 in 2010/11, this in part reflects the work that has been undertaken to promote the comments and complaints service and also the inclusion for the first time of concerns raised directly with the Director as formal complaints where appropriate.</p> <p>Each year the Local Involvement Network (LINK) organises an event for service users, their family and friends to meet with myself and the Director to discuss their priorities for the coming year. Last year they asked us to provide more information on how to send in comments and complaints that would help improve services. In response we have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent out a standard letter to all new clients and included a copy of the comments and complaints leaflet. • Ensured that whenever a client's needs are reviewed they were offered a

copy of the leaflet

- Made the leaflet available at all social care establishments and offices, GP surgeries and all hospitals in Oxfordshire
- Ensures that organisations contracted to provide services by the council are required to give our comments and complaints telephone number as well as their own to their clients.

We are also producing a video, to go onto the website and be made available to service users, explaining the importance of making a complaint if you are unhappy, and how we will respond to the complaint. The video will include a complainant who has seen real improvements as a result of making a complaint, myself, the Director and the Complaints Manager. We need to continually re-enforce the importance of people sending in comments and complaints.

When someone wishes to make a complaint about services purchased with their personal budget we ask them to initially address concerns directly with their care provider unless there are safeguarding concerns which would be investigated by the Council. Even though the Council have no powers to investigate complaints about services purchased with a personal budget, whenever possible, we will ask the care provider to share their response with the council so that we can monitor the situation under our contract monitoring obligations and ensure that relevant care manager is aware of the individual concerns. If they are unhappy with the response, or do not feel comfortable raising their concern, we will advise that either a Broker or Local Advocacy Group can provide support.

The council employs contract monitoring staff who visit care providers either as part of a planned work programme or in response to issues which arise such as a complaint or a safeguarding alert. Monitoring visit will result in recommendations for areas of improvement and agreed actions for the provider to undertake. Staff will

The system is the same for both service users where the care is directly organised by the council and those who purchase care through an agency with a direct payment.

When a service user directly employs a care assistant, they set up a contract with the worker which would include the terms and conditions of the employment.

	<p>Service users are supported in drawing this up either by care managers the council directly employs or independent brokers. All service users, once their service begins, will have a named co-ordinator who is a council member of staff to support the service user in ensuring their care is delivered appropriately. The council also has a contract with the A4E Direct Payments support service to support people directly employing a care assistant.</p>
<p>11. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member for Adult Services join me in welcoming the CQC decision to investigate Private Care Home providers?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SERVICES</p> <p>Yes, I do welcome this decision.</p> <p>The council strongly supported the previous regulation regime whereby CQC visited all registered care providers (both care homes and home care providers) and provided them with a star rating, which we used in our own contract management arrangements. The last time the CQC published figures on provider star ratings by council areas (2009/10) a higher percentage of people in Oxfordshire were placed in services rated as either 'good' or 'excellent' than the average for the rest of the country. The rate of improvement in services was also higher than the rest of the country.</p> <p>We see the role of CQC as part of our wider monitoring arrangements. I also welcome the Local Involvement Network's recent work visiting care homes and assessing the quality of care and would highlight that the council's own contract monitoring teams visit all care providers. This year we have trained a team of volunteer service users and carers who monitor the quality of services we purchase. This team visit other service users and ask them about the quality of care and any issues that need to be raised. Service users themselves are probably the best arbiters of service quality, and it is through their voice, along with local communities (as represented by the LINK) as well as CQC that service quality will be assured.</p>

<p>12. COUNCILLOR ROZ SMITH</p> <p>Thank you for sending the link showing the Customer Service Centre statistical figures recently. I am sure you would agree that members of the public expect a quick and appropriate response to their telephone calls. However, I note that the last mystery shopping exercise was completed in 2008 to disabled persons and in autumn 2007 for general users. This information is now out of date. When is the next mystery shopper exercise planned?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DAVID ROBERTSON, DEPUTY LEADER</p> <p>We undertook 5 years of Mystery Shopping exercises which cost £36K plus a large amount of time from the team which roughly estimate could double this cost. At the time we didn't have contact statistics or call recording, so there was some justification in spending the money. Since then we have implemented a call recording system and the team leaders now mystery shop on a daily basis, listening to Customer Service Calls and providing feedback to advisors, which is incorporated into their annual appraisals.</p> <p>Mystery shopping has been a regular FOI request, because it can be seen as wasting tax payer's money. Quality and accountability against the standards is tighter than ever before for the main contact points, so it would seem wasteful to spend money on Mystery Shopping.</p> <p>In addition, we will start to measure Customer Satisfaction more formally in the new year. We currently offer the option for customers to complete a feedback form on line via email and letter responses but we are not doing anything on phone calls, this was mainly due to shortage of resources, an issue which is now rectified.</p> <p>If anyone wishes to see the process on call monitoring, it can of course be provided</p>
<p>13. COUNCILLOR LARRY SANDERS</p> <p>In your answer to my follow-up question on 1 November 2011 you said that statistics were being kept on the numbers of people of various ethnicities, gender and disability status who lost their jobs as a result of the cuts program in the last two years. Could Cllr Robertson please provide those numbers and how they compare with the number of people employed by the Council in those categories?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DAVID ROBERTSON, DEPUTY LEADER</p> <p>As previously indicated our HR team are monitoring the numbers of people who have lost jobs as we deliver the savings laid out in our Business Strategy. Information is tracked by directorate and in relation to the equality groupings shown below. The following table shows the breakdown of staff made redundant in the period 1 August 2010 to 31 August 2011 in comparison with the equality data for the Council. The total number of employees who were made redundant in the period was 186. We will be including quarterly updates on these numbers as part of our on-going Establishment reports to Cabinet, starting with the position as at 31 December 2011.</p>

		All redundancies 1 st Aug10 – 31 st Aug 11	OCC
Sex	Male	23%	26%
	Female	77%	74%
Disability	Disability	2%	2%
	No Disability	98%	98%
Ethnicity	White	82%	86%
	BAME	12%	5%
	Non-declared	6%	9%
Age	16-24	0%	4%
	25-34	5%	16%
	35-44	18%	24%
	45-54	33%	31%
	55-64	41%	23%
	65+	2%	3%
14. COUNCILLOR LARRY SANDERS	COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT		
Air pollution from vehicle emissions in Oxford can be held to be currently in breach of EU law. The measures proposed by you as outlined in your reply to me at the last Council meeting are largely to take place in the future and their success is uncertain. Does that mean that the Cabinet sees no other way but to continue in breach of EU laws for some time, with the risk of action being taken, while also continuing to tolerate the situation in which more people die prematurely from air pollution than sustain serious injury or die from traffic accidents?	The Council is pursuing the introduction of a Low Emission Zone for Oxford, in partnership with the City Council (the body responsible for air quality monitoring and management) and bus operators, working with the Traffic Commissioner to agree the appropriate framework for this scheme and what the details would look like.		

<p>15. COUNCILLOR LARRY SANDERS</p> <p>The recent report by the Equality and Human Rights Commission into home care commissioned by local authorities found evidence of a “systematic failure” across the country and that elderly people’s human rights were being breached. Commissioned home care, in Oxfordshire, as elsewhere in the country, is being delivered in ways which become more and more difficult to monitor. Very little care is now provided by the Council’s own staff; less is being provided by established companies; more is provided by ad hoc arrangements.</p> <p>What is the County Council doing to make sure that the care for which it pays, and indeed care received by the many vulnerable people who pay for their own care, is of good quality? What processes are in place to prevent the neglect and cruelty which the report found to be so widespread across the country?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SERVICES</p> <p>Thank you for raising this question. I was equally concerned at the recent report from the Equality and Human Rights Commission and have sought assurances from the Director on the same.</p> <p>Members will have noted that in response to an earlier question I spoke about the positive quality rating that the Care Quality Commission had given to home care providers in Oxfordshire. We believe that the Council's work alongside providers has contributed to such a position.</p> <p>The Council retendered its Support at Home Services contract earlier this year with a new contract commencing in July.</p> <p>Our approach to assuring quality covers 3 main phases - at the tender stage, through raising awareness and information sharing, and through on-going monitoring as part of the normal contract management arrangements.</p> <p>At the tender stage we assess the application documentation that is submitted by providers. All providers have to be registered by the Care Quality Commission and we assess various components such as Health & Safety, Insurance, Data Protection and Business Continuity. A further pre-requisite is that all providers must sign up to Oxfordshire's Safeguarding requirements and be prepared to use an Electronic Time Monitoring System of the council's choice. Such a system records when a visit takes place and its duration, and can identify any missed or late calls.</p> <p>Information sharing and raising awareness of issues is an important and on-going process.</p> <p>To achieve this we use avenues such as our Internet pages, through e-mails and mailshots and through regular provider meetings. A key element of this information sharing is the provision of an 'Induction' process for providers at the start of a new contract. Since June we have held 8 half day training sessions for home support</p>

providers where we have explained in more detail what this Council's expectations are. These sessions have covered areas such as Safe Recruitment, Safeguarding, Shared Care Protocols, Health & Safety/Moving and Handling, Business Continuity and what to expect from our Contract Monitoring activity. All presentations made to providers are available on the Taking Control website.

The emphasis here is on a provider being clear about what we expect of them and for them to be fully responsible for the services they deliver under our contract

Our on-going **contract monitoring activity** includes

- intelligence gathering including a review of past performance together with a review of any safeguarding issues
- Reviewing the latest Care Quality Commission reports
- reviewing electronic time monitoring information
- reviewing complaints
- carrying out contract/quality monitoring visits which may be undertaken either as part of a planned work programme or in response to issues which arise.
- obtaining views from service users

A key part of any monitoring visit involves holding a number of individual interviews with the provider's Registered Manager and its staff to cross-reference and confirm areas of concern.

The Director also operates an internal risk management process using a traffic light system. Any provider that generates concerns is subject to increased monitoring by the Contracts Unit to ensure that an action plan for improvement is in place and implemented.

More recently and as I mentioned earlier the Directorate has recruited and trained a number of volunteers (essentially experts by experience) to visit service users and hear their views about the services they receive. They then feed back to the Contracts Team. We are very much in the first phase of this activity with the first round of visits. However I'm sure members will agree with me that this is both an interesting and exciting development and one which I know the Director wishes to

	<p>extend in the future.</p> <p>The fundamental importance of assuring quality is fully accepted by the Directorate. As part of the reorganisation of joint commissioning we are planning on strengthening the contracting function and creating a new senior post to monitor Contracts and Quality across adult social care (subject to consultation with staff). This is partly as a response to concerns about the quality of care for older and disabled people nationally, in recognition of the relative weakness of the regulator and to increase our ability to manage external services effectively as more of our provider services are outsourced.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to return to the theme of the recent report from the Equality & Human Rights Commission. Members will be pleased to hear that the Director's staff will be raising this very issue for discussion with contracted providers later today at one of the regular business meetings we hold with them.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Members who are also Members of a District Council in Oxfordshire

Cherwell District Council

Councillor Alyas Ahmed	Councillor Timothy Hallchurch MBE
Councillor Billington	Councillor Kieron Mallon
Councillor Norman Bolster	Councillor G.A. Reynolds
Councillor Ann Bonner	Councillor Lawrie Stratford
Councillor Mrs Catherine Fulljames	Councillor Nicholas P. Turner
Councillor Michael Gibbard	

Oxford City Council

Councillor Mohammed Altaf-Khan	Councillor Sajjad Hussain Malik (Saj)
Councillor Alan Armitage	Councillor Susanna Pressel
Councillor Roy Darke	Councillor Val Smith
Councillor Jean Fooks	Councillor John Tanner
Councillor John Goddard	

South Oxfordshire District Council

Councillor Tony Harbour	Councillor Bill Service
Councillor Anne Purse	Councillor David Turner

Vale of White Horse District Council

Councillor Marilyn Badcock	Councillor Peter Jones
Councillor Mike Badcock	Councillor A.M. Lovatt
Councillor Jenny Hannaby	Councillor Melinda Tilley

West Oxfordshire District Council

Councillor Louise Chapman	Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles
Councillor Pete Handley	Councillor Ian Hudspeth
Councillor David Harvey	Councillor Neil Owen
Councillor Steve Hayward	

This page is intentionally left blank