



# Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.  
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 DX28340 Oakham

## **RECORD OF DECISIONS AT A MEETING OF THE CABINET**

**Tuesday, 16 May, 2017 at 9.30 am**

**Decisions Published on Thursday 18 May 2017**

**Decisions will be implemented on Friday 26 May 2017 unless the Call-in Procedure as outlined in Procedure Rule 206 is invoked.**

**PRESENT:** Mr T Mathias  
Mr R Clifton  
Mr O Hemsley  
Mr A Walters  
Mr D Wilby

**APOLOGIES:** Mr R Foster

### **OFFICERS**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mr M Andrews	Assistant Director for People
	Mrs H Briggs	Chief Executive
	Mr D Brown	Director for Places
	Mrs T Crowson	Senior Public Health Manager (for part of the meeting)
	Mr S Della Rocca	Assistant Director – Finance
	Dr T O'Neill	Director for People and Deputy Chief Executive
	Ms N Brown	Acting Manager – Corporate Support Team

## **18 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND/OR HEAD OF THE PAID SERVICE**

There were no announcements from the Chairman or Head of Paid Service.

## **19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

## **20 RECORD OF DECISIONS**

The Record of Decisions made by the Cabinet on 18 April 2017, copies of which had been previously circulated were confirmed by Cabinet.

It was confirmed that the Internal Audit review on the Library/Children's Centre requested at minute number 749 had been progressed and a report would go to Audit and Risk Committee in June/July 2017.

## 21 ITEMS RAISED BY SCRUTINY

The Chairman had not been formally notified of any items raised by Scrutiny.

## 22 OFSTED NEXT STEPS ACTION PLAN

Report No. 99/2017 from the Director for People and Deputy Chief Executive was received.

Dr Tim O'Neill, Director for People introduced the report, the purpose of which was that following an inspection of Rutland's children's services by Ofsted, Rutland County Council was required to produce and submit an action plan to Ofsted; and the report provided Cabinet with an opportunity to review the Ofsted inspection action plan before submission to Ofsted.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i. A draft of the action plan had been submitted to Ofsted for comment and they were scheduled to come to RCC to discuss this further in June;
- ii. A Power Point presentation which had been presented to People (Children's) Scrutiny Panel on 4<sup>th</sup> May would be provided to Cabinet;
- iii. Feedback from members at People (Children's) Scrutiny Panel had been very positive with regards the amount that had already been achieved and also the commitment to further improvements within given timescales;
- iv. The team had proven themselves to be open to challenge and constructive criticism and the action plan demonstrated a clear commitment to move forward with improvements;
- v. It was important to continue to focus on the areas that had been identified as being good and keep building on those strengths, as well as focusing on areas of weakness; and
- vi. Where a report is presented to Scrutiny it would be helpful if revised papers could be presented to Cabinet to reflect comments and suggestions made by the Scrutiny Panel.

## DECISION

1. Cabinet **NOTED** the Next Steps Action plan for 'getting to good' and its suitability for addressing the Ofsted inspection recommendations and supporting Rutland County Council to get to good.

### Reasons for Decision

1. *The Ofsted Next Steps Action Plan outlined and addressed the 17 recommendations which Ofsted noted in their report.*
2. *The Action Plan noted the 17 recommendations along with outcomes to each recommendation, how it would be measured and the objectives, followed by the action required and timescale for completion.*

3. *There were a number of actions which had been completed and the rest were on track for completion, all of which were identified through the rag rating (green and amber).*
4. *The actions would fully address the recommendations and enable Rutland County Council to 'get to good' over the next 6-12 months.*
5. *Recommendations pulled out the key issues arising from Ofsted.*

## 23 **SOCIAL VALUE POLICY**

### **(KEY DECISION)**

Report No. 104/2017 from the Director for People and Deputy Chief Executive was received.

Mr Clifton, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Health introduced the report, the purpose of which was to introduce the new Social Value Policy for Rutland County Council for Cabinet to approve.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i. The Policy would initially only be applied to contracts and framework agreements over the EU threshold, but it was hoped that it could be applied across all procurement over time;
- ii. The requirements under the policy might be onerous and difficult to achieve for small businesses should it be extended to include all procurement; and
- iii. Cabinet requested that any plan to extend the policy to a wider section of procurement should be brought back to Cabinet for consideration and approval. Cabinet's expectation was that any such proposal would have undergone full consultation with local business groups.

### **DECISION**

1. Cabinet **APPROVED** the Social Value Policy as attached to Report No. 104/2017.

#### *Reason for Decision*

1. *To ensure that all officers had a consistent approach to social value during procurements.*

## 24 **PROCURING A SUBSTANCE MISUSE & COMMUNITY TREATMENT SERVICE IN RUTLAND**

### **(KEY DECISION)**

Report No. 105/2017 from the Director of Public Health was received.

Mr Clifton, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care and Safeguarding introduced the report, introduced the report, the purpose of which was to set out the process and proposed award criteria for the procurement of a substance misuse and community treatment service, along with recommendations for approval and delegation of final award.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i. There had been an increase in people accessing the service under the new provider and in particular for alcohol misuse amongst older people. This reflected the Rutland demographic;
- ii. The increase in use of the service was likely to be the result of work done around promotion of the service, engagement with other services, targeted services and improved accessibility;
- iii. The service had previously been provided by 3 separate services across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland at a cost to Rutland of £201,300 per year. In 2016 an interim service had been put in place which had resulted in much greater value for money with increased numbers of people accessing the service at a much lower cost (£80,000 per annum);
- iv. Funding was currently provided from a ring fenced Public Health Grant and as such any savings within that grant must be spent on Public Health Provision. It was likely that from April 2019 that funding would come from the authorities main budget;
- v. Part of the procurement criteria requested details regarding location, which was seen as important in ensuring the success of the service. It was identified that it may also be in the interests of the service to be able to change its location at some later date should a more suitable site be identified;
- vi. Mr Wilby highlighted that there did not appear to be a holistic approach with regard to prevention and education, warning young people of the dangers of substance misuse in order to avoid the need for such services;
- vii. Mrs Crowson, Senior Public Health Manager, confirmed that the current service were very proactive working with schools, youth workers and primary care staff in order to share their knowledge and expertise;
- viii. There were also other services which focused on prevention, so the main focus of this service was specialist treatment for people who had become dependent on alcohol and drugs;
- ix. The Warning Zone had a very important part to play in education around drug and alcohol misuse for younger children, but some primary schools were not using this facility and it was also raised that the messages may have been forgotten by the time that children reach secondary school age; and
- x. There was some concern regarding the message on prevention getting through to secondary school age young people, it was agreed that the Director for People, Dr O'Neill would raise this at the Head Teachers Briefing on 19 June 2017.

## **DECISION**

1. Cabinet **APPROVED** the procurement model and award criteria for a substance misuse and community treatment service for Rutland.
2. Cabinet **AUTHORISED** the Director for People in consultation with the Director of Public Health and the Cabinet Member with portfolio for Adult Social Care and Health, to award the contract resulting from this procurement in line with the Award Criteria.

### Reasons for Decision

1. *Provision of specialist support for those with drug and alcohol problems to meet the health needs of Rutland residents would have positive impacts for individuals,*

*families and communities. Collaboration with partner agencies and the Safer Rutland Partnership would strengthen efforts to reduce harm. A recovery orientated community treatment service was an essential component of a collaborative harm reduction programme.*

2. *In order for the procurement process to commence the award criteria needed to be approved by Cabinet. The criteria had been carefully considered to ensure that providers successful in the process were capable of meeting the requirements and could deliver appropriate quality services in Rutland.*
3. *Decisions would only be taken in line with Cabinet approved criteria.*

--oOo--

Mrs T Crowson left the meeting and did not return.

--oOo--

## 25 **BANKING SERVICES PROCUREMENT**

### **(KEY DECISION)**

Report No. 73/2017 from the Director for Resources was received.

The Portfolio Holder, Mr Hemsley, introduced the report, the purpose of which was to update Cabinet in respect of the approach to the procurement of banking services and to seek delegated approval for the Director for Resource in consultation with the Portfolio Holder to define the award criteria and to award the contract following a tender exercise.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i. One of the objectives of the contract would be to find a provider that would be able to give innovative and proactive advice on alternative ways of doing transactions to reduce cash and face to face payments; and
- ii. It was important that any provider had the most up to date IT security controls in place and would be able to provide advice on any current security risks.

### **DECISION**

1. Cabinet **APPROVED** the delegation of the award criteria and the contract award for banking services to the Director for Resources in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Growth, Trading Services and Resources (except Finance).

#### Reason for Decision

1. *To ensure that the Council maintained adequate banking arrangements.*

## 26 **ANY ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

No items of urgent business had previously been notified to the Chairman.

---oOo---

**The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 10.18 am.**

---oOo---