Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on Fusion Lifestyle's 2016/17 Annual Service Plan.

21

Recommendation	Agreed? (Y / N / In part)	Comment
1. That the Council encourages and seeks to facilitate stronger user representation on the Leisure Partnership Board, including by varying meeting times if required.	Y	Current stakeholder groups represented at Leisure Partnership Board include Younger and Older People, Public Health, Early Intervention and Customers. Fusion have been tasked to increase attendance by users. The meeting times have been set following a doodle poll with attendees, although we are very happy to check again and set the meeting at the time that will ensure the best attendance.
2. That the Council encourages the formation of user groups at the remaining Leisure Centres and considers how these user groups could link in with the Leisure Partnership Board, perhaps with each user group having a representative on the Board.	Y	Ferry Leisure Centre and Hinksey Outdoor Pool both have regular or seasonal user group meetings and we have from Fusion a 2016/17 timetable of dates and times for all facilities. Fusion are looking to encourage representation by customers.
3. That the Council takes further steps to understand why the numbers of swimming visits have declined amongst some target groups and challenges Fusion Lifestyle to set a more ambitious target for increasing swimming visits by people over the age of 60 in 2016/17.	Y	Nationally there is a picture of general decline in participation of swimming. Officers continue to work with the Amateur Swimming Society to understand the reason for this and some target groups in Oxford are bucking the trend being used a good practice examples. Swimming visits have increased by the following amounts since 2013/14:Fusion Swim School156% Schools SwimmingSchools Swimming92% 69%
		We will continue to work to increase participation, with an increased focus on the over 60s.

4. That further consideration is given to the case for and expected impacts of a proposal to introduce reduced non- concessionary membership fees at less well used leisure centres.	Y	Customer feedback and our experience tells us that we need to avoid overly complicating our price structures. Fusion are though currently reviewing the membership offer within Oxford facilities, with 2017/18 fees and charges an agenda item at the July 2016 Leisure Partnership Board. This time line supports inclusion of any proposals in the Councils wider 2017/18 budget consultation process. It is important to bear in mind that all the centres are well used at peak times, and the greatest benefit to increase participation is to encourage more off peak usage which is detailed in the city's Leisure & Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2020 Will be pleased to give this further consideration within the review of fees and charges to ensure we are continually looking to remain competitive. We do continually monitor prices to ensure they are competitive, inclusive and provide value for money.
5. That benchmarking on performance, participation and price is undertaken with the wider market, including the private sector, not just with neighbouring local authorities.	Y	 Fees and charges and membership offer benchmarking is compared across other: Local districts Fusion Lifestyle contracts National comparators where they have similar centres (i.e. Exeter, Preston, Rushmoor, Runnymede) Further benchmarking on performance, participation and price is undertaken as part of the UK quality award scheme for sport and leisure QUEST. As part of this process facilities engage with the partnership approach of an industry National Bench Marking Service, which provides critical data on the performance our leisure facilities such as access, finance, utilisation and satisfaction. This includes facilities run by council's, trusts and private operators.

6. That further consideration is given to the idea of introducing gym-only membership options, perhaps on a limited trial basis.	Y	Please see our response to recommendation 4.
7. That consideration is given to the priority order of the five key strategic objectives for 2016/17.	N	As there are only five strategic objectives we do not feel they need to be ranked.

This page is intentionally left blank