

WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

RECORD OF MEMBER DELEGATED DECISION

PUBLIC HEALTH RING-FENCED GRANT

Date Of Decision	25 November 2015
Decision Maker	Mr M J Hart, Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Health and Well-being
Brief Description Of Decision	To approve the proposals for savings to the Public Health Ring-Fenced Grant (PHRFG) as set out in the accompanying table.
Reason(s) For Decision	<p>As set out in the report and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government has confirmed Worcestershire's PHRFG allocation will be reduced by £1.9m in 2015/16 and has indicated that there will be further reductions of around £13.0m by 2020 • Initial proposals for savings were approved by Cabinet in July 2015, with a request that the Director of Adult Services and Health initiate discussions with partners and providers of services, and undertake consultations and Equality Impact Screenings or full Equality Impact Assessments as necessary • These discussions have now taken place and final proposals have been developed taking into account the feedback received • Proposals were included in a paper published 16 November 2015. A letter was received from the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust subsequently and the issues raised have been taken into account. No other representations have been received since this paper was published • The Council is mindful of its responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality duty and where further Equality Impact assessments are required these will be carried out as part of the recommissioning of services to identify any risks and ensure that these are mitigated.

<p>Alternative Options Considered And Rejected</p>	<p>(a) Not to make savings or to save less This is not a tenable position as the Council's liabilities would exceed its income and it would not therefore be able to produce a balanced budget.</p> <p>(b) To defer a decision about savings An early decision about future funding will allow a longer period for service redesign and a greater chance of mitigating the impact of any savings.</p> <p>(c) To save more against some services and less against others The proposals have been developed based on consultation with a range of statutory partners and taking their views into account. Overall they represent a balanced approach that allows services to be maintained with savings achieved by redesign and recommissioning and the impact of funding reductions mitigated.</p>
<p>Any Conflict of Interest declared by a consulted Cabinet Member/ any dispensation granted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Signature of Decision Maker</p>	<p>Mr M J Hart</p>

Note:

Public Health England (PHE) have since clarified their position on Health Checks.

The PHRFG report proposed to *focus efforts to increase uptake of Health Checks to higher risk individuals and noted that this approach was endorsed by (PHE). This was based on a statement by the PHE Chief Executive that "Local authorities can, and do, target the NHS Health Check programme to serve the needs of their communities, for instance by focusing efforts on socioeconomically disadvantaged groups."*

PHE have now confirmed that whilst they support focusing efforts to increase uptake of Health Checks on higher risk individuals, their intention is that this should not be at the expense of universal coverage of the programme as required by the regulations.

I have noted this clarification but remain satisfied that this does not alter my decision as recorded above and therefore no new decision is needed. This will ensure that those most likely to benefit from Health Checks can do so, and allow savings to enable other services to be sustained. Whilst a deterioration in our

overall uptake of Health Checks may be expected with this approach, we are currently well ahead of the national average with an uptake of 26.5% so far during the 2013-18 period, against an England average of 22.9%.

| Cllr Marcus Hart
1 December 2015