

# Cabinet



**Date & time**  
Tuesday, 26 May  
2015 at 2.00 pm

**Place**  
Ashcombe Suite,  
County Hall, Kingston  
upon Thames, Surrey  
KT1 2DN

**Contact**  
Vicky Hibbert or Anne  
Gowing  
Room 122, County Hall  
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020  
8541 9938

**Chief Executive**  
David McNulty

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or  
anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

**Cabinet Members:** Mr David Hodge, Mr Peter Martin, Mrs Helyn Clack, Mrs Clare Curran, Mr Mel Few, Mr John Furey, Mr Mike Goodman, Mrs Linda Kemeny, Ms Denise Le Gal and Mr Richard Walsh

**Cabinet Associates:** Mrs Mary Angell, Mr Tim Evans, Mrs Kay Hammond and Mr Tony Samuels

**If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk.**

**This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Vicky Hibbert or Anne Gowing on 020 8541 9229 or 020 8541 9938.**

***Note:** This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.*

*Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.*

*If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of Legal and Democratic Services at the meeting*

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

## **2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes from the meeting held on 28 April 2015 will be available in the meeting room half an hour before the start of the meeting.

## **3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

## **4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

### **4a Members' Questions**

- (i) The deadline for Member's questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (19 May 2015).

### **4b Public Questions**

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (19 May 2015).

### **4c Petitions**

The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting and none have been received.

### **4d Representations received on reports to be considered in private**

To consider any representations received in relation why part of the meeting relating to a report circulated in Part 2 of the agenda should be open to the public.

## **5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL**

(Pages 1  
- 4)

Reports have been received from the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Adult Social Care Select Committee.

**6 JOINT COMMISSIONING STRATEGY FOR SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY** (Pages 5 - 46)

A draft joint commissioning strategy for speech and language therapy services for children and young people aged 0-25 years has been proposed by the Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups. This paper outlines the key proposals from the strategy, a new speech and language therapy service structure to support children and young people in school and an alternative approach to how the Council should procure speech and language therapy services from April 2016.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Social Care Services Board]*

**7 APPROVAL TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL MICROSOFT LICENCES FOR OFFICE 365 AND ASSOCIATED IMPLEMENTATION** (Pages 47 - 54)

The council's Corporate Strategy, agreed by Cabinet in February 2015, highlighted the importance of a digital strategy in the delivery of services to residents and delivering corporate priorities. An important element of the digital approach is technology which will facilitate collaboration across public services for the benefit of residents, and provide the right tools to enable staff to work flexibly. Implementation of the strategy will be undertaken in phases with reviews of current technology and as part of this, a move to Microsoft Office 365 for the council's email and calendar systems is recommended. The adoption of Microsoft Office 365 for this functionality will facilitate document collaboration across boundaries and will enable staff to work from anywhere and using any device.

This report seeks approval from Cabinet to award an extension to the existing Microsoft Enterprise Agreement to Specialist Computer Centre for the provision of Microsoft Office 365 licences to commence on 1 July 2015, and for implementation costs for Office 365.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]*

**8 AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUILDING CLEANING SERVICES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL PREMISES** (Pages 55 - 60)

This report seeks approval to award a framework agreement for the provision of Building Cleaning Services for Administrative and Operational Premises for the benefit of the Council to commence on 1 August 2015 as detailed in the recommendations as the current arrangements expire on 31 July 2015.

The report provides details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process and, in conjunction with the Part 2 report, demonstrates why the recommended framework agreement and contract award delivers best value for money.

Due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the framework agreement and contract award process the financial details of the potential suppliers have been circulated as a Part 2 report.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 17.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]*

**9 HINCHLEY WOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL**

(Pages  
61 - 66)

To approve the Business Case for the rebuilding of Cranleigh Church of England Primary School, a 1 Form of Entry Infant and 2 Form of Entry Junior provision (330 places), in the grounds of the adjacent Glebelands Secondary School by July 2017 and the disposal of the two existing school sites to release funding to pay for the cost of the proposed scheme.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 18.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

**10 WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOKING**

(Pages  
67 - 70)

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of Westfield Primary School from a 2 Form of Entry Primary (420 places) by 90 places as phase 1 of a 2 phase expansion, to a 3 Form of Entry Primary (630 places) creating 210 additional places in Woking to help meet the basic need requirements in the Woking area from September 2015.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 19.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

**11 CRANLEIGH PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

(Pages  
71 - 74)

To approve the Business Case for the rebuilding of Cranleigh Church of England Primary School, a 1 Form of Entry Infant and 2 Form of Entry Junior provision (330 places), in the grounds of the adjacent Glebelands Secondary School by July 2017 and the disposal of the two existing school sites to release funding to pay for the cost of the proposed scheme.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 20.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

**12 BISHOP DAVID BROWN SCHOOL, WOKING**

(Pages  
75 - 80)

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of Bishop David Brown Secondary School from a 5 Form of Entry Secondary (750 places) to a 6 Form of Entry Secondary (900 places) creating 150 additional places in Woking to help meet the basic need requirements in the Woking area from September 2016.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 21.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

**13 ST ANN'S HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL, VIRGINIA WATER** (Pages 81 - 84)

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of St Ann's Heath Junior School from a two Form of Entry junior (240 places) to a three Form of Entry junior (360 places) creating 120 additional places in Virginia Water to help meet the basic need requirements in the Virginia Water area from September 2015.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 22.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

**14 PROVISION OF A NEW SYSTEM FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE** (Pages 85 - 94)

The contract with the current supplier of Adult Social Care's case management and financial system expires on 31 October 2015. There is no option to extend the contract, though a new contract can be agreed for a time limited period.

This report sets out the proposal to enter into a new contract for a replacement I.T. system to meet Adult Social Care's recording requirements for the foreseeable future.

N.B. An annex containing exempt information is contained in Part 2 of the agenda – item 23.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Social Care Services Board]*

**15 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Pages 95 - 106)

To note any delegated decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

**16 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

## PART TWO - IN PRIVATE

- 17 AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUILDING CLEANING SERVICES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL PREMISES** (Pages 107 - 110)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 8.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]*
- 18 HINCHLEY WOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL** (Pages 111 - 116)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 9.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*
- 19 WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOKING** (Pages 117 - 124)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 10.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*
- 20 CRANLEIGH PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT** (Pages 125 - 132)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 11.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*

- 21 BISHOP DAVID BROWN SCHOOL, WOKING** (Pages 133 - 138)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 12.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*
- 22 ST ANN'S HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL, VIRGINIA WATER** (Pages 139 - 144)
- This is a part 2 annex relating to item 13.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and/or the Education and Skills Board]*
- 23 PROVISION OF A NEW SYSTEM FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE** (Pages 145 - 148)
- This is the part 2 annex for item 14.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Social Care Services Board]*
- 24 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION** (Pages 149 - 180)
- To approve the business case for the council's participation in a regeneration scheme.
- Exempt: Not for publication under Paragraph 3**
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
- [The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]*
- 25 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS**
- To consider whether the item considered under Part 2 of the agenda should be made available to the Press and public.

## QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Cabinet will consider questions submitted by Members of the Council, members of the public who are electors of the Surrey County Council area and petitions containing 100 or more signatures relating to a matter within its terms of reference, in line with the procedures set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution.

### **Please note:**

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to the meeting. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and so cannot relate to "confidential" or "exempt" matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual – for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of this agenda).
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman's discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

## MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*



## COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### Item under consideration: BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

**Date Considered: 23 April 2015**

- 1 At its meeting on 23 April 2015 the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee received a Budget Monitoring Report from the Committee's Performance & Finance Sub Group.
- 2 The Sub Group had met on 30 March 2015 and reviewed the budget monitoring report for February 2015, as well as the detailed monitoring reports for the three areas within the Committee's remit: Business Services; Chief Executive's Office; and Central Income & Expenditure. The Sub Group also considered the Quarter Three Business Report for 2014/15.
- 3 Members noted from the papers that the position appeared to be slightly better than expected at budget decision time. For example, less interest payable (by £2.6m), overstatement of creditors (£1.8m), relocation allowances lower (£0.4m), better than expected 2014/15 MTFP savings in adults and other services. It was recognised that some underspend needed to be carried forward, however, Members thought it would be useful to view a list of unanticipated improvements and how these had been allocated to various pots of money, post-budget to determine whether a recommendation could be made to mitigate some of these savings to front line services such as Children's Centres and Youth Services.

#### **Recommendation:**

**That the Cabinet consider whether the Council could use any of the small improvements to the Council's budgetary position that were unanticipated when it set the budget, to mitigate some of the savings in children's centres and youth services.**

**Nick Skellett**

**Chairman of Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee**



## ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

### Item under consideration: RECRUITMENT & RETENTION AND WORKFORCE STRATEGY UPDATE

**Date Considered: 10 April 2015**

1. At its meeting on 10 April 2015 the Adult Social Care Select Committee considered the plans made by the Adult Social Care Directorate and Human Resources (HR) to improve the recruitment and retention of staff in this area.
2. The Committee discussed the challenges faced by the council in recruiting specific roles namely social workers and occupational therapists and how this was a particular problem in the Mole Valley area.
3. Other factors that can affect the council's ability to recruit and retain high quality professionals such as salary, incentives and reputation were discussed. However, the Committee noted the positive developments made in these areas by the Directorate and HR.
4. Additionally, officers underlined the challenge faced by the council by the high cost of living in the county. The report received by the Committee stated that: lack of access to affordable housing in some parts of the county is a factor that makes recruiting and retaining staff locally a challenge. Our median basic salary is £24,040 while average house prices in Surrey are 12.5 times that at £300,000. The annual average rent on a three bedroom house in Surrey is £15,552 per annum so would be similarly unaffordable for our staff with families.
5. Following this evidence and advice that a public sector housing strategy was being discussed with District & Borough colleagues, Members agreed that the Cabinet needed to consider ways it could mitigate these pressures to ensure it can recruit and retain the best possible staff.

#### **Recommendation:**

**The Committee recommends that the Cabinet give consideration to affordable housing for care staff as key workers in Surrey including the use of the council's land and properties.**

**Keith Witham  
Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 26 MAY 2015**

**REPORT OF: MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES**

**SUBJECT: JOINT COMMISSIONING STRATEGY FOR SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**



#### **SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

A draft joint commissioning strategy for speech and language therapy services for children and young people aged 0-25 years has been proposed by the Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups. This paper outlines the key proposals from the strategy, a new speech and language therapy service structure to support children and young people in school and an alternative approach to how the Council should procure speech and language therapy services from April 2016.

Speech and language therapy services for children and young people in Surrey have until now been commissioned separately by the Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Local Authority.

Commissioning authorities spend an estimated total of £4.m on speech and language therapy services in Surrey. The Council has an allocation of £2.4m which is provided from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and CCG's estimated current spend is £1.7m.

The Local Authority's spend on the speech and language therapy service has increased by 39% since 2010/11 (£0.670m). Despite the level of funding being invested into the speech and language therapy service there remains dissatisfaction from families and schools who tell us that the current delivery model is fragmented, not child-centred and inequitable across the county.

The Children and Families Act 2014 and more specifically the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Code of Practice has provided new guidance and clarity regarding expectations about commissioning arrangements for children with special educational needs and disabilities.

Section 9.74 of the SEND Code of Practice states that 'since communication is so fundamental in education, addressing speech and language impairment should normally be recorded as special educational provision unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so.' This represents a hardening of the position that this provision should normally be treated as 'education' rather than 'health'.

The draft strategy (Annex 1) proposes that the Council takes on responsibilities for speech and language therapy provided in schools. This includes services for which Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups are currently responsible. Surrey Clinical

Commissioning Groups will retain responsibility for Early Years speech and language therapy services and fund the provision of speech and language therapy for school and college aged children in relation to medical conditions.

In addition to the strategy and the new responsibilities for the Council to take on, it is proposed that speech and language therapy services are procured differently from April 2016. Rather than purchasing services directly from health providers, it is proposed that funding for provision in special schools and specialist centres will be devolved to schools to employ therapists directly and the service for mainstream schools will be brought in-house to Surrey County Council.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended:

1. That the Cabinet approves the draft commissioning strategy and the five joint commissioning principles within the strategy.
2. That the Cabinet agrees in principle to the realignment of commissioning responsibilities for the Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups.
3. That the Cabinet agrees for work to continue in developing a detailed costing model for a new speech and language therapy service. At this stage it is estimated to mean an increase of £377,000 in the Council's budget, to be made available from the School's High Need Block and will be subject to Schools Forum approval in June.
4. That the Cabinet agrees that the new speech and language therapy service should be procured through devolving funding directly to special schools and specialist centres and bringing the mainstream service in-house to the Council. This service will be fully in place from September 2016.

#### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Early identification, timely interventions and an integrated school offer will create a service that is built from trust and confidence in the system, where meeting the communication needs of a child or young person is seen as everybody's responsibility.

Implementing this joint commissioning strategy and resourcing and procuring the service differently will offer the following benefits :

- Single speech and language therapy service across Surrey for children and young people aged 0-25 years which focuses on achieving good outcomes and is co-designed with families and schools
- A service that achieves value for money by allowing schools to manage the therapy provision directly
- Clear commissioning principles and arrangements in place between Education and Health, including funding responsibilities
- Investment into early years which focuses on early identification of need and timely intervention (i.e. significantly reduced waiting times and therapy at a time when it is needed)
- Speech and language therapy that forms part of an integrated school offer for children and young people in specialist SEND provision

- The joint commissioning strategy was reviewed at the Children and Education Select Committee on 26 January 2015. Recommendations including support for a hub and spoke structure for therapy provision and emphasis on post-16 provision are reflected in this paper.

## **DETAILS:**

### **Current Situation**

1. SCC and the Surrey CCGs have initially focused on establishing joint commissioning arrangements for speech and language therapy. Work is also underway to agree joint commissioning arrangements for Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy. A joint CCG and Council commissioned review has recently been completed by the College of Occupational Therapy which makes recommendations around future joint commissioning arrangements and a new service delivery model.
2. Currently, both Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Council have responsibilities to commission speech and language therapy for school aged children.
3. Maintained special schools in Surrey have a fixed level of speech and language therapy allocated to them which is commissioned by either the Council or Clinical Commissioning Groups or both.
4. The fixed allocation of therapy going into Surrey special schools is based on historical arrangements. These allocations have not changed over time to reflect the changing needs of children and young people in Surrey. This has resulted in a disparate set of commissioning arrangements which means pupils are receiving varying levels of therapeutic input depending on the school which they are placed in.
5. To add further to this complexity, seven of the eight special schools for pupils with severe learning difficulties have speech and language therapy that is commissioned solely by Surrey CCGs with no Local Authority funding.
6. Specialist Centres attached to mainstream schools are commissioned in much the same way as special schools (by both the Council and Surrey CCGs). Allocation of therapy resource is inequitably distributed across the county and is not based on current need or number of planned pupil places.
7. The Council also commissions a service for pupils in mainstream schools who have a level of speech and language therapy provision specified in their Statement of Special Educational Need/Education, Health and Care plan (EHC plan). The Council will fund the provision if speech and language therapy has been identified as an educational need that is above the core level of provision offered by providers at the school the pupil is being placed in. CCGs are responsible for commissioning provision for those children who do not have therapy specified as Education in their statement of SEN/EHC plan or who do not have a statement of SEN/EHC plan.
8. Both the Council and Surrey CCGs procure speech and language therapy services from the same two health providers (Virgin Care Services Ltd and Central Surrey Health Ltd), through separate contracting arrangements.

9. Virgin Care Services Ltd and Central Surrey Health will assess the needs of the child and detail in the assessment whether the need is educational or not. The number of assessments identifying the need to be educational has risen significantly over the last 5 years.
10. The Children and Families Act 2014 means that young people aged 19-25 in education now have the same statutory rights with regards to special educational needs and the Local Authority has the responsibility to ensure this provision is in place.
11. For young people in Surrey special schools post-16 provision, speech and language therapy is either commissioned by the Council or CCGs.
12. Further Education colleges commission speech and language therapy provision directly for their students who have speech and language therapy detailed on their Education, Health and Care plans.
13. Adult health services have been responsible for providing speech and language therapy to young people aged 19 years plus who have an identified need. Feedback from families and colleges is that this service is not provided in post-16 education settings.

### **Needs Analysis**

14. A needs analysis was commissioned by the Council with the purpose of gaining an understanding of the needs of children and young people with speech, language and communication needs (SLCN) across Surrey. Below are the headline findings -
  - SLCN is the second most prevalent primary need, with 22% of children in Surrey with statements of special educational need (1208) listing speech, language and communication needs as their primary need in January 2013.
  - The proportion of young people who have statements of special educational needs because of speech, language and communication needs is significantly higher in Surrey than nationally – 22% compared to 14%
  - There is a higher proportion of children with statements of SEN in Reception year to year 4 that have speech, language and communication needs in comparison to other primary needs.
  - There is a higher proportion of children and young people with speech, language and communication needs as a primary need in their statement of SEN who are in Surrey mainstream schools than there are in Surrey special schools.

### **SEND Strategy**

15. A key feature of the emerging Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) strategy is to reduce Surrey's reliance on non-maintained and independent schools and develop local provision in Surrey for children and young people with SEND. The Council currently spends approximately £39m on placing 766 children and young people into non-maintained and independent schools (NMIs). In addition to this, it spends around £5.2m on placing 85 young people aged 16-25 into independent specialist colleges. Placement numbers and costs increase year on year.



16. Feedback from the Area Education Team and Post-16 Commissioning team for SEND tell us that an increasing number of Tribunals entered into are partly because of the limited paediatric therapy offer at Surrey maintained schools.
17. The recommendations arising from the Learning Difficulties Review (Autumn 2012) are based on developing local provision for children and young people in Surrey. Key changes that are being implemented include the provision of a centrally located Primary School for children with Learning Difficulties and Additional Needs; secondary schools for young people with autism who are able to access a range of accredited qualifications, including GCSEs; further developing the effectiveness of specialist centres; the creation of new specialist centre provision in the secondary sector and increasing the overall capacity and expertise of mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with statements/EHCPs. With all of these changes there is a need to work in partnership with health to jointly commission paediatric services and ensure a consistent service delivery model for therapy services.

### **Commissioning Principles**

18. The Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups established a therapy forum (February 2014) with provider and service user representation to further inform strategic commissioning and the shift to an outcome based model of commissioning:
19. The following five commissioning principles were co-produced in collaboration with the group

#### **The right support at the right time**

All children and young people in Surrey access the right support at the right time to meet their needs

- Agreement of criteria thresholds – no gaps across the county
- Equity across Surrey in access and quality
- Consistency in service specification
- Clarity regarding responsibilities for commissioning to allow seamless services

#### **An open and transparent service**

The local offer informs families of what help, information and services are available and how to access them

- Common agreement of priorities
- Joint decision making leading to agreement of targets
- Health or Education personal budgets are available to families where possible

#### **Seeing the bigger picture**

Families and professionals work together to help and support a child to achieve their long term outcomes

- A team around the child approach with integrated team working
- Embedding intervention into the home, school and community environment, so that everyone understands the role they can play.

#### **Therapy for children and young people is everyone's business**

Families and professionals are equipped with the right skills and resources to help children and young people achieve their long term outcomes

- Up skilling the wider workforce
- Quality assurance
- Joint monitoring of performance and quality assurance of the service

#### **An outcome focused approach**

Therapy provision is focused on helping children and young people achieve realistic outcomes that will help them to fulfil their life-time aspirations

- Outcome focused – managing expectations but recognising aspiration
- Therapy provision achieves value for money
- Provision is linked to progress towards agreed outcomes
- Evidence based and audited

#### **Proposed Commissioning Responsibilities**

20. The joint strategy for speech and language therapy proposes the following realignment of commissioning responsibilities:
  - Surrey County Council becomes responsible for commissioning a specialist level of speech and language therapy for school and college aged children that will enable them to progress in their learning and be well prepared for adulthood.
  - The focus of CCG commissioned services, working alongside SCC's early year's team, will be the early year's population and those with specific clinical, health related issues such as dysphagia or brain injury
  - Education settings will be supported to meet the universal and sometimes targeted speech, language and communication needs of children and young people.
21. This means that the Council will become responsible for commissioning all speech and language therapy provision at special schools and specialist centres (this is currently shared between the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Groups) with Clinical Commissioning Groups making a financial contribution to the Council to cover those pupils who require input because of medical related issues.
22. The Council will retain responsibility for commissioning speech and language therapy for children with Education, Health and Care plans in mainstream schools where speech and language therapy has been identified on the plan.
23. In addition to this, the Council and schools will support children and young people in mainstream education who do not have Statements of Special Educational Need or Education Health and Care plans but require input from a speech and language therapist.
24. It is proposed that joint funding should be provided in the instances listed below:-

- Initial assessments for school/college-aged children and young people
  - Intervention to children in reception year
  - Training and advice to early years and education settings for providing universal and targeted offer
  - Children who require both Health and Educational related speech and language therapy: commissioned seamlessly (i.e.: children with severe or profound learning disabilities). The majority of these children will be at schools for pupils with severe learning difficulties.
25. Alongside the realignment of commissioning responsibilities, the Council and the Surrey CCGs are currently developing a single new service specification for speech and language therapy.
26. A series of co-design events were held in March 2015, which over 150 people attended. A new service specification is now being designed, based around the feedback and affordability, and this will be implemented by both the Council and Surrey CCGs from September 2016.
27. The proposed realignment of commissioning responsibilities will support the management of the speech and language therapy budget. Education will take responsibility for the assessment of need (this currently sits with Surrey CCGs) and all of the school aged therapy provision. This will enable the Council to take a proactive approach in supporting schools and establishing an education-led service rather than one that is Health led.

### **Proposed New Staffing Structure for School and College Service**

28. It is proposed that the Council resources and procures speech and language therapy services differently from April 2016 at the same time as the realignment of commissioning responsibilities takes place.
29. It is proposed that special schools, specialist centres and colleges form part of a hub and spoke structure. The hubs will be special schools (to be agreed) and the spokes will comprise of other special schools, specialist centres and colleges. The hub and spoke models will be structured around either specialism or geographical areas. A consultation process will take place to agree the hub and spoke structures.
30. A detailed resourcing model has been established based on the proposed realignment of commissioning responsibilities. The resourcing model proposes an overall increase in the number of therapists supporting pupils who require speech and language therapy. The table below details estimates of current staffing by providers compared to proposed staffing for the new school and college service:

<b>Setting</b>	<b>SCC Funded in Current Service (FTE)</b>	<b>CCG Funded in Current Service (FTE)</b>	<b>Total - Current Service (FTE)</b>	<b>Propose d FTEs for new Service* (FTE)</b>
<b>Special Schools/Colleges</b>	10.4	7.3	17.7	35
<b>Specialist Centres (attached to mainstream schools)/Colleges</b>	13.9	4.3	18.2	13.5
<b>Mainstream Schools</b>	35.9	6.5	42.4	35
<b>Total</b>	<b>50.2</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>83.5</b>

FTE - Full Time Equivalent

31. The school service will be commissioned by the Council, there will be an agreed funding contribution from CCGs for pupils requiring speech and language therapy due to medical conditions, for children in nurseries attached to special schools and reception aged children. This is estimated to be £100,000.
32. There is a proposed reduction in staff for specialist centres and the mainstream service, however, more effective use of therapists time (for example, reduced travel time, administration, report writing, record keeping and corporate CPD), will mean therapists spend more time on direct therapy delivery.
33. In the current mainstream school service, if a child requires a termly visit from a speech and language therapist which takes 45 minutes per visit and 2.25 hours in total, the Council is charged 11.25 hours for the package. If a child requires a visit from a speech and language therapist every half term, which is 45 minutes per visit and 4.5 hours in total, the council is charged 22.5 hours for the package. In the new service it will be the administration, travel and report writing that will be reduced and not the direct therapy time to the child or young person.
34. In the current speech and language therapy service only 5 out of Surrey's 23 special schools have a full time speech and language therapist. In the new service, each special school in Surrey will have a minimum of a full time speech and language therapist attached to their school (apart from the four schools for pupils with Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties, because they are smaller).
35. In the current speech and language therapy service, centres are receiving very mixed levels of speech and language therapy provision, for example, one specialist centre for pupils with speech, language and communication needs has a full-time therapist attached to it and another centre of a similar size has a therapist for only two days a week. In the new service there will be equity and consistency of provision across specialist centres and schools

will have direct input to how the therapist spends their allocation of time at the centre.

36. The Children's and Families Act 2014 means that 19-25 year olds can also have Education, Health and Care plans if this will support them to achieve their educational outcomes. This places additional statutory responsibilities on the Council to ensure support, such as speech and language therapy is provided if is detailed on the Education, Health and Care plan.
37. Young people going to local Surrey colleges will benefit from improved transition planning arrangements from the age of 14 and support from their school therapist as they move into post-16 college provision. The hub and spoke model structure will provide support to local colleges to help them meet the communication needs of young people with SEND.
38. A single service for mainstream schools will be established which will provide support to schools for all pupils and will mean that schools will see an improved 'whole school' offer. The current resourcing model estimates that 35 therapists will be allocated to the mainstream service.
39. The mainstream school service will have the following key features:
  - A link therapist (who therefore knows the school, the school's SEND offer and the school population)
  - An individual school based needs analysis
  - Speech and language therapy for children and young people who have this agreed on their Education, Health and Care plan
  - Assessments
  - Input to staff development
  - Direct communication and support to parents/carers
  - Schools can buy in additional therapy support if they feel that their SEN cohort could benefit from direct intervention, but this has not been identified by the speech and language therapist.
40. Included in the mainstream service resource allocation, will be therapists who focus on supporting pupils with hearing impairment. These therapists will sit within the Physical and Sensory Support Service.
41. It is anticipated that speech and language therapists will welcome the opportunity to work as part of an integrated school staffing team and spend more time on direct therapy delivery. Therefore the proposed new service is likely to be an attractive employment opportunity.
42. The new service places more emphasis on supporting families and education settings to reinforce strategies to help improve children and young people's communication. It is anticipated that this approach will help to manage the speech and language therapy budget in the future.

### **Procurement of the New Service**

43. A speech and language therapy business model task and finish group was set up in January 2015 to review the future procurement options for the new speech and language therapy service. The group included school representatives from Schools Forum and the therapy forum, families, education, procurement, finance, social care and post-16.

44. An option appraisal for procuring provision for the new service has been undertaken which reviewed the benefits and risks to the following procurement options:
- Do nothing (i.e. service continues with existing providers until their contracts end in 2017)
  - Transfer funding to Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups to commission through block contract (to existing providers)
  - Competitive bidding process to tender service to a single service provider
  - Devolve funding to special schools and bring mainstream service in to the Council.
45. The business model group recommend that the final option is implemented: devolving funding directly to special schools and specialist centres and bringing the service for mainstream schools in to the Council. This option achieves best value for money and strengthens the service by enabling the service to be part of an integrated school offer.
46. Further benefits to devolving funding directly to schools and bringing the mainstream service into the Council include:
- Allows schools to take full control of the service, enabling more adaptable, flexible and child-centred packages
  - Assessments will be completed by the school therapist, who has a full understanding of the skills of the teaching staff within the school that can help support any input required
  - Improves the school offer to families and children, giving them confidence and trust in their educational setting
  - Strengthens robustness of maintained school placements in comparison to the non-maintained and independent sector offer
  - Reduces the attractiveness of a non-maintained and independent school placement to families
  - Maintained school placement with added therapy enhancement as part of an integrated team around the child offer should reduce tribunal cases and appeals
  - Not for profit ethos of Surrey maintained schools should control costs to breakeven
  - Reduction in central resource costs in contract managing the two providers
  - Hub and spoke model will safeguard against a disparity of provision levels in different areas of the county.

- Reduce the equity gap between children who require speech and language therapy but don't have Education, Health and Care plans compared to those who do.

### **CONSULTATION:**

**Rapid Improvement Event held in July 2013** - This was jointly sponsored by the Council and Guildford and Waverley CCG. Participants comprised families, schools areas teams, health providers and commissioners. Concerns captured from the event included: disagreement over funding and therapists; therapists don't always see the child in a classroom setting; children without statements not getting support; have to fight for provision; things have to go wrong before anything is done and there is poor follow-up on the impact of the therapy.

The rapid improvement event identified a number of solutions that were quickly implemented and resolved some of the issues raised by families, schools and other professionals. More importantly it emphasised the negative impact that the current commissioning arrangements were having on service delivery and that until these were resolved no significant change in the service could take place. Since this event, the Council and Surrey CCGs together with families, schools and professionals have worked together to agree what these arrangements should look like in the future.

**Speech, language and communication needs analysis completed in January 2013** This included questionnaires sent to families and professionals. Families and schools jointly fed back frustration about the lack of resource and shortage of trained therapists. This manifested in complaints about long waiting times and delays in planned treatments. Practitioners highlighted the need for more speech and language therapists to deliver therapy to all children who need it. There were also issues raised by practitioners about 'the system', whereby pupils who transfer from pre-school without a statement are required to wait a term before referral can be made. Improved communication between therapists, schools and parents emerged as a theme amongst all stakeholders.

**A therapy forum set up in February 2014** with representation from families, schools, early years. Therapy forum members agreed the five key principles for the commissioning strategy

**2 September 2014** – the Joint Commissioning Strategy was taken to Health and Wellbeing Children's Group, the strategy was agreed

**7 October 2014** – the Joint Commissioning Strategy was taken to CCG Children's Leads, the strategy was agreed

**21 October 2014**- the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed Guildford and Waverley CCG Clinical Commissioning Committee

**29 October 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed CSF Directorate Leadership Team, with further information required about the funding implications

**30 October 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by Schools and Learning Management Team through e-mail sent. No concerns were raised.

**30 October 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by East Surrey CCG Clinical Execs

**4 November 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by Surrey Downs CCG Executives

**5 November 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by Clinical Operational Group

**10 November 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by Surrey Health

**11 November 2014** - the Joint Commissioning Strategy was agreed by Chief Officers and Strategic Leads

**15 January 2015** – Engagement Event for families and schools and other stakeholders. Feedback from this event was positive and in support of the strategy.

**December 2014/January 2015** Draft Strategy and Consultation Questionnaire published on Surrey Says. There were a total of 79 respondents to the consultation questionnaire. Of these 79, the vast majority belonged to the primary school / early years setting. Parent/ Carers represented the second highest cohort to respond. In general, education taken as a whole (special schools, primary, junior, secondary and early years) made up the majority of responses. 85% of respondents agreed with the proposed strategy.

**26 January 2015 –Children and Education Select Committee** The Committee endorsed and commended the general principles of the Joint Commissioning Strategy. It asks that officers note the following recommendations:

- a) That a consistent universal offer of speech and language therapy is developed across all Surrey early years settings, education settings and schools through training for staff and carers. It is suggested that a “hub and spoke” model is implemented as part of this, in order to allow schools and therapists to share good practice.
- b) That the strategy outlines how it will support children and young people who transition between stages of education.
- c) That the strategy expands on how it will meet the needs of young people in Further Education colleges, given the new responsibilities as a result of Children and Families Act, 2014.
- d) That the implementation model includes performance indicators linked to the outcomes set out by the Joint Commissioning Strategy.

**Four co-design events** were held to seek views from families, schools, therapists and other professionals on what a new speech and language therapy service should look like in Surrey. The events were jointly organised by Surrey clinical commissioning groups and Surrey County Council. More than 150 participants attended the four events to share their ideas and each event was fully booked out. Feedback from these events will be reflected in the service specification.

**A business model group was set up in January 2015**, the working group has representation from schools, families, finance, area teams and procurement and has the remit of agreeing a financial business model for the Council that supports the



proposed joint commissioning strategy for the Speech and Language Therapy Service in Surrey. Members of the group agreed with the proposals set out in this Cabinet paper.

On the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2015 – a paper outlining the proposals in this Cabinet paper was taken to Children, Schools and Families Directorate Leadership Team. Members were in support of the proposals and agreed with the risks outlined in this paper.

1<sup>st</sup> May 2015 – a brief summary of the proposal was provided to Schools Forum. Schools Forum have asked for more detailed information to be provided at the June Schools Forum meeting

A family focus group is in the process of being established to help ensure the new service specification meets the needs of families.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

47. The specialist school nursing service, which is a service provided to the 8 schools for pupils with severe learning difficulties, is the responsibility of the Clinical Commissioning Groups. Funding for the current specialist school nursing offer is currently shared between the Council and Clinical Commissioning Groups. SCC is negotiating with the Clinical Commissioning Groups the withdrawal of funding for the specialist school nursing service in order for the Clinical Commissioning Groups to take on full responsibility for this service.
48. The funding assumptions made in the costing model for the new service assumes that the Council will no longer commission the specialist school nursing service. The Council currently has an allocated budget of £450,000 for this service. The risks involved relate to what the future specialist school nursing service will provide when it is fully commissioned by the Clinical Commissioning Groups.
49. In terms of mitigation, the Council has committed to supporting the Surrey CCGs in working with Surrey schools to complete an impact assessment and agree how this can be restructured within the funding restrictions whilst continuing to meet the medical needs of pupils at these schools.
50. The costing model has been based on a number of assumptions, including salary costs of therapy staff. In those circumstances where it is deemed TUPE applies we will know more details about TUPE transfer costs if recommendations in the paper are agreed and further information can be requested from health providers.
51. An additional risk is that Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups fail to reinvest the savings they make from the realignment of commissioning responsibilities in to Early Years. The joint strategy which has been agreed by all Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups formally documents this agreement and in addition to this a partnership agreement will be put in place.
52. It is recognised that during the period of transition to the new commissioning arrangements, unforeseen situations may arise that have not been included within the strategy. The Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups will put arrangements in place to resolve these and ensure that the service user and their family are not affected by these.

## **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

53. The realignment of commissioning responsibilities, which is based on recent legislation, proposes that the Council takes on more speech and language therapy responsibilities. The newly developed resourcing model, which proposes an overall increase in the number of therapists, means there will be an increase in the cost of the service. The estimated cost of the new service is £3.3m compared to a 2015/16 budget for speech and language therapy of £2.4m.
54. This increased cost will be mitigated by the specialist school nursing service being fully commissioned by the Clinical Commissioning Groups (£0.45m) and contributions from health of approximately (£0.1m) in recognition of the health needs being met in schools and as a contribution to therapy provided in the reception year. This leaves an increase of £0.4m which would be an additional call on the high needs block of the dedicated schools grant, a budget already under pressure.
55. This proposal does however sit with the overall SEND Strategy which focuses on increasing the number of children and young people accessing local provision and reducing the number of those with communication and interaction needs requiring Education, Health and Care plans. Over time the new service should reduce the number of children with EHC plans to address speech, language and communication needs as a result of greater investment by health in early years services. The proposals should also make local Surrey provision more attractive, reducing demand for more expensive non-maintained and independent placements,
56. Although the Council would provide a core offer to all mainstream schools, which would include a link therapist, training and development and an annual review, mainstream schools will be able to buy in direct speech and language therapy through their SEN support allocation. This would allow part of the new mainstream service to operate on a traded basis with schools.
57. Transitional arrangements with the CCGs will be put in place over an agreed period of time with regard to transferring over responsibilities for the mainstream service to the Council. At the same time a single service for all children and young people, with timely assessments and intervention in the early years is likely to reduce the number of children in Years R, 1 and 2 requiring an Education, Health and Care plan to access the level of speech and language therapy services they require.
58. There are risks associated with this proposal, in those circumstances where it is deemed TUPE applies, salary costs have been estimated, although on a prudent basis.
59. In addition, if the funding of specialist school nursing provision in special schools for pupils with severe learning difficulties cannot be successfully resolved with the Clinical Commissioning Groups, there is a risk that Surrey will continue to incur costs in this area.

## **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

60. The speech and language therapy spend has grown by 39% since 2010/11 reflecting both an increase in volume and costs.

61. The proposals recognise the greater clarity about the local authorities' responsibilities for speech and language provision arising from the Children and Families Act 2014 and the new SEN code of practice. These have placed greater emphasis on local authorities meeting this type of educational need rather than it being a health responsibility.
62. Financial modelling suggests the cost of the new service will be £0.4m greater than the £2.4m 2015/16 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The additional funding will have to be found from DSG. The financial model is based on 83.5 therapists and has been prudently costed. However there are risks around TUPE and the terms and conditions of transferring staff. These will be fully evaluated when the TUPE data is available.
63. However the new service is expected to contribute to the emerging SEND strategy, over time reducing the level of EHC plans, increasing inclusion and reducing the number of NMI placements thereby leading to eventual savings.
64. The partnership agreement with Health will be key to ensuring they invest in Early Years and school nursing as they have indicated they will do from discussions to date. Similarly the school community have a key role in ensuring this new approach to speech and language is a success.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

65. Under Part 3 of the Children & Families Act 2014 the Authority has a duty to identify and assess the special educational needs of the children and young people for whom it is responsible. Once assessed the special educational provision that is specified in any EHC Plan (previously known as a statement of special educational needs) must be provided by the Council. Such provision often includes therapies.
66. Under the proposed strategy that the Cabinet is asked to endorse, the Council will take on responsibility for all the speech and language therapy provided in maintained schools including the therapy previously provided by Health through the Clinical Commissioning Groups. Although the strategy proposes a realignment of commissioning responsibility, it has no bearing on the Council's underlying statutory responsibility to children and young people to provide what is set out in EHC Plans. Accepting commissioning responsibility should make it easier for the Council to ensure that it is able to comply with its statutory obligations.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

67. The CCG Equality Impact Assessment template (Annex 2) has been used to support this paper. The protected characteristic that will be impacted by this strategy is 'disability'. The strategy will impact children and young people with disabilities more favourably by establishing an equitable service across Surrey, that is needs led and outcome focused. In some areas this may lead to a reduction in therapy provision. It is proposed that this will be a phased approach to ensure continuity for children currently accessing the service. Improved contracting arrangements and more revised service specification will ensure that the quality of provision at all schools will improve.

<b>WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:</b>
---------------------------

- New service specification designed – May 2015
- Formal notice given to providers for speech and language therapy service – June 2015
- Costing model and resourcing structure finalised – June 2015
- Hub and spoke models consulted on and agreed with schools – July 2015
- Transition, transfer and management arrangements agreed with Surrey CCGs – September 2015
- Final costings approved by Schools Forum and Cabinet – October 2015
- Implementation of new service starts - April 2016  
Service up and running - September 2016

---

**Contact Officer:**

Zarah Lowe, Provision and Partnership Development Manager, Mobile: 01483 519393

**Consulted:**

Health and Wellbeing Children's Group, Schools and Families, Therapy Providers

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – Joint Commissioning Strategy for Speech and Language Therapy Services

Annex 2 – Equality Impact Assessment

**Sources/background papers:**

- All background papers used in the writing of the report should be listed, as required by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
  - A copy of any background papers which have not previously been published should be supplied to Democratic Services with your draft report.
-



DRAFT

**DRAFT Joint  
Commissioning Strategy for Speech and  
Language Therapy Services for Children  
and Young People in Surrey  
2014 - 2017 (V14)**

---



## Content

- Executive Summary
- 1. Purpose
- 2. Commissioning Intentions
- 3. Commissioning Outcomes
- 4. Commissioning Responsibilities
- 5. National and Local Context
- 6. User Engagement
- 7. Current Commissioning Arrangements
- 8. Next steps

DRAFT



## Executive Summary

Up to 50% of children are starting school with speech, language and communication skills below the normal expected level. Of these, up to 10% are likely to have complex or persistent speech, language or communication difficulties.

The Children and Families Act 2014 requires education, health and social care to work together to commission support for children and young people with SEND. The Act states that there should be a clear approach to identifying and responding to the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation. The Act specifies that Speech and Language Therapy should be regarded as an educational provision as communication is so fundamental in accessing the curriculum.

Speech and Language therapy services across Surrey have always been commissioned separately by the Clinical Commissioning Groups and Local Authority. The total spend on Speech and Therapy services is estimated to be £4.1m, with Surrey County Council (SCC) spending £2.4m and CCG's £1.7m.

SCC commissioned a Speech, Language and Communication Needs Analysis which was completed in January 2013. This identified a rising population in the 0-19 year age range, particularly in early years which has seen an increase of 13.5% between 2001 and 2011 and now makes up 6.3% of the total Surrey population. As part of the Needs Analysis, feedback was gathered from 358 families and professionals which highlighted that strengths of the service included: professionalism, expertise and knowledge of Speech and Language Therapy; having the same dedicated SLT attached to school; positive parental involvement and Every Child a Talker (ECAT)

The consultation also highlighted challenges within the service, which included: waiting times; lack of early identification and intervention; need for further workforce development and transition between early years and school.

The Health and Wellbeing Children's group in Surrey identified Paediatric Therapies as a key priority and this strategy reflects national legislation regarding collaboration between agencies and commissioning responsibilities

A therapy forum set up in February 2014 with representation from families, schools, early years, post-16, commissioners and health providers proposed five key commissioning principles: the right support at the right time; an open and transparent service; seeing the bigger picture; therapy for children and young people is everybody's business and an outcome focused approach.



The proposed commissioning responsibilities reflect the recent legislation and the locally agreed principles:

Surrey County Council becomes responsible for commissioning a specialist level of speech and language therapy for school age children that will enable them to progress in their learning and as they get older to be well prepared for adulthood.

The focus of CCG commissioned services will be the early year's population working alongside SCC's early year's team and those with specific clinical, health related issues such as dysphagia or brain injury

Education settings will be supported to meet the universal and sometimes targeted Speech, Language and Communication Needs of children and young people.

DRAFT





## 1. Purpose

This paper outlines the proposals for a three year joint commissioning strategy for the delivery of Speech and Language therapy (SLT) provision for 0-19 year olds (19-25 with SEND) living in Surrey. The strategy sets out to realign provision to meet the commissioning responsibilities and intentions of Surrey's NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG), Surrey County Council (SCC) and other partners who may wish to procure services to meet the speech, language and communication needs (SLCN) of children in Surrey. The specific focus on this paper is on Speech and Language Therapy services as a specialist resource within this context.

## 2. Commissioning Intentions

The commissioning intentions describe how we aim to develop a more joined up child centred approach to commissioning. Our intentions for collaborative commissioning are

- Putting children and families at the centre of our service to ensure best outcomes for children and young people are achieved.
- A shared vision of what a speech and language therapy service spanning 0-25 years should look like in Surrey in line with the Children and Families Act 2014.
- A shared vision of Early Help to support early intervention, diagnosis and prevention escalation of negative behaviours or avoidable impact on learning.
- Agreement and transparency of commissioning responsibilities, providing clarity for providers and service users over who commissions different areas of the SLT service and performance indicators and outcomes expected.
- To ensure that families and other key partners have a clear understanding of commissioning arrangements
- To empower families to have greater control than they had previously with traditional models of commissioning.
- Make effective use of resources across the system
- Shared responsibility in up skilling the wider workforce, including families, early years settings, schools, colleges and other professionals
- A single, outcome focused and evidence based service delivery model that achieves equity across Surrey
- Shared monitoring and quality assurance arrangements



### 3. Commissioning Outcomes

Following stakeholder engagement and commissioning reviews in 2013 and 2014; the CCGs and Local Authority established a therapy forum (February 2014) with provider and service user representation to further inform strategic commissioning and shift to an outcome based model of commissioning:

The following five commissioning principles were co-produced in collaboration with the group<sup>1</sup>.

#### 1) The right support at the right time

All children and young people in Surrey access the right support at the right time to meet their needs

- Agreement of criteria thresholds – no gaps across the county
- Equity across Surrey in access and quality
- Consistency in service specification
- Clarity regarding responsibilities for commissioning to allow seamless services

#### 2) An open and transparent service

The local offer informs families of what help, information and services are available and how to access them

- Common agreement of priorities
- Joint decision making leading to agreement of targets
- Health or Education personal budgets are available to families where possible

#### 3) Seeing the bigger picture

Families and professionals work together to help and support a child to achieve their long term outcomes

- A team around the child approach with integrated team working
- Embedding intervention into the home, school and community environment, so that everyone understands the role they can play.

#### 4) Therapy for children and young people is everyone's business

Families and professionals are equipped with the right skills and resources to help children and young people achieve their long term outcomes

- Up skilling the wider workforce
- Quality assurance

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that family representatives were keen that the principles should be written in plain English to ensure that they were understood by families and all professionals.



- Joint monitoring of performance and quality assurance of the service

### 5) An outcome focused approach

Therapy provision is focused on helping children and young people achieve realistic outcomes that will help them to fulfil their life-time aspirations

- Outcome focused – managing expectations but recognising aspiration
- Therapy provision achieves value for money
- Provision is linked to progress towards agreed outcomes
- Evidence based and audited

## 4. Commissioning Responsibilities

Based on the principles of both Early Help (early intervention) and the Children and Families Act 2014 with associated revised SEN Code of Practice, the strategy proposes that the:

1. Surrey County Council becomes responsible for commissioning a specialist level of speech and language therapy for school age children and young people aged 16-25 (with an Education, Health and Care plan) which will enable them to progress in their learning and as they get older to be well prepared for adulthood<sup>2</sup>. Provision will be delivered in an education setting and focused on enabling children and young people to access the curriculum. These needs will be met in an educational setting during term-time.
2. CCGs are responsible for commissioning services to meet health needs (2006 NHS Act: 2014 Mandate and 2014 NHS Outcomes). The focus of CCG commissioned services will be the early year's population working alongside SCC's early year's team and those with specific clinical, health related issues such as dysphagia. These services could be successfully delivered in a non-educational environment and throughout the calendar year.
3. Early years settings, schools, academies and colleges will be supported to meet the universal and sometimes targeted Speech, Language and Communication Needs of children and young people who require support in order to progress with their learning and access the curriculum.

Further detail in regard to this is included below:

<sup>2</sup> The SEND Code of Practice, paragraph 9.64 states EHC plans should be focused on education, training, health and care outcomes that will enable children and young people to progress in their learning and, as they get older, to be well prepared for adulthood.....Outcomes should always enable children and young people to move towards the long-term aspirations of employment or higher education, independent living and community participation”.



CCGs will be the lead commissioner for speech and language therapy that provides<sup>3</sup> –

- Initial assessments and differential diagnosis of children not yet in full time education (early years)
- Early Years interventions where a specific therapy need is identified that is above the threshold that might reasonably be expected to be met by universal early years services such as:
  - Speech and language Impairment
  - Moderate / severe speech and language delay
  - Phonological or articulation difficulties
  - Social Communication difficulties
  - All conditions listed below in school aged list
- Interventions for school aged children when there is a defined health need such as:
  - Traumatic brain injury
  - Degenerative neurological conditions
  - Cancer
  - Tracheostomy
  - Hearing impairment when a school-aged child requires intensive input following a cochlear implant
  - Dysfluency (stammering)
  - Dysphagia (eating and drinking disorders)
  - Voice problems (e.g: vocal nodules)
  - Cleft palate
  - Complex medical conditions requiring high levels of liaison with tertiary hospitals
  - Selective mutism
- SCC will be the lead commissioner for school aged children and young people aged 16-25 years (for those with an Education, Health and Care plan) where a specific therapy need is identified that is above the threshold that might reasonably be expected to be met by universal services and will enable children and young people to progress in their learning. Speech and Language therapy in this context may either be directly with the child or advice/guidance on whole class or school communication environments. This may include:
  - Speech and language Impairment
  - Moderate / severe speech and language delay

<sup>3</sup> This links to NHS outcomes that are in response to 2006 NHS Act: Section 3A “Each CCG has the power to arrange for the provision of such services or facilities as it considers appropriate for the purposes of the health service that relate to securing improvement in – a) the physical and mental health of persons for whom it has responsibility or b) the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of illness in those persons.



- Phonological or articulation difficulties
- Social Communication difficulties
- Learning difficulties where there is a discrepancy between cognitive and functional communication levels

It is proposed that joint funding should be provided in the instances listed below:-

- Initial assessments for school/college-aged children and young people
- Intervention to children in nursery/reception year, supporting transition from early years to school aged services
- Up skilling wider workforce for example, by training and advice to settings for providing universal and targeted offer
- Children who require both Health and Educational related Speech and Language Therapy. A seamless service will be achieved by health contributing funding to the education commissioned service.

## 5. National and Local Context

In some parts of the UK, particularly in areas of social disadvantage, up to 50% of children are starting school with speech, language and communication skills below the normal expected level. Of these, 10% have complex or persistent SLCN. 7% of children have SLCN as part of another problem/diagnosis such as Autism or learning difficulties. 3% have SLCN as their main or primary difficulty also referred to as specific language impairment (SLI), of which an estimated 1% of these children have the most severe and complex SLI<sup>1</sup>.

In Surrey, SLCN is the second most prevalent primary need, (after autism) with 23% (951) of children with Statements of Special Educational Needs (SSEN) listing SLCN as their primary need in January 2013. The proportion of young people who have SSEN because of SLCN needs is significantly higher in Surrey than nationally – 22% compared to 14%. There are a higher proportion of children with SSEN in National Curriculum years 0-4 ie 5-9 year olds that have SCLN in comparison to other primary needs.

Surrey's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (Children's Summary Analysis March 2015) tells us that 'It is estimated that there are 278,248 children and young people aged 0-19 living in Surrey with 54% concentrated in the northern, more urban districts and boroughs of Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath and Woking<sup>1</sup>. Estimates predict that the 0-19 population will increase by 12% by 2037, with the North East experiencing the lowest rate of growth (8%) and the highest in the North West (15%)<sup>2</sup>. There is now greater ethnic and cultural diversity with 20% of school children in Surrey from a minority ethnic group<sup>3</sup>. There are 187 languages spoken in Surrey's maintained schools and academies, with the most common after English being Polish, Spanish, Portuguese, French and Punjabi.



Most of our children and young people are safe, well educated, experience good health, and have good leisure and employment opportunities. Many families in Surrey also benefit from higher than average socio-economic circumstances and opportunities that are related to this. However hidden deprivation exists in Surrey and there are groups of children and young people who experience poorer outcomes. There are indications that the current economic climate and reforms moving through the welfare system are likely to increase family stress and hardship. Particularly concerning is the impact of deprivation experienced locally as 10% of children and young people in Surrey live in poverty with pockets of poverty close to the most affluent areas. The Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) provision in Surrey was identified as a priority area by the Health and Wellbeing Children's Group.

## 6. User Engagement: Review of Speech and Language Therapy

### July 2013: Rapid Improvement Event

During July 2013 a week-long Rapid Improvement Event took place which was jointly sponsored by Surrey County Council (SCC) and health commissioners. Participants comprised families, schools areas teams, health providers and commissioners. The parents/carers and professionals (including schools, Family Voice, therapists and area education teams) were consulted about which aspects of SLCN worked well in Surrey and what areas needed improvement. All partners were united in their praise for the professionalism, expertise and knowledge of individual speech and language therapists. Schools praised the role that SLTs have had in training staff to recognise SLCN.

In terms of what was not working so well the overriding issue raised by parents was a lack of resource and shortage of trained therapists. This manifested in complaints about long waiting times and delays in planned treatment when the allocated therapist leaves or goes on maternity leave.

Practitioners highlighted the need for more speech and language therapists to deliver therapy to all children who need it. There were also issues raised by practitioners about 'the system', whereby pupils who transfer from pre-school without a statement are required to wait a term before referral can be made. Improved communication between therapists, schools and parents emerged as a theme amongst all stakeholders.

Key recommendations included

- establishing a system that would meet the individual needs of each individual child to achieve the best outcome, whilst ensuring equity of provision across the county
- establishing a whole workforce competent in developing speech, language and communication skills of children



## January – March 2014: CCG Review of Speech and Language Therapy across Surrey

A qualitative review of children's community Speech and Language Therapy services commissioned by Surrey CCG collaborative was undertaken at the end of 2013/14 (final report 2014) with the purpose of

- identifying areas of strength, innovation, risk and challenge
- gaining clarity regarding funding, allocation of resources, service access, waiting and prioritisation criteria.
- making recommendations regarding service specifications and key performance indicators which have the potential to support practical and sustainable delivery of equitable therapy across Surrey.

Mirroring responses from the July 2013 Rapid Improvement Event, user feedback regarding the quality of the SLT service once accessed was positive but issues of long waiting times, inequitable access across Surrey, delays to treatment and perceptions of insufficient levels of input were key findings.

In addition to a review and analysis of local documentation and data the review included interviews and focus groups using a qualitative questions framework. Nine sessions were held and those consulted included service commissioners from health and the local authority, contract managers, heads of therapy services and professional therapy service leads, GP lead for children and head teacher of a special school

Alongside the review, a needs analysis was commissioned by SCC.

### January 2014: Speech, Language and Communication Needs, Needs Analysis

A needs analysis was commissioned SCC with the purpose of gaining an understanding of the needs of children and young people with speech, language and communication needs across Surrey. It will help us estimate the nature and extent of the needs of our local population, so that services can be planned accordingly and so we can focus effort and resources where they are needed most. This analysis can be used by commissioners, providers or professionals, communities and users (including parents, children and young people). Below are the headline findings -

- SLCN is the second most prevalent primary need, with 23% of children in Surrey with statements of special education need (951) listing speech, language and communication needs as their primary need in January 2013.



- The proportion of young people who have statements of special educational needs because of speech, language and communication needs is significantly higher in Surrey than nationally – 22% compared to 14%
- There are a higher proportion of children with statements of SEN in Reception year to year 4 that have speech, language and communication needs in comparison to other primary needs.
- There are a higher proportion of children and young people with speech, language and communication needs as a primary need in their statement of SEN who are in Surrey mainstream schools than there are in Surrey special schools.
- Those pupils identified with moderate learning difficulties as a primary need make up the highest proportion of pupils identified with speech, language and communication needs as a secondary need, making up 40% of the total cohort of pupils with speech, language and communication needs (SLCN) as a secondary need.
- In Surrey, 60-70% of children with SLCN are statemented between 0 and five years of age, 5-10% receives their statement after the age of 10.
- At least one third of young people with special educational needs at general further education colleges in Surrey had speech, language and communication needs identified whilst they were at school.

As part of the Needs Analysis, feedback was gathered from 358 families and professionals which highlighted that strengths of the service included: professionalism, expertise and knowledge of Speech and Language Therapy; having the same dedicated SLT attached to school; positive parental involvement and Every Child a Talker (ECAT).

The consultation also highlighted challenges within the service, which included: waiting times; lack of early identification and intervention; need for further workforce development; transition between early years and school.

### **February 2014: Paediatric Therapy Forum Established**

It was evident from the engagement of commissioners in these reviews and the needs assessment that, despite positive attempts to address the concerns, there was no clear strategic commissioning agreement between Surrey County Council and CCG Commissioners regarding how to meet the needs of all children with Speech and Language Therapy difficulties. This had resulted in some confusion of commissioning responsibilities and how to work collaboratively to successfully resolve some issues highlighted in the reviews.





A multi agency and parent representatives Therapy Forum was established in January 2014 with the remit of reviewing current service delivery and commissioning arrangements, and advising on changes that would support compliance with the Children and Families Act. Members act as both a communication forum and advisory group focussed upon understanding current service models, gaps, challenges and opportunities with regard to the commissioning and delivery of therapy services to children. The Therapy Forum has representation from parents from 'Family Voice' at each monthly forum.

### Parent Empowerment Workshops: August 2014

In addition to engagement with families of children with long term speech, language and communication needs 30 families of children newly referred to the service were asked about Speech and Language Therapy services, including aspects of access, waiting times, quality and self help. Families were also asked to consider ways in which they felt services could be improved. These consultations took place following workshops which parents are invited to attend when their child is referred to the Speech and Language Therapy Service. Families reported mixed experiences both in terms of waiting times and convenience of the workshop sessions. Prior to attending the workshop, some families had accessed support with their child's communication development via children centres, private therapy, Portage, whilst others had had no support. The majority of parents either agreed or strongly agreed that they were better able to support their child's communication development as a result of attending the workshop.

### Legislation/Statutory Guidance

The Children and Families Act 2014 and more specifically the Special Educational Needs (SEN) Code of Practice has provided new guidance and clarity regarding expectations about commissioning arrangements for children with special educational needs and disabilities. Section 5.4 of the Code of Practice states that there should be a clear approach to identifying and responding to the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage (0-5 years) who have special educational needs. *Commissioning should ensure there is collaboration between early years providers and health providers to ensure early identification of difficulties leads to early assessment, diagnosis and intervention in line with evidence based practice.*

Section 9.74 states that 'Speech and Language therapy and other therapy provision can be regarded as either education or health care provision, or both. It could therefore be included in the EHC plan as educational or health provision. However, since communication is so fundamental in education, addressing speech and language impairment should normally be recorded as special educational provision unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so'.



Section 9.76 states that “In cases where health care provision or social care provision is to be treated as special educational provision, ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the provision is made rests with the local authority”.

## Governance

The Health and Wellbeing Strategy is the key partnership document underpinning this work and the Health and Wellbeing Board will be the lead partnership forum responsible for this strategy. However, governance approval and sign off for this strategy will be agreed via SCC’s Directorate Leadership Team and each Surrey CCG Governing Body. It is anticipated that this will be achieved by April 2015 alongside new service specifications and performance metrics. Oversight and development of the joint commissioning strategy occurs through the following forums:

- Joint agency
  - Health and Wellbeing Board
  - SEND Governance Board
  - Children’s Health and Wellbeing Group
  - Children’s Strategic Partnership
- Surrey County Council
  - Children and Education select committee
  - Cabinet
- Clinical Commissioning Groups
  - Children’s CCG Leads meeting
  - Strategic Collaborative
  - Each Governing Body

The strategy will be presented at the Therapy Forum, Early Help Commissioning group, Schools and Learning committee, and to lead members between September 2014 and December 2014.

Oversight of the new service will be done through a workstream within the SEND Operations Group.

## 7. Current Commissioning Arrangements in Surrey

The council currently commissions speech and language therapy (SLT) for children and young people who have SLT named on Part 3 of their Statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN). It also commissions some of the speech and language at Surrey’s maintained special schools and specialist centres. In 2013/14 the Council’s budget for SLT was approximately £2.4m.

The NHS commission SLT for children and young people in Surrey for children who have not reached school age and those children and young people who do not hold a SEN. The NHS commissions all speech and language therapy in Surrey’s maintained schools for pupils with severe learning



difficulties (SLD) and shares the commissioning responsibility with the council for SLT in other maintained special schools in Surrey.

SCC has had an increase in spend of 71% from 2009 to 2014, see table below:

Figure 1: Table to Show Increase in Surrey County Council Spend on Speech and Language Therapy

Therapy	2009-10	2010-12	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Speech and Language Therapy	£1.4m	£1.6m	£1.7m	£1.8m	£2.4m

The estimated spend on Speech & Language Therapy in 2013/14 is shown in the table below :

Figure 2: Table to Show Annual Spend in 2013/14 on Speech and Language Therapy

Organisation	2013/14 Spend
NHS CCG	£1.7m
Surrey County Council	£2.4m
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4.1m</b>

The current commissioning arrangements for the delivery of Speech and Language Therapy in Surrey mean that there is inequity of provision across the county. Those with the highest need are not always able to access the right level of support in a timely way.

This strategy seeks to establish a service which achieves value for money by focusing on achieving outcomes, developing functional skills and providing a skill-mix service able to provide different grades of Therapy staff to ensure the best use of funding.

## 8. Next Steps

1. Nov 14: Draft strategy circulated and presented to CCG and SCC groups and boards
2. Dec 14: Engagement events held, and strategy document published on 'Surrey Says'
3. Jan 15: Final strategy agreed
4. Jan –April 15: Service specification co developed with families and early years settings and schools and other relevant groups.
5. April 15: Service specification agreed



6. April 16: Transition to new service delivery model; to be fully implemented at the start of academic year September 2016.

Commissioning Outcome	Actions	Leads	Timescale
All children and young people in Surrey access the right support at the right time to meet their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish criteria of thresholds</li> <li>Design single service specification for all providers</li> <li>Make boundaries between commissioning transparent</li> <li>Scope role of schools in commissioning SLT services directly</li> </ul>	Schools and Learning and CCG	April 15
The SEND local offer informs families of what help, information and services are available and how to access them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation with families to ensure local offer provides information, resources and services which meet their needs</li> <li>Local Offer includes services available to support children with SLCN</li> </ul>	Schools and Learning and CCG	April 15
Families and professionals work together to help and support a child to achieve their long term outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement a new person centred assessment process</li> <li>Key communication partners (eg parents and teachers) embed strategies into children's everyday life</li> </ul>	Service providers with families	Dec 14 April 16
Families and professionals are equipped with the right skills and resources to help children achieve their long term outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gain an understanding of skills of the workforce through online audit</li> <li>Provide training to address gaps in skills and knowledge</li> </ul>	Schools and Learning and CCG	April 15 April 17
Therapy provision is focused on helping children and young people achieve realistic outcomes that will help them to fulfil their life-time aspirations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Therapy will be evidence based and focused on outcomes</li> <li>Key communication partners involved with the child to be aware of the identified outcomes and how they may support them</li> </ul>	Service providers with families	April 16 April 17

<sup>i</sup> Hartstone, M. (2009) The Cost to the Nation of Children's Poor Communication



DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

New Template EIA (for documents)

Ref. No.: [INSERT]

6

## To be completed by Document owner or an EDS Lead

Start Date of completing EIA	30/07/14	End Date of completing EIA	12/5/15
<p><b><i>The assessment should be started prior to policy development or at the design stages of the review and continue throughout the policy development/review.</i></b></p> <p><i>For an existing document, it needs to be ensured that any changes identified as necessary can be implemented. <u>The assessment will need to inform decision-making</u> so the end date should take this into account. The end date should not however be the end of the assessment cycle, as this may link to any requirements for review.</i></p>			
1	<b>Name of the Document:</b>	Joint Commissioning Strategy for Speech and Language Therapy Services	
2	<b>Who owns the document and who will be responsible for any implementation deriving from this document?</b> <b>Who is the document aimed at?</b>		
Document Owners: Anne Breaks / Zarah Lowe Aimed at: CCG Boards, Health and Well Being Board SCC education commissioners, Council members, schools, general public			
3	<b>Detail the main aims, purpose and outcomes of the document?</b>		
Aim and Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To explain and set out recommendations for commissioning of services to meet the needs of children with speech, language and communication needs (SLCN)</li> <li>To ensure that all stakeholders are have been directly involved in the process</li> <li>To build trust and collaboration between families and service providers and commissioners</li> </ul> Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A responsive and equitable service that meets the SLCN of all children and Young People in Surrey.</li> <li>Improved patient /carer experience and satisfaction</li> <li>Improved use of resources through clearer pathways of care, empowering others, and reducing duplications</li> </ul>			
4	<b>Detail which key Stakeholder Groups are 'affected' by this document and what <u>demographical data has been assessed</u> to identify any positive/negative impact to these groups upon implementation of the document</b>		

Affected groups: Children and Young People and their families, Early Years providers and practitioners, schools staff and Governing bodies, Virgin Care Services Ltd., Central Surrey Health, SCC, GPs, Post 16 services.

Impacts: JSNA and CCG commissioning priorities, Surrey - i and schools data and have been taken into account when considering impacts of the implementation of the strategy.

5	<b>How would you rate the level of impact / risk of this document to the organisation? (Delete opposite as appropriate)</b>	Medium CCG	High SCC	<p><b>USE THE SPACE BELOW TO DETAIL THE IMPACT TO THE ORGANISATION</b></p> <p>Please detail any risk management (<i>reference to risks being added to the CCG Risk Register</i>); if the impact is positive and/or negative and how this will be managed</p>
---	---	---------------	-------------	--

Risks for CCGs are around relationship with SCC as it is likely that SCC will have increased costs associated with the strategy as the Children and Families Act 2014 states that SLT should be provided be viewed as education or training and is therefore the responsibility of SCC. Risks around relationships with current providers as service specs will be written to reflect the change in emphasis of CCG commissioned services to early identification and intervention.

<b>Does the Document affect one group more or less favourably than another based on the 9 protected characteristics?</b>				
	<b>Protected Characteristics</b> <i>(please refer below for further definition of each character)</i>	More favourably Yes / No	Less favourably Yes / No	Comments / Information considered to reach this decision.
6	Age	Yes*	No	*SLT services to Preschool aged children will have more investment and are expected to improve with reduced waiting times and increased provision for children with speech and language impairments. **There is a possibility that parents of some children who may have a reduction in Speech and Language Therapy allocation may perceive this as a poorer
	Sex	No	No	
	Disability	Yes	Yes **	
	Race	No	No	
	Religion and Belief	No	No	
	Sexual orientation	No	No	



	Pregnancy and Maternity	No	No	<p>service, so communications/ messages will need to be considered and y handled sensitively. Any reduction is expected to be mitigated by more effective use of current resources.</p> <p><b>Factors to consider</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance to the Equality Duty as stated by law</li> <li>• Level of evidence available that different groups may be affected differently (little, some, substantial)</li> <li>• Level of concern raised by the communities or the public about the policy etc when they are consulted – (recorded opinions, not lack of interest) (little, some, significant)</li> </ul>
	Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	No	
	Gender Re-assignment	No	No	

If you have answered yes to any of the above, you **MUST** complete the comments column explaining what information you have considered which has led you to reach this decision.  
**Please continue overleaf if required.**

7	Where, if any, are the gaps in the information required? What are the reasons for any lack of information? List them below for each 'Protected' group			
No gaps identified				
8	Are there barriers which could inhibit access to the benefits of this document? E.g. Communication / information, physical access, location,	No		

	sensitivity			
9	Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities? If so which and how?	Yes		.
<p>There are inequalities in waiting times and levels of service provision across Surrey which will be addressed through the changes which will result from the implementation of the strategy.</p>				
10	Please list below what evidence you have used in carrying out this assessment.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ In some areas, up to 50% of children starting school with speech, language and communication skills below expected level</li> <li>▶ Part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014 states that joint commissioning should be established between health, education and social care commissioners.</li> <li>▶ Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: “Healthcare provision is to be treated as special educational provision when it is made wholly or mainly for the purposed of the education or training of a child or young person”. “ Since communication is so fundamental in education, addressing speech and language impairment should normally be recorded as special educational provision unless there are exceptional reasons for not doing so”.</li> <li>▶ In Surrey, Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN) are second most prevalent primary need (after autism)</li> <li>▶ In Surrey 951 children with Statements of Special Educational Need (SSEN) listed SLCN as primary need in January 2013. The proportion of children and young people who have SSEN is significantly higher in Surrey than nationally (22% compared to 14%). There are a higher proportion of children with SSEN in Key Stage 1 who SLCN listed as a primary need in comparison to other primary needs</li> <li>▶ Surrey has a rising population. The population aged 0-4 yrs has increased by 13.5% in the 10 year period 2001 – 2011 and now makes up 6.3% of Surrey’s population. Between 2011 and 2023 the population aged 5yrs to 24yrs is forecast to grow by 10% from 272,389 to 300,800</li> <li>▶ Feedback from stakeholders and service users identified key issues in the systems that needed to be addressed: Lack of resource and shortage of trained therapists. Long waiting times and delays in planned treatment when therapist goes on leave or maternity leave. Need for more speech and language therapists to deliver therapy to all children who need it. Issues with ‘the system’ including transition to school from early years. Poor communication between key partners</li> </ul> <p><b>Chronology of consultation, collaboration and co-production events:</b></p> <p>June 2013: <b>A Rapid Improvement Event</b> was held to explore outcome focussed assessment and delivery for school-based paediatric therapy services to Surrey children and young people with SEN. An on-line survey was sent out to the following groups of stakeholders; children and young people, parents and carers, schools, area education teams, therapists and commissioners. Responses were received from 143 parents and 215 practitioners.</p> <p>Dec 2013: <b>A qualitative review of speech and language therapy provision</b>, commissioned by Surrey CCG children’s collaborative was</p>				

undertaken which revealed significant variation in the provision across Surrey. The report was published in April 2014.

February 2014 – March 2015: A monthly **therapy forum** was held to review current service delivery and commissioning arrangements, and advise on changes that would support compliance with the Children and Families Bill currently in progress through Parliament.

August- October 2014: A total of 23 parents attending **parent empowerment workshops** for children who had been referred to speech and language therapy were consulted informally by the commissioner about their experiences of the service. The parents were seen at 3 different location in Redhill, Woking and Ashford.

**15 January 2015** – Engagement Event for families and schools and other stakeholders. Feedback from this event was positive and in support of the strategy.

**December 2014/January 2015** Draft Strategy and Consultation Questionnaire published on Surrey Says. There were a total of 79 respondents to the consultation questionnaire. Of these 79, the vast majority belonged to the primary school / early years setting. Parent/ Carers represented the second highest cohort to respond. In general, education taken as a whole (special schools, primary, junior, secondary and early years) made up the majority of responses. 85% of respondents agreed with the proposed strategy.

**Four co-design events** were held to seek views from families, schools, therapists and other professionals on what a new speech and language therapy service should look like in Surrey. The events were jointly organised by Surrey clinical commissioning groups and Surrey County Council. More than 150 participants attended the four events to share their ideas and each event was fully booked out. Feedback from these events will be reflected in the service specification.

11	<p><b>Please indicate if a Full Equality Impact Assessment is required.</b></p> <p><b>PLEASE NOTE THAT FOR EIAs ON SERVICES, A FULL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IS ALWAYS REQUIRED (N.B this is a CCG process)</b></p>		No	

<b>PRINT NAME</b>	Anne Breaks/Zarah Lowe	Date completed	<b>12/05/2015</b>
<b>Signature of individual completing the assessment:</b>			
<b>Details of where EIA is being submitted to</b>	Surrey County Council/ Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups	Date to review EIA	

<b>Outcome of EIA Review:</b>	<b>Tick as appropriate</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

6

<b>Outcome 1:</b> No major change: the EIA demonstrates the policy is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken.	X
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Adjust the document: the EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the document to remove barriers or better promote equality.	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Continue the document: the EIA identifies the potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality. Clearly set out the justifications for continuing with it. The justification should be included in the EIA and must be in line with the duty to have due regard. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed.	
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Stop and remove the document: the document shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped and removed or changed (the codes of practice and guidance on each of the public sector duties on the Commission's website provide information about what constitutes unlawful discrimination).	

For any other outcome other than Outcome 1, an action plan should be developed, monitored and reviewed. This should include evaluation of the changes, to measure whether they have had their intended effect, and of the outcomes achieved. Actions identified as necessary:

- Details of who is responsible for implementation of actions
- Timescale for implementation
- Timescale and actions for review, and
- Details of how the effects of the actions will be evaluated to measure if expected outcomes are achieved in practice.

<b>Summary of EIA review:</b>			
<b>Signature of EDS Lead endorsing the EIA:</b>		Date to review EIA	
<b>PRINT NAME</b>		Date completed	

**Descriptions of Protected Characteristics**

<b>Age</b>	Where this is referred to, it refers to a person belonging to a particular age (e.g. 32 year olds) or range of ages (e.g. 18 - 30 year olds).
<b>Disability</b>	A person has a disability if s/he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. <i>(Covering mental, physical and learning disability, physical disability, sensory impairment and mental health problems should be included in this section)</i>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	The process of transitioning from one gender to another.
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	Marriage is defined as a 'union between a man and a woman'. Same-sex couples can have their relationships legally recognised as 'civil partnerships'. Civil partners must be treated the same as married couples on a wide range of legal matters.
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	Pregnancy is the condition of being pregnant or expecting a baby. Maternity refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth, and this includes treating a woman unfavourably because she is breastfeeding.
<b>Race</b>	Refers to the protected characteristic of Race. It refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.
<b>Religion and belief</b>	Religion has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (e.g. Atheism). Generally, a belief should affect your life choices or the way you live for it to be included in the definition.
<b>Sex</b>	A man or a woman.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015****REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES****LEAD OFFICER: PAUL BROCKLEHURST – HEAD OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT & TECHNOLOGY****SUBJECT: APPROVAL TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL MICROSOFT LICENCES FOR OFFICE 365 AND ASSOCIATED IMPLEMENTATION****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The council's Corporate Strategy, agreed by Cabinet in February 2015, highlighted the importance of a digital strategy in the delivery of services to residents and delivering corporate priorities. An important element of the digital approach is technology which will facilitate collaboration across public services for the benefit of residents, and provide the right tools to enable staff to work flexibly. Implementation of the strategy will be undertaken in phases with reviews of current technology and as part of this, a move to Microsoft Office 365 for the council's email and calendar systems is recommended. The adoption of Microsoft Office 365 for this functionality will facilitate document collaboration across boundaries and will enable staff to work from anywhere and using any device.

This report seeks approval from Cabinet to award an extension to the existing Microsoft Enterprise Agreement to Specialist Computer Centre for the provision of Microsoft Office 365 licences to commence on 1 July 2015, and for implementation costs for Office 365.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

1. The council migrates its email and calendar system from Lotus Notes to Microsoft Office 365, purchases extended licences as described in this report, and engages with Microsoft and other implementation partners to assist with the migration.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The adoption of Microsoft for the council's email and calendar requirements will facilitate the delivery of the council's digital strategy. The new system will enable collaborative working with partners and will deliver enhanced flexibility. The technology will ensure that the council's technical platforms are modern and comparable with the very best technologies in both the public and private sectors.

<b><u>DETAILS:</u></b>
------------------------

### **Background and options considered**

8. Surrey has been a long-time user of Microsoft Office as a productivity tool, which is utilised by over 90% of organisations globally and is universally recognised as “Best in class”.
9. The Enterprise Agreement (PSA09) was signed in 2009 and was recognised as the most commercially advantageous agreement that Surrey could sign at this time.
10. The Head of Information Management and Technology and Surrey’s Chief Digital Officer considered at length how Office 365 would support Surrey’s Digital agenda and presented their findings to a Cabinet meeting on the 25 November 2014 where Office 365 adoption was verified to support Surrey’s Digital aspirations
11. The recommendation to move email from Lotus Notes to Office 365 is based on the following:
  - Office 365 is universally recognised as industry standard software, and using it is recognised widely as best practice. It is also similar in look-and-feel to email applications users often use at home.
  - Office 365 allows access to non-sensitive email from any device (including home PCs), allowing users to work more flexibly. This is especially important as we have in the region of 4000 users who don’t have SCC provided equipment
  - People with skills in Office 365 are easier to find. It has become more expensive and hard to find Lotus Notes expertise due to reducing skills available in the market.
  - The look-and-feel of the different applications within the Office 365 suite is very similar, reducing time for users to learn new applications, or find features.
  - The Office 365 platform offers key security compliance guarantees; including exacting information on where Surrey’s “Data at Rest” (where our information is located).
  - Office 365 has integration support from over 90,000 software partners in the IT industry – therefore allows for Surrey to be flexible in the solutions chosen when going to the market for new products that will need to integration with our productivity suite. Other vendor offerings have far reduced capability in this area.
  - Office 365 gives Surrey the opportunity to have mail located in-house and in the Microsoft cloud all through the same software. This is advantageous should we need to move our data back in-house quickly – or subsets as required (Sensitive PSN data for example). Other vendor offerings are cloud-only and commit us fully to their services.



- Office 365 has in-built support to enable integration with many other applications used by council staff. The council has had to spend significant time and money on bespoke developments to integrate these with Lotus Notes. Office 365 integrates already with a number of enhancements made to systems such as SAP or Norwell (legal case management) – where competing offerings from other vendors do not.
- Better collaboration opportunities with partners, districts and boroughs, all of whom are using a Microsoft-based email platform. This includes East Sussex County Council, and would enable us to have a unified mail platform for Orbis.

## **Implementation**

12. The project to implement Office 365 is in planning, looking at the best approach for implementation, taking into account any consultancy and support that Microsoft can offer. In parallel, the project team is gathering details of user requirements which will inform the phasing and speed of the rollout. Present plans are looking to start a pilot in Q3 2015, with a completion by Q2 2016.

## **Business Case**

13. This report seeks approval to increase the licence commitment from £0.9m to £1.4m per annum to reflect the migration to Office 365.
14. Surrey has done an extensive amount of work evaluating alternative Mail and Calendaring systems to the current Lotus Notes system with Microsoft Office 365 being considered the best suited for Surrey's ambitions. This will add an additional cost of £0.26m to the Enterprise agreement for upgrades to key software, and up to £0.1m for the Office 365 E3 licences, which will be purchased on a per-user, per-month basis. We will also have the capability to purchase "kiosk" licences for non-corporate IT users such as school lunchtime supervisors, to enable them access to Surrey's systems. This will cost a further £0.1m for 4000 users. However, these only need to be purchased on a per-user, per-month basis.
15. Following migration part of the Lotus Notes licences will no longer be required, saving the council £0.1m per annum.
16. To effect this change of moving from "Lotus Notes" email system Microsoft has committed to £73,741 of Consultancy support for technical design, implementation and migration, at no cost to the council.
17. This report recommends that the current framework contract for the provision of Microsoft Licences to commence on 1 July 2015 is awarded to Specialist Computer Centre under the Sprint II government Framework. The price that the Licence Agreement reseller has quoted is regulated and has been benchmarked by the Crown Commercial Service (CCS).
18. There are additional implementation costs for project management, training, co-existent software and possibly some time from an implementation partner. The estimated cost of implementation is £550,000, which is provided for in the IMT budget.

## Procurement Strategy

19. This new agreement will future proof MS licensing and reduce future expenditure. This purchase of Microsoft licences ensures the council remain fully compliant during the proposed Equipment Desktop refresh in 2015/16.
20. There has been no negotiation of a new agreement as Surrey will remain on PSA09 for one more year and the Licence Agreement Reseller is the incumbent with a regulated % uplift on licences which has been benchmarked with CCS.
21. The PRG (Procurement Review Group) has approved the structure of the agreement and the associated commercial obligations.

## Key Implications

22. By awarding a contract to Specialist Computer Centre for the provision of Microsoft licences to commence on 1 July 2015 the Council will be ensuring that we are fully compliant with Microsoft's licensing during the desktop refresh programme and during migration of email systems to Office 365.
23. IMT Contract managers will manage licences in conjunction with Specialist Computer Centre. Due to the flexibility of the agreement to contract according to the council's usage, there will never be any wastage or "Over Licensing".
24. The management responsibility for the contract lies with IMT Contract Management and will be managed in line with the Contract Management Strategy and plan as laid out in the contract documentation improvements in performance.

## Competitive Tendering Process

25. The licenses will be procured with the reseller Specialist Computer Centres using the Sprint II Framework which was let by the Crown Commercial Services. The uplift on cost price is 1.9%.

## **CONSULTATION:**

26. Over the last few months, Procurement and IMT have been meeting with several market suppliers to ascertain the most appropriate licensing option. Various MS licensing options (Select, EA, and ESA) have been considered and evaluated against our requirement and best value for money.
27. Extensive consultation has also taken place with the Software Licensing team at Crown Commercial Services (CCS) to determine what is the most appropriate license structure for Surrey's future ambitions.
28. Various partner resellers have been consulted but due to the fact that there is only one year left to run of PSA09 and due to the fact that the uplift is regulated and benchmarked it has been decided to remain with Specialist Computer Centres to contract under the Framework "Sprint II".

## **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

29. The following key risks associated with the contract and contract award have been identified, along with mitigation activities:

Category	Risk Description	Mitigation Activity
Financial	Surrey need to ensure that licensing remains compliant, or may be subject to legal action from Microsoft	Award Contract
Reputational	Surrey need to ensure that licensing remains compliant, or may be subject to action from Microsoft	Award Contract
Service	Lotus Notes is no longer able to support the ambitions of Surrey.	Update existing infrastructure to migrate from Lotus Notes to Microsoft Office 365
Customer Impact	During transition to Office 365, there will be a period of overlap with Lotus Notes	Purchase co-existence tools to ensure that customer experience is as seamless as possible
Customer Impact	Some users will only be familiar with Lotus Notes	Appropriate training and communications will be employed. Extensive training resources are available from Microsoft.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

30. Implementation of Office 365 will start with a pilot in August 2015. This licence purchase is necessary to provide the base platform for the implementation. Bulk purchasing the licences in advance has enabled the provision of £73,741 of consultancy from Microsoft that would not have been available if the licences were purchased piecemeal.

31. The licences for Office 365 are in two parts:

- £264,000, additional spend on enterprise licences to make us "ready" for Office 365
- £160,000 (max) for the Office 365 licences themselves – these only need to be paid on a "per-user, per-month" basis.

The enterprise licences need to be purchased in advance, at licence renewal (June 2015). There is no advantage to purchasing these licences at another time, as the cost is per year, from July 2015-June 2016. Purchasing them at any other point during the year will cost the same, but incur more administration costs.

32. There are additional implementation costs for project management, training, and possibly some time from an implementation partner. The estimated cost of implementation is £550,000, which is provided for in the IMT budget.

33. Migrating to Office 365 will result in

- a more efficient workforce, as non-PSN email will be available to users at home
- reduced infrastructure costs (as the bulk of the organisation's email will be stored in the cloud – this is appropriate and cost-effective for the type of data stored)
- lower costs in training of staff, as Microsoft skills are more prevalent
- improved responsiveness to business-drive demand, as less costly customisations will be required
- more streamlined interfacing to partners (districts, boroughs and neighbouring councils), who all use Microsoft-based email

34. If this licence purchase isn't made, this will delay the move to Office 365, and incur ongoing costs for Lotus Notes. It will block the capability to integrate email with line-of-business applications; reduce workforce flexibility; and reduce the capability for partnership working.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

35. The Section 151 Officer confirms the report clearly sets out the reasons for the recommendations to extend the council's subscription of Microsoft Licences and to migrate the council's email from Lotus Notes to Office 365. The additional cost of £0.4m for licences and £0.6m for implementation can be met from within existing budgets.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

36. It is recommended that approval be given to purchase the licences for a one-year period so that we can legally use the Microsoft software and remain fully compliant.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

37. An equalities impact assessment will be carried out as part of the implementation of this project.

#### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

38. The timetable for implementation is as follows:

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Cabinet decision to award (including 'call in' period)	03 June 2015
'Alcatel' Standstill Period	n/a
Contract Signature	15 June 2015
Contract Commencement Date	01 July 2015

**Contact Officer:**

Peter Sullivan, Infrastructure Solutions Manager

**Consulted:**

Paul Brocklehurst, Head of IMT

Paul Todd, Senior Category Specialist, Procurement

Peter Sullivan, IMT Technical Architect

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 26 MAY 2015**

**REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

**LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUILDING CLEANING SERVICES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL PREMISES**



#### **SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report seeks approval to award a framework agreement for the provision of Building Cleaning Services for Administrative and Operational Premises for the benefit of the Council to commence on 1 August 2015 as detailed in the recommendations as the current arrangements expire on 31 July 2015.

The report provides details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process and, in conjunction with the Part 2 report, demonstrates why the recommended framework agreement and contract award delivers best value for money.

Due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the framework agreement and contract award process the financial details of the potential suppliers have been circulated as a Part 2 report.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

1. The framework agreement is awarded to Servest Group Limited for two years from 1 August 2015 with an option to extend for two further periods of one year each.
2. An immediate call-off contract under the framework agreement is placed with Servest Group Limited for the Council for two years with an option to extend for two further periods of one year each.

#### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirements of Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. The recommendations provide best value for money for building cleaning services for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

The framework agreement as awarded sets out the terms and conditions under

---

which a specific purchase known as a call-off contract can be made on behalf of the Council during the term of the agreement.

## **DETAILS:**

### **Background**

1. The framework agreement provides a robust and flexible building cleaning service to the Council and other named users of the framework for a range of administrative and operational premises. The agreement supports the Council's ability to provide a high quality provision of cleaning across the Council estate with a competitive schedule of rates that represents value for money and clear monitoring measures to ensure a quality service is maintained. The current arrangement expires on 31 July 2015.
2. The framework agreement allows other named bodies including borough and district councils within Surrey, Surrey Choices Ltd and Police and Crime Commissioner's Office to utilise the framework agreement for their own buildings.

### **Procurement Strategy and Options**

3. A full tender process, compliant with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders, has been carried out using the Council e-Procurement systems following review by the Procurement Review Group (PRG) on 16 December 2014. This included advertising the contract opportunity in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) on 9 January 2015.
4. Several procurement options were considered when completing the Strategic Procurement Plan (SPP) prior to commencing the procurement activity. These included the following options:
  - a) continue to provide the service with the incumbent contractor;
  - b) place a call-off contract from either an East Sussex County Council Framework Agreement or framework agreement provided by other external organisations;
  - c) undertake a tender exercise and establish a framework agreement.
5. After a full and detailed options analysis, the tender process described in paragraph 4(c) was chosen. This option was selected as the option as described in 4(a) did not present an opportunity to address service levels while also obtaining best value for the Council. Option 4(b) was rejected as either the specifications for the frameworks did not meet the requirements of the Council or they had not yet been awarded with attendant pricing released for comparison and benchmarking.
6. All suppliers who expressed an interest in the tender were invited to tender for the framework agreement.

### **Key Implications**



- 7. By awarding a contract to the supplier as recommended for the provision of Building Cleaning Services to commence on 1 August 2015, the Council will be meeting its obligations to provide a quality service for the Council and ensuring best value for money for this service.
- 8. The Council, as part of the tender documentation, released detailed information and specifications for each building in the Council's portfolio, and suppliers were given the opportunity to survey each building to inform their submissions for the tender. This has had a positive effect with a reduced core contract cost compared to the current supplier.
- 9. There will be a seven week mobilisation period with the requirements for staff transfer from the incumbent supplier to the incoming supplier addressed by both organisations in respect of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) which is applicable to this contract. As part of the tender process suppliers were provided information from the incumbent supplier in respect of all staff transferring to the incoming supplier and as required all confirmed that their tendered sum included TUPE costs with no adjustments to be permitted following award.
- 10. Performance will be monitored through regular management meetings and ongoing 'real time' information provided by the supplier and as specified in the tender documents in respect of satisfying the published key performance indicators. Property Services will ensure that the performance regime is used to ensure the supplier performs to requirements and continues to improve the service to achieve and maintain a high standard.
- 11. The management responsibility for the contract lies with the contract performance officer for Property Services, Business Services. The schedule of rates will be fixed for the initial term of the contract and then reviewed on an annual basis. Any extensions will be subject to RPIX increases at the discretion of the Council after negotiation with the supplier.

**Competitive Tendering Process**

- 12. The contracts have been tendered following a competitive tendering exercise using an open process.
- 13. All suppliers expressing an interest in the advertised tender opportunity were invited to tender for the contract and were given 42 days to complete and submit their tender. A total of 13 tender responses were received.
- 14. Tender submissions were initially evaluated against selection criteria including Good Standing, Insurance Requirements, Financial Information, Health and Safety and Equalities, Quality Assurance and Sustainability, Social Value and Business Continuity which all suppliers passed. Tender submissions were then scored against the quality and commercial award criteria and weightings as shown below.

Award Criteria	Weighting
----------------	-----------

Section A – Staffing and Recruitment	7%
Section B - Performance	7%
Section C – Contract Management and Supervision	7%
Section D – Contract Mobilisation	6%
Section E – Health & Safety (for the contract)	6%
Section F - Environmental	7%
Section G – Case Study	10%
Price	50%

#### **CONSULTATION:**

15. Key internal stakeholders have been consulted at all stages of the commissioning and procurement process including Procurement, Legal Services, Property Services and Finance.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

16. Risks were appropriately identified and have been satisfactorily mitigated. These risks and action to mitigate include:
- a) Cost – the price is only fixed for the initial two years of the contract. Increases are possible after the initial two year contract term has ended, however these will be negotiated with the supplier prior to any contract extension being granted.
  - b) Stability – the supplier is not financially stable resulting in the supplier no longer being able to provide the services. Annual checks will be undertaken on the supplier to monitor spend on the framework agreement and call-off contracts.
  - c) Reputation – high profile buildings are used by external organisations so high cleaning standards need to be maintained. Ongoing performance monitoring will be undertaken by the supplier and the Council to maintain standards.
17. The contract includes termination provisions to allow the Council to terminate the agreement with a three month notice period should circumstances change. Termination or expiry of the framework agreement will not affect the validity of any call-off contract in force at the date of such termination or expiry, and if terminated the Council will only be liable to pay to the supplier sums due for services provided up to the date of termination.
18. All suppliers successfully completed satisfactory financial checks. The successful contractor will be required to provide either a Parent Company Guarantee or Performance Bond against failure.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

19. Full details of the framework agreement and call-off contract for the Council values and financial implications are set out in the Part 2 report.
20. The procurement activity has delivered a solution which is a reduction against current core contract costs and is therefore within budget.

**Section 151 Officer Commentary**

21. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the cost of the proposed procurement of cleaning services is included within the council’s Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The savings achieved by the procurement will be monitored during the year and recognised in future revisions to the MTFP.

**Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

22. The Council has a Best Value Duty to ensure it ‘makes arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness’. It also has a fiduciary duty to be prudent in its use of resources for the interest of the residents.

23. The contract offers the Council various measures of protection, including requirements that the supplier comply with the Council’s safeguarding and staffing policies, undertake Disclosure and Baring Service checks (formerly CRB checks) and appropriate insurance cover. The contract also requires the supplier to indemnify the Council against all liabilities arising from any deliberate or negligent act, default, omission or breach of the agreement by the supplier or any of its employees or sub-contractors (if any).

**Equalities and Diversity**

24. The current Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) template and guidance was considered. In light of these tender submissions were assessed for adherence to the Council’s Equality and Diversity policy with specific questions requiring response on how staff will uphold and promote the aims of the policy in day-to-day work and how the suppliers will ensure staff comply with their policies and monitor this. From mobilisation and onwards Property Services will monitor the supplier’s adherence to the above and take appropriate action to address any concerns with the supplier. The preferred supplier will be required to comply with all relevant legislation.

**Other Implications:**

25. The potential implications for the following Council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	Lack of competent service will lead to poor cleanliness , discomfort and an unhygienic environment for the Council’s staff and building users – this will be addressed through continual performance monitoring
Public Health	Lack of competent service will lead to poor cleanliness , discomfort and an unhygienic environment for the Council’s staff and building users – this will be addressed through continual performance monitoring

Climate change	Supplier will be expected to use environmentally friendly cleaning materials where possible as well as following the Council's policy on recycling
Carbon emissions	Supplier will be expected to meet the Council's standards for any vehicle emissions and use energy efficient appliances and equipment

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

26. The timetable for implementation is as follows:

Action	Date
Cabinet decision to award	26 May 2015
Cabinet call in period	27 May to 1 June 2015
'Alcatel' Standstill Period	2 June to 11 June 2015
Contract Signature	June 2015
Contract Commencement Date	1 August 2015

27. The Council has an obligation to allow unsuccessful suppliers the opportunity to challenge the proposed framework and contract award. This period is referred to as the 'Alcatel' standstill period.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Sara Walton, Category Specialist – Procurement and Commissioning, Business Services,  
Tel: 020 8541 7750

**Consulted:**

None applicable for external

**Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details attached to agenda as item 18.

---

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 26 MAY 2015**

**REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**  
**MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**



**LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER**  
**PETER- JOHN WILKINSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**SUBJECT: HINCHLEY WOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL, ESHER**

#### **SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of Hinchley Wood Primary School from a 2 Form of Entry Primary (420 places) to a 3 Form of Entry Primary (630 places) creating 210 additional places in Claygate to help meet the basic need requirements in the Claygate area from September 2016.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 18 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 1 Form of Entry (210 places) primary places in Esher be approved.

#### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Esher area.

#### **DETAILS:**

##### **Background**

1. There has been an increasing trend in the demand for places in primary schools in Elmbridge. Despite both temporary and permanent expansions of a number of local schools in The Dittons and Weston Green area there remains a need for one more permanent form of entry. This will ensure a sufficiency of places up to the end of the current forecast period which is 2024.
2. Hinchley Wood Primary is a popular and successful school which delivers high quality education. It was rated by OFSTED at its last inspection (May 2012) as a good school and is consistently over-subscribed. The proposed provision of 210 additional places at Hinchley Wood therefore meets the Government's policy position to expand successful schools in order to meet parental preferences.

3. The Dittons and Weston Green is one of the primary place planning areas most under pressure in Elmbridge Borough. The combined Published Admission Number is 330 Reception class places per year although the Local Authority has been able to increase the local capacity by supplying 390 places in recent years. This has largely been achieved through schools taking temporary expansions or 'bulge' classes.
4. Although the birth rate seems to have now slowed, the forecast data, (which includes proposed new housing that has already been granted planning permission), indicates that there is an ongoing requirement for around 370 places per year up to 2024. Some of this demand will be met by rebuilding Cranmere Primary School and increasing its overall capacity to 630 places in 2016, but there is a clear need for one more permanent form of entry to add capacity and allow for in year admissions.
5. Hinchley Wood Primary School has recently taken a number of 'bulge' classes to help meet the rising demand in the area and has taken additional students in 2012, 2013 and 2014. So, in three of its seven year groups, it is already three forms of entry. It now has just over 500 pupils on roll and if it expands it would have 630. Its Governors and Headteacher have indicated a willingness to permanently expand providing that they are given accommodation to meet their needs. The campus is considered sufficiently large to enable expansion.
6. It is proposed that the school has extensions to provide five new junior classrooms and a new kitchen and a small dining room, which will operate in addition to the existing school hall, which could only accommodate pupils in several sittings. A new kitchen is required as the primary school is no longer able to use the kitchen and dining facilities at the adjacent Academy (Hinchley Wood Secondary School) as the facilities are at their capacity and could not meet the capacity demands of the larger primary school intake. The proposed plan would also entail the removal of the temporary double modular building, which will be utilised on another site.

A planning application has been submitted and a decision is expected at the Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting on 15 July 2015.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

7. Public consultation was undertaken on this proposal in September 2014. A consultation document was published and all statutory stakeholders including parents and local residents were informed. In addition, a public meeting was held at the school on 2 October 2014.
8. The results of the public consultation were summarised in the report to the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning on 21 November 2014.
9. The consultation meeting was attended by 19 people and the council received fifty written responses of which 20 respondents agreed, 19 disagreed and 11 were undecided. The number of objections were largely based on parents' concerns about being able to transition to Hinchley Wood Secondary School, but that school has since named 'feeders' within its catchment area and has included Hinchley Wood Primary School. There was a detailed written response from the Governing Body of St Mary's Church of England Voluntary Aided Junior School, Long Ditton, objecting to the proposal on the grounds that it would create surplus junior places at their school and pupils would have less

of a chance at securing a place at Hinchley Wood secondary school based on home to school distance. Hinchley Wood has since altered its Admissions Arrangements to include named feeder primary schools including St Mary's. There is no current evidence of excessive surplus junior places in this planning area.

10. Since the publication of notices there have been no formal representations on this proposal.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

11. Hinchley Wood Primary School is on a tight access arrangements which will need careful planning. The preferred option is to extend the existing building in order to suite classrooms into year groups and provide a kitchen and dining facilities. The delivery team will work closely with the school's management and contractor to manage construction risks and ensure the site is safe for pupils, staff and visitors.
12. The planning application will be considered by the Local Authority's Planning and Regulatory Committee at its meeting on the 15 July 2015.
13. There are risks associated with the project and a project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. A contingency allowance appropriate to the scheme has been included within the project budget to mitigate for potential unidentified risks.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

14. The project will be subject to robust cost challenge and scrutiny to drive optimum value as it progresses. Further financial details are set out in the report circulated in Part 2 of the agenda. These details have been circulated separately to ensure commercial sensitivity in the interests of securing best value.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

15. The funding for this scheme is included in the 2015/20 Medium Term Financial Plan.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

16. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on a Local Authority (with responsibility for education) to ensure sufficient primary and secondary education provision is available to meet the needs of the population in its area.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

17. The expansion of the school will not create any issues, which would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment.
18. The new school building will comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations. The expanded school will provide employment opportunities in the area.

19. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. The Admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the Special Educational Needs (SEN) register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.
20. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after schools clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

#### **Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

21. This proposal would provide increased provision for primary places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This means it would therefore also be of benefit to any looked after children who will attend the school.

#### **Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

22. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy.

#### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

If approved, to proceed to complete tenders and subsequent contract award through delegated decision.

#### **Contact Officer:**

Keith Brown, Schools and Programme Manager – tel: 020 8541 8651  
Melanie Harris, School Commissioning Officer – tel: 020 8541 9556

#### **Consulted:**

Tony Samuels, Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration  
Mike Bennison, Local Member: Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott  
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Business Services  
Paula Chowdhury, Strategic Finance Manager – Business Services

#### **Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details

#### **Sources/background papers:**

- The Education Act 1996
- The School Standards Framework Act 1998
- The Education Act 2002
- The Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Report to Cabinet: Schools Capital Budget Allocations Service update based on latest or most appropriate report year and version





This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015****REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES****MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER  
PETER- JOHN WILKINSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****SUBJECT: WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOKING****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of Westfield Primary School from a 2 Form of Entry Primary (420 places) by 90 places as phase 1 of a 2 phase expansion, to a 3 Form of Entry Primary (630 places) creating 210 additional places in Woking to help meet the basic need requirements in the Woking area from September 2015.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 19 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 90 places as phase 1 of a 2 phase expansion by 1 Form of Entry (210 places) primary places in Woking be approved.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Woking area.

**DETAILS:****Background**

1. The number of primary school places required in Woking is increasing. There are insufficient primary school places to meet this demand and increased primary provision is needed. Westfield Primary School is one of the schools best placed to expand to meet this demand. The demand is such that the expansion of Westfield Primary School is required for September 2015. This proposal alone will not permanently expand the school, but will provide up to 3 years of additional intake at the school. A second phase of building development at the school will be required to enable the full 1 Form of Entry expansion. The second phase of building would require further approval from Cabinet and full statutory consultation.

2. The requirement for school places has increased significantly in Woking. By September 2015, through the school expansion programme, the Council will have provided 1260 additional primary school places at a range of schools within the borough, representing an investment of £14,770,000. This action has been taken to address the additional demand that has arisen as a result of an increased birth rate, which peaked in the Borough in 2012 at 37% above 2002 levels, migration and local building. This proposal is part of a strategic response to this increase in demand.
3. The phased approach enables flexibility as to future provision which will allow the Council to react to potential changes that may result from the approval of future Free Schools. In part, this is to ensure that the Council does not over provide school places in the area and retains the sustainability of the existing pattern of provision.
4. Westfield Primary School was last inspected in 2012 and the school received a 'Good' Judgement. Officers are confident in the schools ability to manage the increase in pupil numbers.
5. The proposal is to provide a modular building providing three classrooms with associated storage, circulation and pupil toilet facilities. The foundations and building structure will allow the addition of a second storey to future proof for the planned phase 2 expansion.
6. The planning application has been submitted and is expected to be considered by the Planning and Regulatory Committee at its meeting on the 15 July 2015.

<b><u>CONSULTATION:</u></b>
-----------------------------

7. Westfield Primary School has existing capacity in its current buildings for 420 pupils and this current proposal does not permanently alter the schools Published Admission Number. The Council's requirement to consult will be reached prior to the commencement of the phase 2 element of the capital build. At that stage there would be a need to undertake formal consultation on this proposal and the need to publish statutory notices to be determined by the Cabinet Member.
8. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning has therefore not received a formal report to consider the publication of notices or to consider representations. Cabinet Member determination of a Statutory Notice will be required prior to the third year in which the school recruits 90 pupils in this case September 2017. It is the intention to undertake consultation in the Autumn Term 2015. The increase in admission number will be the subject of a Council led consultation process, which it is intended will be held for a 4-week period. This process will engage a range of interested stakeholders, including the school community, local admissions authorities and the Surrey School Admissions Forum. Ultimately, the outcome of this consultation will be the subject of a statutory approval process that will report through the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning.
9. Whilst formal consultation is not required at this stage, significant informal consultation has been undertaken by the Local Authority with all primary schools in Woking regarding this proposal for some time and the school governors have consulted their parents and local communities through their existing communication channels.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

10. There are risks associated with the project and a project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. A contingency allowance appropriate to the scheme has been included within the project budget to mitigate for potential unidentified risks.

### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

11. The project will be subject to robust cost challenge and scrutiny to drive optimum value as it progresses. Further financial details are set out in the report circulated in Part 2 of the agenda. These details have been circulated separately to ensure commercial sensitivity in the interests of securing best value.

### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

12. The funding for this scheme is included within the 2015/20 Medium Term Financial Plan.

### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

13. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on a Local Authority (with responsibility for education) to ensure sufficient primary and secondary education provision is available to meet the needs of the population in its area.

### **Equalities and Diversity**

14. The expansion of the school will not create any issues, which would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment.
15. The new school building will comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations. The expanded school will provide employment opportunities in the area.
16. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. The Admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the Special Educational Needs (SEN) register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.
17. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after schools clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

### **Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

18. This proposal would provide increased provision for primary places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This means it would therefore also be of benefit to any looked after children who will attend the school.

**Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

19. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

If approved, to proceed to complete tenders and subsequent contract award through delegated decision.

**Contact Officer:**

Keith Brown, Schools and Programme Manager – tel: 020 8541 8651  
Melanie Harris, School Commissioning Officer – tel: 020 8541 9556

**Consulted:**

Tony Samuels, Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration  
Will Forster, Local Member: Woking South  
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Business Services  
Paula Chowdhury, Strategic Finance Manager – Business Services

**Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details

**Sources/background papers:**

- The Education Act 1996
- The School Standards Framework Act 1998
- The Education Act 2002
- The Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Report to Cabinet: Schools Capital Budget Allocations Service update based on latest or most appropriate report year and version

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015****REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES****MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER****PETER-JOHN WILKINSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****SUBJECT: CRANLEIGH CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL REBUILD****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve the Business Case for the rebuilding of Cranleigh Church of England Primary School, a 1 Form of Entry Infant and 2 Form of Entry Junior provision (330 places), in the grounds of the adjacent Glebelands Secondary School by July 2017 and the disposal of the two existing school sites to release funding to pay for the cost of the proposed scheme.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the rebuilding of the school as set out in agenda item 20 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the rebuilding of the school be approved.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient quality school places to meet the needs of the population in the Cranleigh area.

**DETAILS:****Background**

1. Cranleigh Church of England Primary School was formed by the merger of Cranleigh Infant and St Nicholas Junior Schools in 2008. It currently operates on two sites, with the infant and junior schools some 150 metres apart. The school also houses a Speech, Language and Communications Needs Centre for Key Stage 1 aged children and a nursery. The intention is to rebuild the school within the grounds of the adjacent Glebelands Secondary School site, combining the infant and junior schools, to improve its facilities and management structure.

2. The existing buildings are in poor condition and require extensive maintenance investment and the proposal will address this and reduce future maintenance cost. An application for funding under Priority Schools Building Programme 2 (PSBP2) has been successful. It is intended to vie this funding to the rebuilding of the school. The details of the PSBP2 award are subject to building surveys by the Department of Education's appointed specialists and the announcement of the amount awarded should be made in early 2016.
3. The November 2013 Ofsted rated the school as 'Requires Improvement'. The most recent monitoring inspection of the school by Ofsted in March 2014 was positive about the school's improvement trajectory and this assessment is reinforced by the Council's own monitoring process.
4. This proposal is not a 'prescribed alteration' and the proposal does not alter the schools Published Admission Number.
5. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning has therefore not received a formal report to consider the publication of notices or to consider representations.
6. Whilst formal consultation is not required, significant informal consultation has been undertaken by the school governors with their parents and local communities through their existing communication channels.
7. It is intended to provide 11 classrooms, main hall, studio, nursery, Speech Language and Communication Needs Centre, kitchen, staffroom, administration offices, ancillary spaces, and infrastructure to enable enlargement at a future date if required.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

8. Cranleigh Church of England Primary and Glebelands Schools, have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the rebuilding proposal. A comprehensive agreement will be developed during the scheme's design and development phase.
9. Cranleigh Church of England Primary School has secured the relevant Section 77 agreements with the DfE for the change of use of the Glebelands playing field, and disposal of the existing school sites.
10. A number of meetings have been held with the Surrey County Council Local Member, School Governors and Headteachers of Cranleigh Church of England Primary and Glebelands Schools, to inform them of progress, these will continue throughout the life of the project.
11. Several briefings and communications have been held with representatives of the Diocese regarding the rebuild. An agreement will be developed between the Local Authority and the Diocese regarding the contribution of their element of the proceeds towards the proposed rebuild of the school.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

12. There are risks associated with the project and a project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. A contingency allowance appropriate to the



scheme has been included within the proposed project budget to mitigate for potential identified risks.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

13. The project will be subject to robust cost challenge and scrutiny to drive optimum value as it progresses. Further financial details are set out in the report circulated in Part 2 of the agenda. These details have been circulated separately to ensure commercial sensitivity in the interests of securing best value.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

14. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the full financial implications of this scheme are being considered and the details are included in Part 2.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

15. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on a Local Authority (with responsibility for education) to ensure sufficient primary and secondary education provision is available to meet the needs of the population in its area.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

16. The relocation of the school will not create any issues, which would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment.
17. The new school building will comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations. The expanded school will provide employment opportunities in the area.
18. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. The Admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the Special Educational Needs (SEN) register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.
19. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after schools clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

#### **Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

20. This proposal would provide improved provision for school places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This means it would therefore also be of benefit to any looked after children who will attend the school.

### **Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

21. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authorities adopted core planning strategy.

### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

If approved, to proceed to complete tenders, together with the disposal of the two school sites and subsequent contract award through delegated decision. That Surrey County Council sign an Access Agreement to the new Southern Construction Framework.

#### **Contact Officer:**

Philip Roche, Senior Project Manager – tel: 020 8541 8910  
Kathy Beresford, School Commissioning Officer – tel: 020 8541 9689

#### **Consulted:**

Tony Samuels, Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration  
Mr Alan Young, Local Member – Cranleigh and Ewhurst  
Local Member Waverley Borough Council  
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director, Business Services  
Paula Chowdhury, Strategic Finance Manager – Business Services  
Julie Stockdale, Head of Schools Commissioning and Admissions  
John Stebbings, Chief Property Officer  
Rev D Holbird Guildford Diocese  
School Governors and Leadership

#### **Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details attached to agenda

#### **Sources/background papers:**

- The Education Act 1996
- The School Standards Framework Act 1998
- The Education Act 2002
- The Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Report to Cabinet: Schools Capital Budget Allocations Service update based on latest or most appropriate report year and version
- Site Valuation Report- March 2015

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 26 MAY 2015**



**REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

**MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER**

**PETER- JOHN WILKINSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**SUBJECT: BISHOP DAVID BROWN SECONDARY SCHOOL, WOKING**

#### **SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of Bishop David Brown Secondary School from a 5 Form of Entry Secondary (750 places) to a 6 Form of Entry Secondary (900 places) creating 150 additional places in Woking to help meet the basic need requirements in the Woking area from September 2016.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 21 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional Form of Entry (150 places) secondary places in Woking be approved.

#### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Woking area.

#### **DETAILS:**

##### **Background**

1. Secondary demand follows primary demand and Woking has already reached a point where additional secondary school places are required. Demand is forecast to increase in 2015 and to increase significantly from 2017 and 2018. In the longer term, the Local Authority is planning to need between 9 and 10 additional forms of entry in Woking by 2021. This need equates to a total of 1350 to 1500 additional secondary places, where 'one form of entry' equals 150 secondary places based on 5 year groups (ages 7-11) of 30 pupils. The forecasts indicate that demand for entry of year 7 places will increase from 880 pupils in 2015 to 1150 pupils in 2021. The rise in demand is not simply linear, it is anticipated that

there would be a 1 form entry requirement in 2015, rising to 3 forms in 2017, 6 in 2018 and 9 to 10 by 2021.

2. The Local Authority is of the view that in Woking Borough Bishop David Brown and St John the Baptist both have the capacity for expansion, but that Woking High School and Winston Churchill Secondary School could not be expanded further than they have already, without significantly constraining the quality of educational provision that they can offer. The overarching approach is to provide an additional form of entry at Bishop David Brown School, to assume that there will be at least 4 forms of entry at the Hoe Valley Free School and a further 2 forms of entry at an expanded St John the Baptist School. It is anticipated that any further capacity in the future would be provided at the Hoe Valley Free School, or if required, at Bishop David Brown School through further expansion.
3. In June 2014, the Government approved the proposed Hoe Valley Free School, which is due to open at 4 forms of entry (120 year 7 places) in the South Woking area from 2015. Given the scale of demand indicated above, the Local Authority is generally supportive of the Hoe Valley School and has worked with the proposers as their plans have progressed. Following the Government announcement, Hoe Valley are now in the 'pre-opening phase' which means that further work is taking place with Woking Borough Council and the Education Funding Agency to provide temporary buildings and then a permanent site and building from which this school will operate. The Local Authority, as the responsible body, must ensure that there are sufficient school places in the future should the Hoe Valley Free School proposal be delayed.
4. Given the lead in times for construction projects, the relative uncertainties of the current place planning environment and the likelihood that the places will be needed in the future (whether in the shorter or longer term), it is recommended that the Local Authority proceed with providing additional capacity at Bishop David Brown School by 2016.
5. Bishop David Brown School has a 'Good' Ofsted rating in all areas from its last inspection in April 2014. We are confident in the schools ability to manage the increase in pupil numbers whilst maintaining education standards.

### **Links with New Vision Homes Proposals in Sheerwater**

6. This proposal is independent from the Sheerwater regeneration proposals currently being considered by Woking Borough Council. This is because the future pressure on secondary school places in Woking exists irrespective of how the regeneration proposals in Sheerwater develop. Now that Woking Borough Council have given approval to New Vision Homes to continue with the master planning process and with a planning application expected towards the end of the year, the Local Authority is mindful of the additional pupil yield that will be generated from the additional 350-500 additional dwellings planned in the area (not taken into account in the above profile). The proposed expansion of Bishop David Brown will help meet any additional demand for secondary school places generated by the development in the future.
7. As part of the master planning process, the Project Team at New Vision Homes has been working in partnership with Woking Borough Council, Surrey County Council (SCC), Broadmere Community Primary School and Bishop David Brown Secondary School to develop an outline proposal for enhanced recreational

facilities including a Leisure Centre that it is intended will be shared between the two schools and the wider community. This would be funded by the developer.

8. Modern sporting facilities will be of great benefit both to Bishop David Brown School and to Broadmere Primary School. On this basis, SCC and Governors of Bishop David Brown have agreed 'in principle' to the location of these facilities on the existing school site (in-between both schools) on the basis that the facilities (including a four court sports hall) will be available to the schools during school hours and the local community outside of those hours.
9. If approved, works on the recreational facilities could start on the site as early as 2016 so for this reason it would be better to have completed any enlargement of premises at Bishop David Brown School in advance of this date to avoid multiple contractors on site and undue disruption to the school.
10. The expansion proposals for Bishop David Brown School consist of the construction of an extension providing two classrooms and associated storage and internal remodeling including general classrooms, science laboratories, ICT suites and associated corridors. External works include the relocation of some drainage, footpaths, ramps, paving and external lighting.
11. The opportunity will be taken to undertake a proposed planned maintenance windows replacement, as part of the scheme, in order to attain greater value and reduce disruption.
12. A planning application was submitted on 15 April 2015 and is expected to go to Surrey County Councils Planning and Regulatory Committee in July 2015.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

13. The Local Authority published a consultation document to all statutory stakeholders on 10 September 2014 and held a public meeting at the school on 23 September 2014 to hear the views of parents, residents and other interested parties. The deadline for all responses to the consultation was 3 October 2014. A total of 25 formal written responses were received during the consultation via the Surrey Says website and email. The responses included 11 from parents of children currently attending the school, and a further 6 from parents of children attending other schools or considering sending children to Bishop David Brown in the future.
14. Of the 25 written responses, 8 agreed with the proposal to expand the school, 14 disagreed with the proposal and 3 did not know or offer a position. Responses to this consultation were reported to the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning on 17 October 2014 who, following consideration of comments and officer responses agreed to proceed with the publication of a Statutory Notice, which was determined by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning on the 15 January 2015.
15. A Statutory Notice was published on 24 October in the local paper and displayed at the school gate. No formal responses were received against this notice.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

16. There are risks associated with the project and a project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. A contingency allowance appropriate to the scheme has been included within the project budget to mitigate for potential identified risks.

### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

17. The project will be subject to robust cost challenge and scrutiny to drive optimum value as it progresses. Further financial details are set out in the report circulated as item 22 in Part 2 of the agenda. These details have been circulated separately to ensure commercial sensitivity in the interests of securing best value.

### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

18. The Section 151 Officer confirms that this scheme is included in the 2015/20 Medium Term Financial Plan and that a contribution from capital maintenance will be made towards the scheme for the replacement of the windows at the school.

### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

19. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on a Local Authority (with responsibility for education) to ensure sufficient primary and secondary education provision is available to meet the needs of the population in its area.

### **Equalities and Diversity**

20. The expansion of the school will not create any issues, which would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment.
21. The new school building will comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations. The expanded school will provide employment opportunities in the area.
22. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. The admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the Special Educational Needs (SEN) register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria, which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.
23. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after school clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

### **Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

24. This proposal would provide increased provision for secondary places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This means it would therefore also be of benefit to any Looked After Children who will attend the school.

### **Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

25. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authorities adopted core planning strategy.

### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

If approved, to proceed to complete tenders and subsequent contract award through delegated decision.

#### **Contact Officer:**

Keith Brown, Schools and Programme Manager – tel: 020 8541 8651  
Nicholas Smith, School Commissioning Officer – tel: 020 8541 8902

#### **Consulted:**

Tony Samuels, Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration Programmes  
Mr Ben Carasco, SCC Local Member – Woking North  
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Business Services  
Paula Chowdhury, Strategic Finance Manager – Business Services

#### **Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details attached to agenda

#### **Sources/background papers:**

- The Education Act 1996
- The School Standards Framework Act 1998
- The Education Act 2002
- The Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Report to Cabinet: Schools Capital Budget Allocations Service update based on latest or most appropriate report year and version

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015**

**REPORT OF: MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**  
**MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**LEAD OFFICER: JOHN STEBBINGS, CHIEF PROPERTY OFFICER**  
**PETER-JOHN WILKINSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**SUBJECT: ST ANN'S HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL, VIRGINIA WATER****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To approve the Business Case for the expansion of St Ann's Heath Junior School from a two Form of Entry junior (240 places) to a three Form of Entry junior (360 places) creating 120 additional places in Virginia Water to help meet the basic need requirements in the Virginia Water area from September 2015.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 22 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional Form of Entry (120 places) junior places in Virginia Water be approved.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Virginia Water area.

**DETAILS:****Business Case**

1. Numbers of children starting school in The Virginia Water and Englefield Green area have been increasing. There were not enough permanent reception places in September 2012 for those that needed them. Therefore, an additional bulge class was provided at Trumps Green Infant School and the school has now been permanently expanded by 1 Form of Entry. Additional junior places are now needed.
2. St Ann's Heath Junior School has been pursued as the school that should expand to provide the additional junior places that are required and a full statutory

consultation and approval process has been undertaken that approved the expansion on 21 November 2012.

3. The expansion of Trumps Green Infant School from 2013 to offer an additional 30 places per year group feeds directly into this scheme to expand St Ann's Heath Junior School. The established route of education for children attending Trumps Green Infant School has historically been by feeder link to St Ann's Heath Junior for Key Stage 2 provision. It is necessary to be able to maintain the security of this educational route, and also to fully meet the increased junior demand that has been created as a result of this infant expansion. This combination can only be achieved by the expansion of St Ann's Heath Junior School.
4. St Jude's CE (A) Junior School is the only other junior school within the planning area, it was not considered as a favourable option for expansion. The spaces provided at infant level (Trumps Green Infant) are a significant distance from that school, which is situated in Egham (Englefield Green) to provide places at that school would necessitate pupils travelling from a wider area to attend and would not meet the existing pattern of provision. As an aided school St Jude's also has specific admission arrangements to reflect its denomination, these currently give advantage to pupils who worship within the parish of St Jude's, expansion would therefore not provide directly for the increase in demand in the Virginia Water area. Additionally the site at St Jude's Junior schools is significantly smaller at 17,760m<sup>2</sup> then that of St Ann's Heath, at 30,523m<sup>2</sup> making options for expansion more difficult at the St Jude's site.
5. St Ann's Heath School was last inspected in 2013 and received a 'Requires Improvement' Judgement. Following that inspection the school has received significant support and intervention from Council improvement programmes. The latest Council monitoring report details, 'improvements in performance' and projected 'significant improvement going forward. Officers are confident in the schools ability to manage the increase in pupil numbers.
6. The proposal consists of the relocation and refurbishment of a four classroom modular building currently on another Surrey school site. Other works include additional car parking and improvements to the existing car parking. A new entrance into the site from the highway will be provided together with an improved one way access road within the school site to allow a circular in and out arrangement onto the highway.
7. A planning application was submitted in December 2014 and was approved by the Planning & Regulatory Committee on 22 April 2015.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

8. Public consultation was undertaken on this proposal in 2012. A consultation document was published and all statutory stakeholders including parents and local residents were informed.
9. There were 66 formal responses received during this consultation. 85% supported the expansion proposal, 3% neither supported nor opposed the proposal, and 12% of respondents opposed the proposal.
10. Following this consultation the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning approved the publication of Statutory Notices. No responses were received against this notice.

11. On 21 November 2012 the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning determined the Statutory Notice confirming the Councils intention to pursue the expansion of the school.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

12. There are risks associated with the project and project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. A contingency allowance appropriate to the scheme has been included within the project budget to mitigate for potential identified risks.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

13. The project will be subject to robust cost challenge and scrutiny to drive optimum value as they progress. Further financial details are set out in the report circulated as item 23 in Part 2 of the agenda. These details have been circulated separately to ensure commercial sensitivity in the interests of securing best value.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

14. This scheme is included in the 2015/20 medium term financial plan.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

15. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on a Local Authority (with responsibility for education) to ensure sufficient primary and secondary education provision is available to meet the needs of the population in its area.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

16. The expansion of the school will not create any issues, which would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment.
17. The new school building will comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations. The expanded school will provide employment opportunities in the area.
18. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. The admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the Special Educational Needs (SEN) register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria, which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.
19. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after school clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

**Other Implications:**

20. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

**Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

21. This proposal would provide increased provision for infant places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This means it would therefore also be of benefit to any Looked After Children who will attend the school.

**Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

22. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authorities adopted core planning strategy.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

23. If approved, to proceed to complete tenders and subsequent contract award through delegated decision.

**Contact Officer:**

Keith Brown, Schools and Programme Manager – tel: 020 8541 8651  
Nick Smith, School Commissioning Officer – 020 8541 9556

**Consulted:**

Mel Few, Local Member for Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water. Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care  
Tony Samuels, Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration Programmes  
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Business Services  
Paula Chowdhury, Strategic Finance Manager – Business Services

**Annexes:**

None - Part 2 report with financial details attached to agenda

**Sources/background papers:**

- The Education Act 1996
- The School Standards Framework Act 1998
- The Education Act 2002
- The Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Report to Cabinet: Schools Capital Budget Allocations Service update based on latest or most appropriate report year and version

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015**

**REPORT OF: MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE**  
**MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

**LEAD OFFICERS: DAVID SARGEANT, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE**  
**JULIE FISHER, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

**SUBJECT: PROVISION OF A NEW SYSTEM FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The contract with the current supplier of Adult Social Care's case management and financial system expires on 31 October 2015. There is no option to extend the contract, though a new contract can be agreed for a time limited period.

This report sets out the proposal to enter into a new contract for a replacement I.T. system to meet Adult Social Care's recording requirements for the foreseeable future.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

1. Approval is given to enter into a contract with Liquidlogic for the provision of the Adult Social Care I.T. System under the current contract with East Sussex County Council, where East Sussex acts as the central purchasing body for other Local Authorities.
2. Approval is given to enter into a new one year contract with the incumbent supplier to facilitate the migration to a new system.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- A contract with the new supplier will:
- a) provide all required functionality for Care Act implementation by 1 April 2016
  - b) enable integration with the Children's System and the systems of health partners
  - c) improve system usability and efficiency
  - d) deliver a mobile working system and self-assessment functionality
  - e) more closely align the Adult Social Care system with the council's digital strategy
  - f) support strategic alignment with East Sussex County Council

<b>DETAILS:</b>
-----------------

### **Current System**

1. Northgate Public Services has provided Surrey County Council's core Adult Social Care System since 2001. This contract expires on 31 October 2015. There is no option to extend the contract as all extensions have been exhausted.
2. The changes to the system required for April 2016 to implement the major funding reforms under the Care Act 2014 are significant. The reforms mandated by the Care Act will generate a huge increase in the demand for both eligibility assessments and financial assessments. A modern case management and financial system that enables online access, self-assessment, and mobile working, and is flexible and compatible with the council's digital strategy is central to our compliance with the Care Act.
3. If no action is now taken to replace the Adult Social Care IT system, there is a risk that the council will not be compliant with the Care Act by April 2016 and will not have the necessary functionality to manage the increased demand for assessments.

### **Options considered**

4. Three options have been considered for the future Adult Social Care I.T system:
  - (1) Go to market for a solution
  - (2) In-house or partner bespoke development
  - (3) Utilise East Sussex County Council's procurement process and contract (December 2014) that awarded an Adults' and Children's Social Care Management system to LiquidLogic Limited
5. A summary of the detailed options appraisal is at Annex 1.

### **Proposed solution**

6. The options appraisal, including evaluation against critical success factors, show that implementation of the Liquidlogic system using the East Sussex County Council's contract would provide the greatest benefits with the least level of risk and is the recommended option.
7. Liquidlogic is the supplier of the council's Integrated Children's System (ICS). This will provide an opportunity to integrate the two systems. IMT resource will also be maximised as only one system will be supported across both the adults and children's services. There is also the opportunity to use the materials and expertise already gained by East Sussex and share further development ideas and costs.
8. The East Sussex County Council's contract with Liquidlogic includes Surrey County Council as a contracting authority. The contract was entered into as part of a comprehensive procurement process, providing a level of assurance and rigour that quality and cost considerations have been fully assessed. The contract negates the time and resource needed to go through a full OJEU tendering process. The council needs to avoid the resource and business

disruption that would be caused by any requirement to implement 2016 Care Act changes twice (once in the current system and once in the alternate solution).

9. The Council's Orbis partnership with East Sussex County Council will be further strengthened through using the same IT system, providing as a minimum; strategic opportunities for software development, lessons learned from the implementation of Liquidlogic and shared knowledge and training resource.
10. The proposed system is a market leader with the functionality to meet the statutory requirements of the Care Act and online self-assessment capabilities within the time frames demanded.
11. Research and intelligence to date, including site visits, indicates that the proposed system is intuitive, easier to use and is more efficient than the current system. For example, it incorporates many aspects that minimise the duplication of input and maximises automatic data field population. It also allows individuals to securely access their own data and promotes 'self-serve' options; key to managing increased demand.
12. The system will integrate seamlessly with the recently re-launched Surrey Information Point portal.
13. The functionality for safeguarding allows the recording of information against providers, supporting the recording of the number and seriousness of incidents and identifying possible trends. This facility can focus exclusively on providers which would permit full sharing of information with the Council's Clinical Commissioning Groups and Mental Health commissioning partners to update live information and trigger alerts where a multi-agency response may be required.
14. The system has been assessed against the Digital Strategy and supports us in taking an interim step toward Surrey County Council's Digital vision. This product supports the council in working towards achieving its' digital ambitions by consolidation of the social care platforms across adults and children's services, employing open standards for integration with health and other agency systems and facilitating the opportunity for residents to self serve. The council will actively work with Liquidlogic on the digital agenda to make sure that they remain aligned to achieving the longer term digital strategy.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

15. Consideration of the way forward for the Adult Social Care I.T. system has been on-going for the last two years and has taken account of feedback from staff across the service in a number of fora, which included a Rapid Improvement Event and conversations with staff during the council wide Better Place to Work Programme.
16. Focused consultation has been carried out across key stakeholders within the council during the development of the business case and options appraisal. This has encompassed representation from Adult Social Care, Procurement, Finance and IMT.

<b>RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:</b>
--------------------------------------

17. The following is a summary of the risks currently identified:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Procurement/contract issues are more complex than anticipated	low	A dedicated procurement and contract manager to lead on the procurement issues.
Financial performance of the new supplier	low	Assessment by the council's commercial insight team shows strong growth over recent years, in revenue and profit as well as consistently high credit ratings.
Challenge regarding the decision from other IT suppliers	low	East Sussex acted as a central purchasing body with a clear OJEU stating that it was buying services on behalf of other contracting authorities and named SCC. Surrey can therefore purchase the services available under the East Sussex contract.
Timescales from contract signature to implementation	medium	Dedicated project team led by ASC supported by a formal project management approach
Care Act compliance - change in regulations	medium	Final regulations and guidance for 2016 likely to be published in October 2015. Emerging discussions will be monitored closely. Strong links with Department of Health.
Training	medium	A full training plan will be put in place. It will involve the software provider and potentially East Sussex staff knowledge
Incumbent supplier	high	Early planning with the incumbent supplier to clarify requirements, timescales and scope.
Resources	medium	As part of the project planning process key resources will be identified with 'back fill' where required
Cost	medium	The costs will be set out within the contract and identified/monitored through the project planning process
Current system goes out of support during implementation	low	Linked to incumbent supplier and timescales

<b>Financial and Value for Money Implications</b>
---

18. An improved IT solution is required for Adult Social Care, both to enable smarter working across the Directorate and implementation of the new Care Act regulations due to come into force from 1 April 2016.



19. The East Sussex tender process for a new Adult Social Care system identified Liquidlogic as the best option and Liquidlogic is still judged to be the leading system solution currently available on the market. In light of this, and given the significant time constraints, option 4 to pursue implementation of Liquidlogic represents the best value for money approach. This option will deliver a long term system solution that will avoid the need for a two tiered system change to initially enable Care Act compliance for 1 April 2016 and subsequently implement full new system functionality. It is also sensible to avoid the costs of a full tender process when it is judged that Liquidlogic would win the tender based on the current system solutions available on the market.
20. The forecast costs of the proposed implementation are set out in more detail in item 23 (Part 2 Annex) of this report. The contract term is linked to the East Sussex contract, with an initial 4 and a half year period with the option to extend for a further five years.
21. Costs can be met through a combination of grant funding the Council is receiving to support the implementation of the Care Act and existing IMT funding that is already part of the Council's capital programme and annual revenue budget. Following implementation a small saving is likely to be realised on the current support and maintenance costs for the Northgate system.
22. A full schedule of the estimated project costs and available funding streams is out in item 23 (Part 2 Annex) of this report.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

23. The Section 151 Officer agrees that the proposed option for implementation of the proposed system represents the best option to achieve the required outcomes in the available timeframe at a reasonable cost.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

24. East Sussex County Council procured the services of Liquidlogic as a contractor through a proper process acting as a central purchasing body for Surrey County Council and other local authorities. Surrey can therefore purchase the services available under the East Sussex contract. The existing contract with the current supplier can be extended by agreement between the parties for 12 or 15 months under a waiver because such an extension is permitted under EU law as set out in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

25. No equalities or diversity issues are expected in the award of this contract.

<b>WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:</b>
---------------------------

26. The timetable for implementation is as follows:

Action	Date
Cabinet decision to award contract	26 May 2015
Cabinet call in and 10 calendar day statutory standstill period	5 June 2015
Contract signature	8 June 2015
Implementation commencement	9 June 2015

---

**Contact Officer: Toni Carney, Head of Resources, Adult Social Care, 01483 519473, Lorraine Juniper, IMT Programmes Manager, 020 8541 8999**

**Consulted:**

William House – Finance Manager  
 Kelly Marshall – IT Category Specialist  
 Chris Millard – Chief Digital Officer

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 Summary Options Appraisal  
 PART 2 Annex 2 Summary of Estimated Project Costs and Available Funding  
 Streams – item 23

**Sources/background papers:**

None.

---

## Summary of Option Appraisal

All of the following options will also require a new, time limited contract with the current supplier in order to facilitate the transition to new arrangements and plan an exit strategy with the current provider. The time limited contract would need to be for one year, with the possibility of an additional three months for contingency.

### **Option 1 – Go to market for a solution**

This would involve a large scale procurement exercise with associated costs and time frame. The total life of the project from start to implementation is likely to be in excess of two years.

A new system would need to be configured to meet current requirements. Care Act requirements would need to be included in the specification.

Advantages:

- Adult Social Care (ASC) could write a specification detailing exactly what they want. This could potentially result in additional functionality being delivered, although there is no current evidence that any alternative systems could offer additional functionality over and above that offered by the proposed supplier
- ASC would select the supplier of choice
- There are frameworks which have most of the key suppliers on, which would make procurement faster

Disadvantages:

- Cost of procurement process
- Potential cost of purchase of new system
- Uncertainty about the future of how ASC services are delivered may hinder future proofing specifications
- As a market leader the proposed supplier may well win the tender exercise thereby unnecessarily spending council funds on a larger scale and more lengthy procurement exercise.
- The time scale for the option would mean implementing another solution to meet the Care Act requirements and therefore require two implementations ( The contract with the current supplier can only be extended for a finite period of time and it is unclear at this point what the impact will be on the council's preparedness for the 2016 Care Act requirements).
- There is the potential that the outcome will be a different supplier from Children's Social Care and the potential improvements and efficiencies from having the same system will be lost
- The current supplier potentially has a substantial price advantage over the rest of the market as the system is already implemented. Basing a decision on cost alone could restrict our ability to benefit from innovation in the marketplace.

**Comments:**

The time scale for this option would require two implementations if the service were also be able to meet Care Act requirements. It would need a full procurement process and the significant associated costs. It would deliver benefits to the service, but may result in two different systems for Adults and Children's services, missing the opportunity to capitalise on those advantages, and other potential benefits that could be explored through our partnership with East Sussex County Council.

**Option 2 – in-house or partner bespoke development**

This option could include different approaches such as looking for a partner to develop the system or embarking on an in house development. It would require staying with the current core system in the interim, which may not be viable as the current contract could only be extended for a short period. There is also an option to invest in alternative solutions to meet new requirements and gradually replace current systems.

**Advantages:**

- Adult Social Care could gradually define what they want in an agile way over a period of time.
- Gives the most scope for innovation.
- Using a development partner or in house development team may provide more control over the product roadmap (timings and results)

**Disadvantages:**

- It would not be possible to develop an in house solution within the current time constraints, e.g. to support Care Act implementation
- A new 15 month contract with the current supplier is unlikely to give sufficient time for the new solution to be developed and implemented and there is a risk that the current system would go out of support before the new one is in place
- There is a high level of risk with this approach and Surrey County Council would be 'going it alone'.
- Cost of development of new systems will not be clear at the outset and could be much greater than an 'off the shelf' solution. Ongoing costs would be difficult to ascertain and control against future statutory changes.
- Developing the design and technical specification would be more time consuming and resource intensive than implementing an off the shelf solution.
- We would lose the advantage of having the same solution across Adults' and Children's Social Care both within Surrey and in partnership with East Sussex.
- Adult social care is strictly governed by statute and statutory guidance and a more radical development option might present a greater risk of not meeting the statutory requirements generally
- A bespoke solution results in a greater dependency on a limited number of developers and an increased risk of single points of failure.

**Comments:**

This is a high risk approach that would not meet the time frames required. A high cost is also likely to be incurred with insufficient evidence of benefits, over and above other options.

**Option 3 – Utilise East Sussex procurement process and contract (December 2014) that awarded an Adults’ and Children’s Social Care Management system to LiquidLogic Limited**

Surrey County Council is a contracting authority to the East Sussex County Council (ESCC) full EU procurement, which chose Liquidlogic, as part of it partnership with East Sussex. The council was involved in the specification but not the selection. Surrey County Council is referenced within the contract as a participating authority and consequently can use the contract to purchase Liquidlogic without the need for a further procurement process. The initial term of the contract is for 5 years with an option to extend for 3 years and a further 2 years after that.

The likely contract period for Surrey if it chooses to use this option would be for 4.5 years with a maximum 5 (2+3) year extension thereafter (Maximum whole life contract of 9.5 years).

Advantages:

- Liquidlogic is one of a handful of market leading products
- Lowest risk option as fastest route to being Care Act compliant.
- Additional procurement process would be minimised.
- Timescale provides opportunity to implement the Care Act changes solely in a new system The system meets the core Adult Social Care needs
- The system is used by Children’s Services and so integration with their data could be achieved quickly
- Having the same system as the Children’s service will support a more integrated council approach – Adults, children’s, the transition team and the Emergency Duty Team would all be on the same system
- Liquidlogic has a track record of integration (including with health)
- Liquidlogic and OCC have a range of Care Act and self service tools in production and development (move up)
- There are mobile working options
- It is a more ‘open’ system making future integration and development simpler
- IMT already have the skills to support this system and the experience of implementation in the Children’s Service.
- An established supplier relationship already exists between the council and Liquidlogic.
- There is potential to ‘go live’ with the Care Account module in advance of the core system, which would support early assessment and ‘smooth’ the demand curve
- Joint partnership working with East Sussex would provide opportunities for joint development of the system and shared / reduced development costs
- Opportunities to explore joint disaster recovery platform hosted by SCC within data centres
- Greater opportunity for sharing / developing best practice processes with East Sussex
- Opportunity to explore reduction in SCC training costs by re-using East Sussex material and training resources
- There is a small cost saving on the annual maintenance costs when compared to the current supplier.
- The third party software is considerably cheaper than the software the current supplier relies on.

#### Disadvantages:

- Migration and configuration would be a large project, needing resource from both Adult Social Care and IMT
- Although there is no current evidence of a better system solution in the market, not going through a further full tender exercise could mean implementing the proposed solution without confirming it is still the best system compared to alternatives in the long-term.

#### Comments

This option represents the ability to implement quickly in order to meet Care Act requirements and avoid two implementations. The system would deliver service benefits and efficiencies, and avoid full scale procurement costs.

#### Conclusion

Fundamental drivers for the system change highlight the timing of replacement and greater 'usability' and efficiency and alignment with the council's digital strategy as prime areas for consideration. The scale and nature of the service supported indicate that a low risk approach needs to be taken, while maximising service improvements and the ability to respond to future change.

Options 1 and 2 have significantly longer time frames and the associated costs of either a full procurement or more radical approach do not make these options desirable. They also carry a higher risk.

It is recommended that option 3 is progressed as it would deliver the greatest benefits within the specified time frame. It is the lowest risk option.

---

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 MAY 2015****REPORT OF: N/A****LEAD OFFICER: ANN CHARLTON, DIRECTOR OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES****SUBJECT: LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To note the delegated decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

**DETAILS:**

1. The Leader has delegated responsibility for certain executive functions to the Deputy Leader and individual Cabinet Members, and reserved some functions to himself. These are set out in Table 2 in the Council's Scheme of Delegation.
2. Delegated decisions are scheduled to be taken on a monthly basis and will be reported to the next available Cabinet meeting for information.
3. **Annex 1** lists the details of decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last Cabinet meeting.

**Contact Officer:**

Anne Gowing, Cabinet Committee Manager, 020 8541 9938

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – List of Cabinet Member Decisions

**Sources/background papers:**

- Agenda and decision sheets from the Cabinet Member meetings (available on the Council's website)

This page is intentionally left blank



**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS****APRIL / MAY 2015****(i) LIBRARY DELIVERY SERVICE CONTRACT AWARD****Details of decision**

That the contract be awarded to Global Services Group for the provision of the Library Delivery Service. This is a three year contract with the option to extend for two further periods of up to one year each. The supplier will provide a dedicated delivery service exclusively for Surrey libraries.

**Reasons for decision**

The existing contract will expire on 31 July 2015. A full open tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders had been completed and a preferred supplier emerged following a combined quality/price evaluation.

The bid from the preferred supplier offered a significant saving and value for money over the full contract term and demonstrated that they were able to deliver the high standard of service expected by the County and its residents and will work with the Council over the duration of the contract to continue to add value.

*(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Services – 20 April 2015)*

**(ii) PETITION: IN RELATION TO SUPERFAST SURREY BROADBAND IN MICKLEHAM VILLAGE****Details of decision**

That the response, attached as Appendix 1, be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

*(Decision of Deputy Leader – 13 May 2015)*

**(iii) PUBLICITY AND STATIONERY PRINT SERVICES****Details of decision**

That following consideration of the results from the procurement process, the award of the framework agreement to the contractors, as set out in the submitted part 2 report, was agreed for a period of 12 months to commence on 21 May 2015 and expire on 20 May 2016.

### Reasons for decision

A new short term contract is requested to provide publicity and stationery print services for a period of 12 months.

This time will allow for a review of this service across the Council as part of a wider digital and print review and will also allow for a review at East Sussex County Council with a view to a future joint contract serving both Councils.

*(Decision of Cabinet Member for Business Services – 13 May 2015)*

#### (iv) **PETITION: IN RELATION TO MAKING TOWNS AND VILLAGE SAFER FOR PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS AND STOP PRIORITISING THE CAR OVER OTHER ROAD USERS**

### Details of decision

That the response, attached as Appendix 2, be approved.

### Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

*(Decision of Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning – 13 May 2015)*

#### (v) **PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF LAND AT GOODWIN'S NURSERY, BEARE GREEN**

### Details of decision

That the decision to apply to the Magistrates' Court for an order stopping up of land at Godwin's Nursery, Old Horsham Road, Beare Green be approved in accordance with the provisions of Section 116 and 117 of the Highways Act 1980 and subject to the conditions of the County Council's approved policy on stopping up applications.

### Reasons for decision

The land in question is deemed surplus to highway requirements and on completion of a successful application the County Council would be relinquished from any future maintenance liability. The land is currently used as a garden for Wren Cottage and is not performing any highway function. Sufficient land is to be retained that would accommodate a two metre footway, should one be required upon redevelopment of the nursery site.

*(Decision of Cabinet Member for Highway, Transport and Flooding – 13 May 2015)*

#### (vi) **ON STREET PARKING REVIEW PROCESS UPDATE – THIS ITEM WAS DEFERRED**

**DEPUTY LEADER**

Wednesday 13 May 2015

**RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING SUPERFAST BROADBAND IN THE AREA OF MICKLEHAM VILLAGE****The Petition**

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to include the area of Mickleham Village on the 01372 telephone exchange, in the roll out of Superfast Surrey Broadband network, or to require BT Openreach to extend fibre to Mickleham. The part of Mickleham Village on the 01372 exchange has been excluded from the Superfast Surrey Broadband network because we are too far from the "Leatherhead 1 cabinet" situated at Givons Grove. BT Openreach has upgraded the fibre as far as Leatherhead1, but admits that the cabinet is too far from Mickleham to be effective. Mickleham will be stuck with speeds of up to 4 mbps and in many cases less than 1 mbps. This will have adverse economic and social implications and prevent many people from working from home and making it difficult for school children to access and download homework. It is an unacceptable situation for a village that is half way between Dorking and Leatherhead and a 45 minute commute of London to be left out from this necessary and essential service. We are being discriminated against by reason of our geographical location. We want Surrey to install a cabinet in Mickleham to ensure we have the same access to Superfast Surrey Broadband as the rest of Surrey. We want a reliable, fast and consistent internet provision to our homes and businesses. This is our future.

Submitted by Ms Mary Flint  
Signatures: 218 (as at 10 April)

**Response**

Surrey County Council has now finished the main phase of its Superfast Surrey Broadband programme to bring fibre broadband to those areas in the county not included in commercial roll outs.

In December 2014 the Superfast Surrey team were tasked with developing options for using any remaining funds to enable a decision to be made on the future scope of the programme.

Options were developed that not only acknowledged Openreach's analysis of premises with slow speeds in the Superfast Surrey deployment area but also took into account feedback from residents and businesses in the commercial rollout area that were not covered by the fibre network or who were on slow speeds.

As a result, and to ensure that Surrey County Council fully understands the extent of the remaining challenge, on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2015 Surrey County Council commenced an Open Market Review (OMR). This is the only way to establish a clear understanding of the latest position regarding existing and planned broadband coverage throughout the county. The

review will identify all premises throughout Surrey without a fibre broadband connection or those covered by the fibre network but unable to access a fibre service including those in Mickleham.

Surrey County Council will be seeking State Aid Approval for plans to further extend broadband coverage across the County within the constraints of available funding following a process laid down by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK). The first stage is to request current and future broadband coverage information from existing infrastructure providers in an Open Market Review (OMR). Once the broadband coverage and speed responses are analysed, a map will be produced and uploaded to the Superfast Surrey website as part of the public consultation process. This stage, which will be during Autumn 2015, is the opportunity for residents, businesses as well as any other infrastructure providers to contact the Superfast Surrey team to provide additional information that may further inform the understanding of broadband coverage across the County.

Following the public consultation phase, the Superfast Surrey team will then agree with BT Group, as part of the existing contract and within the constraints of available funding, how to target those areas identified as not having current or proposed broadband coverage or access to download speeds of 15 Mbps or above. The proposed deployment must be signed off by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) as being compliant with State Aid Funding regulations before any deployment can commence.

The OMR, analysis of responses, mapping, public consultation and development of a new deployment plan will take many months and whether or not residents who are currently unable to access a fibre service will benefit from any subsequent deployment will not be known until the above process is completed.

With limited budgets combined with high demand for council funded services across the County Surrey County Council is conscious that there is no quick fix solution, however Surrey County Council remains committed to working towards extending fibre broadband services to as many residents and businesses as economically possible.

**Mr Peter Martin**  
**Deputy Leader**  
**13 May 2015**

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

Wednesday 13 May 2015

**The Petition**

It states: **Make our towns and villages safer for pedestrians and cyclists and to stop prioritising the car over other road users.**

‘According to the Department of Transport (<http://road-collisions.dft.gov.uk>), Surrey County Council (SCC) has the highest number of cycling fatalities in the whole of England and is fourth highest for pedestrian fatalities of any highway authority. Pedestrians spend more per week than any other shopper Tfl (Town Centre Study 2011). One in five cars on the road at morning peak traffic times are taking children to school, contributing to congestion, air pollution and carbon emissions. With school pupil numbers projected to rise year on year, the school run is expected to have an increasingly negative impact on congestion. One in three children leaves primary school either overweight or obese. ([www.livingstreets.org.uk/wow](http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/wow)). Inactivity is costing the Primary Care Trust in England in excess of £940million a year. We petition SCC senior leadership team to make our towns and villages safer for pedestrian and cyclists and to stop prioritising the car over other road users. We ask that they look at best practice outside their own County.’

**Submitted by Victoria Leake**

**Signatures: 139**

**Response**

The petition asks that Surrey County Council takes steps to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This response sets out the data on road casualties in Surrey in the national context and outlines the measures that the County Council is taking to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Casualty Data**

Table 1 below describes the number of cycling and pedestrian fatalities in Surrey over recent years. It can be seen that the number of people fatally injured as cyclists has varied between one and six and the number of people fatally injured as pedestrians has varied between two and ten since 2005.

**Table 1: Pedestrian and cyclist fatal road casualties in Surrey**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Cyclists</b>	<b>Pedestrians</b>
2005	5	10
2006	6	8
2007	2	10
2008	1	10
2009	2	10
2010	4	9
2011	1	10

2012	2	2
2013	1	5
2014	4	10

Data on the numbers of fatal road casualties within each local highway authority area is published annually by the Department for Transport (DfT) in table RAS30043 which is available to download via the following link. The latest available data is for 2013.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/ras30-reported-casualties-in-road-accidents>

Table 2 below sets out the number of local highway authorities suffering different numbers of cycling and pedestrian fatal injuries in 2013. As Surrey had one cycling fatality and five pedestrian fatalities in 2013, it can be seen from the table 2 that the petition is incorrect in the claim that Surrey had the highest number of cycling fatalities and the fourth highest number of pedestrian fatalities in England, as there were 23 local authorities with greater numbers of cyclists fatally injured, and ten local authorities with greater numbers of pedestrians fatally injured in 2013.

**Table 2: The number of local highway authorities suffering different numbers of cycling and pedestrian fatal injuries in 2013 (source DfT data table RAS30043)**

Number of fatal casualties	Number of local authorities with that many cyclists fatally injured in 2013	Number of local authorities with that many pedestrians fatally injured in 2013
14	-	1
13	-	-
12	-	-
11	-	1
10	-	1
9	-	-
8	-	-
7	-	5
6	-	2
5	-	9 (including Surrey)
4	4	15
3	4	17
2	15	32
1	33 (including Surrey)	32
0	96	37
Total	152	152

However, a simple comparison of the total number of road casualties between different highway authorities is misleading because different authorities can vary widely in terms of the population living within each area, and the amount of vehicle miles travelled through each area. To that end, we have completed analysis to compare Surrey to other highway authorities in terms of the number of road casualties per population, per vehicle miles travelled and percentage reduction against a baseline average. With regard to fatal casualties it was found that out of 151 English local authorities in 2013, Surrey was ranked:

- 51 in terms of fatal casualties per 100,000 population

- 24 in terms of fatal casualties per billion vehicle miles travelled
- 30 in terms of reduction in fatal casualties compared to 2005 to 2009 baseline average

A more detailed report on road casualties in Surrey in 2013 can be found via the following link:

<http://www.drivesmartsurrey.org.uk/a/4055721-7510389>

We continue to monitor road casualties in Surrey on a regular basis, and report to the Drive SMART Board comprising Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and Surrey Fire and Rescue.

### Promoting Walking and Cycling

We agree with the petition that improving pedestrian facilities can help promote the economic vitality of town centres and other shopping areas. We also agree that promoting alternatives to the motor car for the school run can help reduce congestion, reduce air pollution, carbon emissions and help tackle obesity through active travel. Consequently the county council has a number of policies and initiatives to support more walking and cycling. The county council has also invested substantial amounts of money in a range of projects that aim to improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Each of these projects draws on best practice and latest government guidance. Some examples of these include:

- **The Surrey Cycle Strategy.** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/surrey-transport-plan-ltp3/surrey-transport-plan-strategies/surrey-cycling-strategy> The aim of the strategy is to get more people in Surrey cycling, more safely. This includes the development of local cycling infrastructure plans within each of Surrey's Boroughs and Districts. These plans highlight the priorities for improving cycling infrastructure in each area.
- **Redhill Balanced Network.** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/major-transport-projects/reigate-and-banstead-major-transport-schemes> The £4 million Redhill Balanced Network project consists of a series of junction improvements, as well as improvements for walking, cycling and buses.
- **Runnymede Major Transport Schemes.** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/major-transport-projects/runnymede-major-transport-schemes> The first project relates to the Runnymede Roundabout, at the junction of the A30, Egham Bypass and A308, The Causeway and next to junction 13 of the M25 at Egham, where significant traffic management measures are proposed including carriageway widening, signalling of junctions, pedestrian and cycle improvements. This area suffers from high levels of congestion during the peak periods and there are difficulties for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the junction. The second scheme relates to the Egham sustainable transport package, which includes area wide walking, cycling and bus improvements, connecting people from where they live to where they work, go to school and shop.

- **Epsom plan E.** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/major-transport-projects/epsom-and-ewell-major-transport-schemes> This scheme involves a change to the road layout in Epsom to reduce congestion and improve the town centre. It will make walking easier by having better signing and widened footways and improved cycle facilities at key destinations, and better facilities for buses. It will make Epsom a nicer place to visit by improving the market area, rationalising road, bus and pedestrian signage and other street furniture to provide un-cluttered routes for pedestrians.
- **Travel SMART** <http://www.travelsmartsurrey.info/> This is a programme designed to provide people with more travel choices that help cut carbon, calories and cost. It aims to support economic growth by helping people travel better. The scheme includes engagement with schools and workplaces to promote alternatives to car travel. The Travel SMART journey planner enables users to plan their journey across all modes of travel. A Department for Transport grant has enabled intensive work in Guildford, Redhill and Woking including provision of new infrastructure and wayfinder mapping to support walking and cycling, combined with promotional activity such as a programme of cycle festivals.
- **Cycle safety schemes (Leatherhead-Ashted and Walton Bridge Links)** [www.surreycc.gov.uk/leatherheadashtedcycling](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/leatherheadashtedcycling) and [www.surreycc.gov.uk/waltonbridgelinks](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/waltonbridgelinks) In July 2012 the Department for Transport announced a £15m fund for cycling infrastructure in order to tackle cycling casualties and reduce barriers to more cycling. Following analysis of cycling casualties across Surrey, the county council submitted a bid which resulted in Surrey County Council receiving the second highest award of all local authorities in the country. The two schemes provide continuous off road cycle paths segregated from traffic as well as providing improvements to pedestrian facilities.
- **Woking Cycle Demonstration Town.** <http://www.cyclewoking.org.uk/aboutus> This project resulted in improvements and extensions to the Woking Cycle Network (now known as the 'Planet Trails') , widening and resurfacing works along 12.9km of the Basingstoke Canal towpath and improved links with the Borough's neighbourhoods, increased cycle parking at all train stations, local shopping areas and community facilities across the Borough, and increased activities and cycle clubs within schools ensuring all children have access to National Cycle Training (Bikeability).
- **Road Safety Outside Schools Policy** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/school-road-safety> The purpose of this policy is to set out the process that will be used by Surrey County Council for investigating and responding to concerns about road safety outside schools. The aim is to reduce the risk of collisions, and to make the road feel safer in order to improve the attractiveness of walking and cycling to and from schools.
- **Travel Planning Strategy.** <http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/surrey-transport-plan-ltp3/surrey-transport-plan-strategies/travel->



[planning-strategy](#) The aim of the Travel Planning Strategy is to provide travel-planning measures, interventions and self-help support to schools and workplaces in Surrey to make informed choices about their travel.

- **Cycling Training Service.**  
<http://www.travelsmartsurrey.info/cycling/training>. Surrey County Council delivers a countywide cycle training services which trains around 11,000 children per year to ride a bike safely. Training is also available for adults of all abilities.
- **Walk to school.** We are partners to a successful bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund to run a walk to school programme in Surrey in 2015/16. Delivered by Living Streets, this scheme will support Surrey schools to implement measures to encourage and enable children to walk to school.

In addition to the projects, initiatives and policies mentioned above there are local committees of elected members in each of Surrey's boroughs and districts who are allocated money by the county council for highway improvements within their area. It is up to each local committee to decide how best to invest their budget in response to local concerns and it is often the case that the highway schemes chosen by the local committees are ones that provide improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. More information on each of the local committees can be found via this link:

<http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/mqListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

The county council continually monitors where road collisions are taking place throughout Surrey and has an annual budget of £200,000 for investment on highway improvements at the very worst collision hotspots to reduce the risk of road casualties. The county council also works closely with the police on the Drive SMART partnership [www.drivesmartsurrey.org](http://www.drivesmartsurrey.org) with the following aims:

- Reduce and prevent death and injury on Surrey's roads
- Work with road users to reduce and prevent anti-social behaviour on Surrey's roads

## Conclusion

The petition is inaccurate over the claims in relation to the number of cyclists and pedestrians suffering fatal injuries in Surrey. None the less the county council is not complacent in its efforts to reduce road casualties and is in agreement with the petitioners that as well as reducing the risk of road casualties, improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists can also help promote economic growth and can help reduce congestion, reduce air pollution, carbon emissions and help tackle obesity through active travel. Consequently the county council has a number of policies and initiatives, and has invested substantial amounts of money in a range of projects that aim to improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, some of which are described above.

The county council will continue to work with colleagues in public health, boroughs and districts and other partners to support more walking and cycling through the continued implementation of the above policies and initiatives. We will continue to seek opportunities to bid for more money for more transport

schemes that will incorporate improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as training and promotional activity to encourage more people to cycle. We will continue to review and learn from best practice from other authorities and to adopt an evidence-based approach to the development of our activities. To that end, we are establishing a Cycling Board with senior representation to oversee and ensure effective delivery of the Surrey Cycling Strategy.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning**  
**13 May 2015**

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank