

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 September 2018 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.45 pm.

Present:

Voting Members:

~~Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat~~
Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat – in the Chair
Councillor Lawrie Stratford
Councillor Ian Corkin
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale
Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE
Councillor David Bartholomew
Councillor Mark Gray

Other Members in Attendance:

Councillor Michael Waine (Agenda Item 11)
Councillor John Howson (Agenda Item 11)
Councillor Emma Turnbull (Agenda Item 11)
Councillor Glynis Phillips (Agenda Items 6 & 8)
Councillor Bob Johnson (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Charles Mathew (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Liz Brighthouse (Agenda Item 9)
Councillor John Sanders (Agenda Item 10)
Councillor Laura Price (Agenda Items 4 & 12)

Officers:

Whole of meeting	Peter Clark, Chief Executive; Deborah Miller (Law & Governance).
Part of Meeting	
Item	
6	Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance;
7	Bev Hindle, Strategic Director Communities; Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance;
8	Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance and Tim Chapple;
10	Susan Halliwell, Director for Planning & Place and John Disley;
11	David Clarke, Deputy Director Education;
12	Steve Munn, Director of Human Resources.

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

81/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item. 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Eddie Reeves and Steve Harrod.

82/18 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 July 2018 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

83/18 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Laura Price had given notice of the following question to Councillor Judith Heathcoat:

“Could the Deputy Leader explain why, at a time when Oxfordshire is considering the implementation of a new operating model with significant implications for staff, the creation of 6 new Deputy Director posts was authorised? Where was the public business case for the appointments and how many other senior positions have been created, or are planned to be created without scrutiny?”

Councillor Heathcoat replied:

“Following Cabinet agreement to the Senior Management Review (SMR) in December 2016, the senior management of Communities (specifically the Environment & Economy areas) was left to be reviewed and adjusted during the restructuring processes underway. This was prior to the initiation of the Transformation programme or Fit for the Future. Following the appointment of the Strategic Director for Communities, his first major task was to review and put in place the senior management teams for the new Department. The first stage of that was to establish new Director posts to reflect the direction of the organisation and align this with other departments to fill out how Communities would engage in cross council work participate in the Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) – again this was prior to Transformation getting under way. The new Directors were then tasked with developing structures which could both meet our MTFP commitments, but also meet the emerging challenges we were facing at the time: unitary council, devolution, property issues arising from Carillion and the development of partnership working.

In the autumn of 2017 an operational decision was taken to add Assistant Director posts into Communities. These new posts would be part of restructuring activity to address the volume and nature of the work in Communities and the need to be prepared to deal with Fit for the Future. This injection of capacity and capability would enable us to address some

major issues affecting Communities and indeed the Council. Most significant was how to:

- deal with a failing Carillion contract (prior to their collapse);
- develop and solidify the emerging Growth Deal and Housing Infrastructure Funding proposals;
- develop and deliver a new approach to asset management and investment;
- completely overhaul how we deliver our capital programme; and
- develop and implement the department's part in developing and implementing the emerging target operating model (TOM).

To wait until we agreed the TOM to change our operational leadership structure was not operationally possible because we would not be able to achieve existing MTFP savings (particularly for Planning & Place directorate) and we would not be in a robust position to begin the implementation of the TOM. Similar decisions had been taken previously in People Directorate (both Adults and Children's Services). Although we had no absolute clarity on TOM when we started the process to recruit in January 2018, we knew enough about the emerging layers, the major principles of transformation and the workload priorities to enable us to recruit the skills and capacities we would need to see us through."

Supplementary: "Given the assertion in the answer that these Assistant Directorships were crucial to achieving the savings in the existing Medium Term Financial Plan, could you outline where we will be able to scrutinise the impact of the Directorships in relation to delivering the savings? Would it have been more prudent to wait until we were rolling out the new operating model?"

Councillor Heathcoat asked Peter Clarke to respond as follows: "The appointments of the Assistant Directors within Communities are essential given the scope and scale of the Housing and Growth Deal, the HIFF fund and the half a million potential investment in the infrastructure in Oxfordshire. In reality, the Strategic Director and all directors in communities have been actively involved in the work around the Operating Model and have agreed the full range of principals that relate to the operation of that work, and therefore the appointments were seen as being essential in order for them to fulfil that agenda rather than to wait. The housing and growth deal was made many months ago and we have been actively involved in the Growth Board, we need to get on with fulfilling those requirements and in those circumstances the directors have made the necessary appointments that they feel are necessary in order to fulfil their service. The point on Scrutiny is that is if they fail or there are any issues around performance those will be addressed in Performance Scrutiny."

Councillor Howson had given notice of the following question to Councillor Lindsay-Gale:

“Could you list the revenue balances for all maintained primary schools in Oxfordshire at the end of the 2017/8 financial year and show what percentage of revenue income the balance represents and how the percentage has changed since the end of the previous financial year, as well as the latest available number of pupils on the school roll?”

Councillor Lindsay-Gale replied:

“Please find below the information required for all maintained primary schools in Oxford. This list includes the primary schools maintained as at 31 March 2018 and the data used for the number on roll is at October 2017.”

Supplementary: Lord Agnew, the Minister of State told Auditors of Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) and committees that they may approve the virements of cash between schools in a Multi Academy Trust or a Multi Academy Committee. Is the Cabinet Member prepared to ask Multi Academy Trusts or Committees in Oxfordshire not to take money from one school to support another and especially with those Multi Academy Trusts with Headquarters outside Oxfordshire, not to transfer money away from any school in Oxfordshire because we have been a member of the F40 Group and it would be unfair if money was taken from a school in Oxfordshire to support a school in a much better funded part of the Country. If MATs won't agree with this, would the Cabinet Member be prepared to write to the Secretary of State, asking for the same virements arrangements that are available to schools in MATs to be available to the State schools and stand-alone academies.”

Councillor Lindsay-Gale responded that she would be very happy to support that as Oxfordshire money should be for Oxfordshire Schools and anything she could do to support that she would be happy to undertake.

84/18 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

The Leader of the Council had agreed the following requests to address the meeting:-

Item	Speaker
Item 11 – Elective Home Education	Councillor Michael Waine, Chairman of Education Scrutiny Committee; Councillor John Howson, Local Member Councillor Emma Turnbull
Item 6 – Service & Resource Planning Report 2019/20	Councillor Glynis Phillips
Item 7 – Business Case to support Significant	Councillor Bob Johnston Councillor John Sanders

Capital Investment in the Council's Assets	Councillor Charles Mathew
Item 8 – Treasury Management 2017/18 Outturn	Councillor Glynis Phillips
Item 9 – New Operating Model for Oxfordshire County Council	Councillor Liz Brighthouse as Chair of Performance Scrutiny Committee
Item 10 – Oxfordshire Joint Statutory Spatial Plan	Councillor John Sanders
Item 12 – Staffing Report – Quarter 1	Councillor Laura Price

85/18 ELECTIVE HOME EDUCATION WORKING GROUP REPORT

(Agenda Item. 11)

The Education Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a short investigation into the reasons for an increase in elective home education (EHE) across the County in December 2017. The working group comprised of Councillor Waine and Councillor Smith. The Cabinet had before it a report which presented the findings of the investigation and the recommendations to Cabinet for consideration.

Councillor Michael Waine, Chairman of the Education Scrutiny Committee highlighted the key findings of the deep dive which had been carried out with Councillor Emily Smith who had raised a Motion at Council on the same topic at the same time. He thanked officers for providing timely evidence and support for the Review. The Review's findings were in line with the National picture of a rise in Elective Home Education. The findings mainly focused on those children that had attended School and then had dropped out for some reason, rather than those who home educated from the beginning as a choice.

There was a concern around the legislation and the non- statutory guidance regarding the local authority's responsibility and the authority's ability to enforce it. The working group noted that the comparative lack of High Needs Funding contributed to EHE together with the need to create an inclusive learning environment within schools so that issues could be addressed within the school.

The working group also felt that further data analysis was needed to gain greater understanding of the underlying issues that gave rise to elective home education.

The working group were supportive of the RAG rating that had been introduced. The rating system should mean that parents/carers who had taken a proactive approach to home educating felt supported and intervention work could be targeted where the authority might have concerns or families needed support. The working group wished to continue to monitor EHE numbers, the impact of the restructure and the introduction of the system to ensure that the right resources were in place.

Councillor Emma Turnbull, Shadow Cabinet Member for Education & Cultural Services drew the Cabinet's attention to two areas in the report which she felt needed to be prioritised: the higher numbers of EHE in SEND Children(highlighting the inadequacy of SEND provision and the urgent need to carry out of the SEND Review) and the need for of a Review of how the County Council communicated and maintained relationships with the parents of EHE children in order to build trust and have a relationship with these families and to fulfil the Council's Statutory responsibility to ensure children are safe from harm and that there learning needs were always met.

Councillor John Howson, local member for St. Margaret's spoke in support of Councillor Michael Waine. He referred to the need to focus on 2 groups, those who had started school but were removed from school at one point or another, particularly at Year 9, and Gypsy Roman and Traveller Groups. He asked the Cabinet to ensure that EHE did not become a route for schools to off-roll those children that cost more to educate for whatever reason and to ensure that children were not denied state education because the school had made it clear to parents that to EHE would be better than a less attractive alternative such as fixed term or permanent exclusion.

Councillor Yvonne Constance, Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the findings of the report, noting the huge increase of EHE in one year, but felt that the report did not go far enough in highlighting the number of children that had been excluded or suspended or had been driven someway into EHE. She requested that recommendation one be expanded to compare the statistics on EHE with statics of those who had been excluded and suspended to see how they matched up, noting that the increase in exclusions had mainly happened in Years five and nine.

Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of the Council referring to the pockets in the County where EHE was high, queried why 2 primary schools within his Division had some of the Highest numbers. David Clarke, Deputy Director undertook to look into the schools.

Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale, Cabinet Member for Education & Cultural Services introduced the contents of the report and moved the recommendations. She thanked the Elective Home Education Working Group for their work highlighting this issue and agreed to expand recommendation one for further work around the link to exclusion rates.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) consider the recommendations of the Education Scrutiny Committee Elective Home Education working group;
- (b) agree which of the following recommendations the Cabinet will accept:
 - (i) further analysis is undertaken to understand the reasons for higher numbers of EHE at years 5 and 9 through modifications to the EHE parent/carer questionnaire;
 - (ii) further analysis is undertaken by officers on a school level and locality basis to understand the trends associated with EHE in locality areas to see if there are links with social deprivation, gender, adoption or SEND provision. This should be reported to the Committee in 6 months' time;
 - (iii) the concept of a 2-week cooling off period before taking pupils off the roll at a school is discussed as part of the attendance conference in July, or at another suitable occasion with head teachers, to gauge level of commitment from schools to understand whether it would be feasible to implement a system across Oxfordshire;
 - (iv) that the authority advocates that school leaders include information about numbers of EHE children in their termly reports to governors/directors or other reporting mechanism that may exist;
 - (v) schools and colleges in the County are contacted and asked if they would be prepared to provide access to private candidates to expand the range of exam centres in the County for EHE pupils;
 - (vi) a named contact on the MASH is identified as a point of contact for EHE issues and concerns;
- (c) ask the Director for Children's Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Education, to prepare a response a future meeting of the Education Scrutiny Committee.

86/18 SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING REPORT - 2019/20 - SEPTEMBER 2018

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet had before them the first in a series on the Service & Resource Planning process for the forthcoming year which will culminate in Council setting a budget for 2019/20; a medium-term plan to 2022/23 and capital programme to 2028/29 in February 2019. The initial report set the context and the starting point for the process, and sought approval to the proposed process, including the timetable.

Councillor Glynis Philips, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance stated that the report reflected the current level of uncertainty and the challenges faced by the County Council. She questioned whether the £46.5m which needed to be taken out of this year's budget was achievable as areas of overspend and risk this year would put pressure on the 2019/20 budget. Whilst the additional funding for the NHS was welcome, there needed to be a significant increase in adult social care funding to reflect the community based services of home care some adults needed before they could be discharged from hospital. This had to be in addition to the Adult Social Care precept which was not keeping up with need.

She welcomed 'Fit for the Future', although it was a high-risk investment, and the investment in the County's roads but queried what was being done about direct services for residents such as our offer for young carers. She urged the Cabinet at the start of this budget process to look at what could be done to improve vital services for the most vulnerable residents.

Councillor David Bartholomew, Cabinet Member for Finance, responded to the points made commenting that a cautious and careful approach was taken to the any risks unknown and known and that very careful attention was paid to overspends. The rise in Adult and Child Social Care was a National Issue and budgets had been increased to significant amounts to deal with this. Everything possible was being done to protect and safeguard vital services.

Councillor David Bartholomew introduced the contents of the contents of the report and moved the recommendations.

RESLOVED: to:

- (a) note the report;
- (b) approve the Service and Resource Planning process for 2019/20; and
- (c) approve a four-year period for the Medium Term Financial Plan and ten-year Capital Programme to 2028/29.

Correction in *italics* in paragraph two above agreed at cabinet on 16 October 2018.

87/18 BUSINESS CASE TO SUPPORT SIGNIFICANT CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN THE COUNCIL'S ASSETS

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet had before it a report which sought approval to the inclusion of significant investment in the Council's assets as part of the proposed Capital Programme to 2029, the funding for which would be included in the proposed Budget for 2019/20 and Medium Term Financial Plan to 2022/23, which was due to be considered by Cabinet in January 2019.

Councillor Bob Johnston, local member for Kennington & Radley, whilst welcoming the recommendations commented on the need to ensure that the correct resource, staff and project management were in place to administer

the investment and to ensure that any potential contractors were also pre-assessed to ensure that they had the right skill sets.

Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment spoke in support of the report. He believed that the only way out of austerity was to invest and that this was an excellent plan in this regard. He believed that you could not achieve growth without investment and that the growth had the potential to boost funding for the Council. He cautioned the Cabinet to take note of the changes in demography and increase in population as they were key to determining future infrastructure needs and to take note of past contract issues and urged the Cabinet to keep as much of the work in-house as possible and to, at the very, least keep the management of the project in-house.

Councillor Charles Mathew, local member for Eynsham, whilst having sympathy for the need of further investment in schools and highways, expressed concern over further external borrowing in addition to £350m current external borrowing which currently cost the Council £16m per year. He believed the Council should be decreasing not increasing external borrowing. The present plans suggested that the extra potential council tax to 2023/24 could service any extra loan. He cautioned that this was inappropriate measure at this time when all the Council finances were under such pressure. He urged the Cabinet to only use internal borrowing and that external borrowing was used only if there was guaranteed means to repay it.

Councillor David Bartholomew, Cabinet Member for Finance responded to the financial points raised. He reassured members that each project would be dealt with prudence and caution have its own individual business case and would be done over a number of years when the Council was sure that it had the Council Tax base growth to fund it, so that the Council did not spend the money until it was sure the money was available and that resources would be identified at that time.

Although Councillor Bartholomew agreed that internal borrowing was preferable he did not feel that it was appropriate to tie the Treasury Management Team in to internal borrowing if circumstances arose when a much better return could be achieved with external investments and the capital funding was obtained via the PWLB.

Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of the Council moved the recommendations and responded to the points made explaining that this investment was key to the growth deal and by investing in the highways and infrastructure now it would free up resource to provide vital services to protect the most vulnerable. This investment together with the growth deal was showing true investment in Oxfordshire's economy. Better connectivity would encourage more businesses to Oxfordshire generating additional business rates which could be reinvested into services. He confirmed that the Council would be taking a cautious phased approach which would include very careful monitoring.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) note the report; and
- (b) approve the inclusion of significant investment in the Council's assets as part of the proposed Capital Programme to 2029, the funding for which will be included in the proposed Budget for 2019/20 and Medium Term Financial Plan to 2022/23 which will be considered by Cabinet in January 2019.

Paragraph 6 deleted and replace by the wording in italics at the meeting of cabinet on 16 October 2018.

88/18 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2017/18 OUTTURN

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report which set out the Treasury Management activity undertaken in the financial year 2017/18 in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice. The report included Debt and Investment activity, Prudential Indicator Outturn, Investment Strategy, and interest receivable and payable for the financial year.

Councillor Glynis Phillips, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance welcomed the positive report and in particular the repayment of £18m of maturing loans, that the Council's investments were classified as low risk and high return and that Northamptonshire had repaid the £10 million it had borrowed. She noted that Arlingclose had raised as a risk the known uncertainties which would follow the Withdrawal Treaty, new international trading arrangements and the implications of the US and China trade war and the possible effect on the Council's Treasury Management Activity.

Councillor David Bartholomew, Cabinet Member for Finance, responded to the points raised acknowledging that there were uncertain times ahead but gave assurances that this was being very carefully monitored.

Councillor Bartholomew moved the recommendations and introduced the contents of the report, highlighting that benchmarking results confirmed that the Council was achieving higher than average interests on deposits at 31 March 2018, when compared with a group of 135 other local authorities. This had been achieved by placing deposits over a longer than average duration with institutions that were of higher than average credit quality.

RESOLVED: to note the report, and to **RECOMMEND** Council to note the Council's Treasury Management Activity in 2017/18.

89/18 NEW OPERATING MODEL FOR OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet had before them a report (CA9) which set out a proposed Operating Mode which was a detailed description of how the Council would work in the future, with the key aim of putting better outcomes for residents and the delivery of the Thriving

Communities Vision at the centre of all plans and operations. Development activity since March had produced a detailed design for the Operating Model and the report sought Cabinet approval for the proposal.

The draft Cabinet Report and Annexes, had been considered by Performance Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committees on 6 September and by full Council through a themed debate on 11 September, the comments from which were before the Cabinet for consideration.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse, Chairman of the Performance Scrutiny Committee spoke to the comments made by the Performance Scrutiny Committee who overall had accepted that there was a need to change the way the organisation worked. Improved coordination across the whole authority for the benefit of Oxfordshire residents must be the way forward, but the risks associated with this change needed to be properly managed. She urged the Cabinet to proceed with the cross party working group as soon as possible.

The points the Committee wished to raise with Cabinet were as follows:

- The business case provided insufficient detail about implementation to give members and the public confidence that there would not have to be further cuts to front line services to make the required savings. No 'Plan B' was outlined in the report.
- There was a lack of evidence in the business case that similar models had worked elsewhere. More evidence should be included to demonstrate the benefits of a different approach and enable Cabinet to make a robust decision.
- Members were sceptical that implementation could be achieved within 3 years. A more realistic timetable should be developed.
- Councillors were great collectors of local intelligence; the interface with councillors and the public as the operating model was embedded and would be important. Elected members needed to be involved in shaping and overseeing this process and there needed to be clear evidence along the way that benefits were being realised.
- The levels of staff engagement and involvement in the design of the model; if staff had not 'bought into' the new ways of working, they were likely to find work arounds which could negate planned efficiencies and savings.
- Members were mindful that potential redundancy costs had not yet been factored into the financial model and were concerned about the impact this could have on the identified savings.
- The need to ensure that vulnerable people were still supported to access vital services, in light of a heavy reliance on technological solutions in the new model. Members queried how we would ensure investment in new technology would deliver the best results.
- The proposed approach to business intelligence had the potential to be transformative in itself and members hoped this would lead to better decision-making and management of the organisation.

Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of the Council in moving the recommendations explained that he felt he had addressed the comments

made by the Performance and Scrutiny Committee at Full Council. He agreed that whilst it was important to proceed with a digital agenda, that the council did need to ensure that people were able to assess the council if they didn't have the technology, using libraries and facilities to provide that assess. This was about redesigning and streamlining the service to make a more efficient Council, providing better access to services, making sure the Council was fit future, taking a long term look to make savings and not having to cut front line services in the future.

He confirmed that moving forward there would be a cross party member group appointed to monitor the model, together with Audit & Governance and Performance Scrutiny to ensure that it was implemented correctly and ensure it was constitutional.

Peter Clark, Chief Executive explained that the proposal was about reshaping the Council and was not about us being in similar situations to many Councils. This was not about reduction or cuts to vital services or budgets, the proposal on the operating modal was about service improvement, better community engagement and effective utilisation of technology to support staff in their essential work. The PWC activity analysis found staff were working very hard but were doing a third more on customer management and a third less service delivery than other comparable authorities showing that the Council was not supporting staff as well as it should. £33m needed to be saved and this could be done by changing the working arrangements and how the council was organised, creating a Council that was fit for the future. The alternative would be to cut meaning less staff with rising demand and less resources to provide the services that so many people rely on.

Councillor Eddie Reeves, Cabinet Member for Transformation would have oversight of the project and subject to the Cabinet approving the proposals, further details on the implementation of the model would come to the Cabinet meeting in October.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) endorse the proposed Operating Model set out in the Business Case in Annex 1 as the basis of whole council transformation planning;
- (b) agree to Option 1 (see para. 66), to enable delivery of the estimated range of savings (£34m-£58m) to the fullest extent appropriate;
- (c) agree the delivery principles set out in paragraph 77 as the basis for future detailed decision making;
- (d) direct the Chief Executive to bring a costed proposal for implementation to Cabinet in October 2018.

90/18 OXFORDSHIRE JOINT STATUTORY SPATIAL PLAN (JSSP); LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS) AND STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)

(Agenda Item. 10)

The six Oxfordshire Councils and the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OXLEP) had signed the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal with Government in March 2018. Under the terms of the Deal the local District and City authorities had committed to producing an Oxfordshire Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (JSSP) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination by 31 March 2020 and adoption by 31 March 2021, subject to examination process.

Oxfordshire County Council was an observer to the process however, Cabinet had before it a report which outlined the Local Development Strategy (LDS) and the Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for the JSSP as well as the Scoping Document which set out the level of detail and processes associated with the JSSP.

Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the report but queried whether the LTP4 which was referred to in the Spatial Plan was now out of date and urged the Cabinet to ensure that this plan was taken seriously as it was a statutory requirement.

Councillor Ian Hudspeth, Leader of the Council welcomed this forward-looking plan to take a look at connectivity, infrastructure in the right places, delivering homes for people with the correct assess to employment. He welcomed the 3-year land supply and the opportunity to take a good look at rail.

Councillor Yvonne Constance, Cabinet Member for Environment moved the recommendations congratulating officers on their work on the JSSP welcoming the opportunity to provide an Oxfordshire-wide, integrated strategic planning framework and supporting evidence base to support sustainable growth across the county to 2050, including the planned delivery of much needed homes and economic development and infrastructure.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) note and support the Local Development Scheme (LDS) for the JSSP presented at Annex 1;
- (b) note and support the draft Statement of Community Involvement 2018 for the JSSP, presented at Annex 2, which will undergo a six-week period of formal public consultation;
- (c) note and support the JSSP Scoping Document presented at Annex 3.

91/18 STAFFING REPORT - QUARTER 1 - 2018

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet considered a report that provided an update on staffing numbers and related activity for the period 1 April 2018 to 30 June 2018.

Councillor Laura Price, Opposition Deputy Leader, welcomed the opportunity she had been given to meet with the Cabinet Member and officers to discuss a new format for the staffing report but requested that, particularly in light of the forthcoming operating model, the placement of the staffing report on the Cabinet Agenda be given further consideration to give it greater emphasis and prioritise the way the council looked at staffing and how it related to the wider objectives and to provide a way to monitor the implementation of the operating model.

In relation to the growth in Agency staff, she noted that this mainly seemed to come down to vacancies that had not been able to be filled and expressed concern that there was continuous use of Agency Staff to cover essential business posts and that the Council did not appear to have any data about how those posts that were becoming vacant, correlated to the Council's objectives. She urged the Cabinet to consider whether the new operating model was robust enough to ensure that the council was bridging the gap between where the vacancies existed that needed to be filled and where the reduction in posts in the new operating model needed to come from.

Councillor Judith Heathcoat, Deputy Leader of the Council explained that data would be collected under Fit for Future as the plans develop, and that meeting the Corporate Plan's aims and objectives come to the Business Management Plan so would not want to duplicate work.

RESOLVED: to note the report.

92/18 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 13)

The Cabinet considered a list of items for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes and additions set out in the schedule of addenda.

RESOLVED: to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing