

Business Case

A/R.6.213 Youth Offending Service (YOS) - Efficiencies from Joint Commissioning and Vacancy Review

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.213 Youth Offending Service (YOS) - Efficiencies from Joint Commissioning and Vacancy Review		
Project Code	TR001431	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.213
Business Planning Brief Description	The full year impact of savings are realised as a result of the Commissioning of Appropriate Adults and Reparation Services with Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire Constabulary. Removal of all capacity within the YOS to spot purchase time limited support programmes, tailored to meet individual needs, which may be over and above the core offer. Removal of a part time vacant case holding post. Savings from now jointly commissioned arrangements, therefore no reduced service, just more efficient and economies of scales.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Sarah Ferguson		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

In order to meet savings, the following areas have been identified; Efficiency savings from joint procurement of the Appropriate Adults contract across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

- Reduction in capacity to purchase other additional services such as Educational Psychology.
- Reduction in Case Holder capacity.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Increased pressure on other parts of People and Communities.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

- To secure financial efficiencies through jointly procuring the Appropriate Adult contracts with Peterborough City Council.

- For the Youth Offending Service to continue to manage caseloads under current establishment, as it has for the past two years.

Project Overview - What are we doing

- Meeting efficiency savings by jointly procuring contracts with Peterborough City Council.
- Maintaining current casework capacity, thus maintaining financial savings.

What assumptions have you made?

- That the budget can withstand the removal of any capacity to spot purchase time-limited support.
- Appropriate Adults provision will continue to be commissioned across Peterborough & Cambridgeshire.

What constraints does the project face?

None.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

- Appropriate Adult contracts.
- Youth Offending Service provision.

What is outside of scope?

Other related contracts and service provisions.

Project Dependencies

Title

Peterborough City Council

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Appropriate Adult contract will be jointly procured and maintained - with effective provision to both PCC & CCC.

Title

Risks

Title

Maintaining current casework capacity.

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Young People within Service.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

- Joint contract with PCC on Reparation/Appropriate Adult provision.
- Maintenance of current service provision across Youth Offending Service caseworkers.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Appropriate Adult Contract: Reduced capacity to spot-purchase additional support if required.
Maintained YOS caseworkers numbers: Impact on service and its users if pressures on service were to increase.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

None.

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

A/R.6.214 Central Integrated Youth Support Services

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.214 Central Integrated Youth Support Services		
Project Code	TR001436	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.214
Business Planning Brief Description	Removal of a staff training budget for youth staff as there are no longer staff studying for their JNC qualification. Proposed reduction in staff capacity equitable to a 0.5 FTE post within the Youth and Community Team. A reduction of £10.5k in the Community Reach Fund which equates to approximately 30% of the total budget. Community groups could be supported to apply to alternative funding streams including CCC's Innovate and Cultivate Fund and those administered for communities by the Big lottery.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Sarah Ferguson		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

To realise efficiencies within the service.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Savings would need to be found elsewhere.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To realise efficiencies across the service to release savings across People and Communities.

Project Overview - What are we doing

We will review the establishment of youth staff and remove the training budget for a historical training requirement.

What assumptions have you made?

- There are no additional training requirements.
- The service can absorb a reduction in post.

What constraints does the project face?

- There is a current establishment.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Current staff team.

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

N/A

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Young people and local community.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Savings will be achieved.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Reduced capacity to create community based activities for young people.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

None.

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

A/R.6.253 Looked After Children (LAC) – Mitigating additional Residential Placements

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.253 Looked After Children (LAC) - Maintaining Residential Placements		
Project Code	TR001429	Business Planning Reference	A/R 6.253
Business Planning Brief Description	There is currently a shortage of foster placements due to increased numbers of children in care both locally and nationally. This has resulted in a growing number of young people being placed in much higher cost residential placements. This business case describes how we will seek to mitigate three of the additional eight residential placements expected in residential hence requiring a reduced contribution to the placement budget from demography funding.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Lou Williams		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Residential placements are high cost and in most cases are not a positive choice based on the needs of the child or young person concerned, the exception being where specialist residential care is required to support children and young people with complex disabilities. For most children and young people in care, residential placements come about after two, three or more unplanned foster placement endings. As part of our broader changes under Change for Children, we are improving the capacity of social workers in our new specialist Corporate Parenting service, which will focus solely on supporting children and young people in care and care leavers. Through this approach, we aim to improve placement stability, making it less likely that young people's needs escalate to the point that only residential care is available.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Levels of expenditure would increase in line with previous years, outcomes for children and young people would be likely to be less good than they could be.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Improving placement stability for children and young people in foster placements, and so delivering better outcomes for them, while reducing the likelihood of unplanned escalation into residential placements. The combined effect will be to maintain numbers in residential at current levels, reducing the amount of demographic funding required compared with the projection.

Project Overview - What are we doing

The activity of the system-wide changes has been described above and in A/R 6.255 Looked After Children - Reducing the number of LAC. This will not only reduce LAC numbers outright but will also support the reduction of the number of unplanned placement endings and thereby reduce the number of children/young people placed in residential care.

There is a significant amount of work being done in 19/20 to develop the in house fostering service and increase their capacity. There is also work being done to retender the contract with independent fostering agencies. Taken together these activities are aiming to increase the availability of foster placements, this will also contribute to reducing the number of children/young people placed in residential care as some young people are currently placed in residential care because there are no appropriate foster placements available to meet their needs.

Combined the two activities above will support in reducing the number of children/young people placed in residential care, however there are likely to be some children/young people for whom residential care is the most appropriate placement. Therefore there is also activity planned to review the existing cohort of children/young people placed in residential care with a view to supporting older teenagers into semi-independent placements where this is in line with their care plans.

What assumptions have you made?

That the Change for Children programme delivers the expected improved outcomes in terms of improving support to our children and young people in care, and so is successful in helping to improve placement stability.

What constraints does the project face?

There are risks that the market for placements for children in care continues to tighten, increasing the pressure on foster placement availability and so resulting in a continued increase in use of residential placements.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Children in care placements

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Change for Children Programme

Recruitment of foster carers

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Improved placement stability and increased recruitment of our own foster placements are beneficial in terms of long term outcomes for children in care.

Title

Risks

Title

Reduction in number of foster placements available

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

This is a county-wide approach affecting small numbers of children and young people in care. Fewer than 90 children and young people access a residential placement in the course of any one year.

Residential provision is a positive choice for very few children and young people. Some, particularly those who have complex disabilities, will always require specialist residential provision and this will continue to be provided in accordance with assessed need.

The majority, however, move to residential placements after a number of family based placements have come to an unplanned end. In almost all cases, outcomes for young people in residential care are less good than those who remain placed in a consistent family based placement. Reducing overall use of residential placements is therefore likely to result in improved outcomes for children and young people.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

As noted above, maintaining children and young people within stable family-based placements and reducing use of residential care is likely to improve overall outcomes for children and young people in care.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

None

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

N/A

Business Case

A/R.6.254 Looked After Children (LAC) - Fee Negotiations, Review and High Cost Placements

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.254 Looked After Children (LAC) - Fee Negotiations, Review and High Cost Placements		
Project Code	TR001430	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.254
Business Planning Brief Description	Negotiations of external placement costs and reviews of high cost placements including: Pursuing discounts, both volume and long-term discounts; reviewing packages of support for all purchased placement types; reviewing high cost placements.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Lou Williams		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Numbers of children in care have been increasing year on year nationally for the last few years and the increase in Cambridgeshire has been much more rapid than national or local comparators. Market capacity has not kept pace with the increase in numbers of Looked After Children so placements are increasingly being made in expensive or out of county placements.

The demand being placed on children's services can also mean that children are coming into care in an unplanned or emergency way following a crisis. This tends to mean that placement costs are higher than if the entry into care had been more planned.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Placement costs for children and young people will remain as they are at point of placement. This would mean once the placement has stabilised and the need is lower, the placement would no longer offer value for money.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Ensure that all placements are offering value for money

Project Overview - What are we doing

This is a continuation of work that has taken place over the last few years to negotiate placement costs for children in care. The approach will differ but will include individual placement negotiations, negotiations around inflationary increases, pursuit of contractual discounts and wider contract negotiations. This will also include reviews of existing packages of support as well as high cost placements. This will be monitored by taking a targeted approach of those recently placed and those whose packages of support are particularly high.

What assumptions have you made?

Placement negotiations are possible and will deliver savings.

What constraints does the project face?

Competition in the market means that negotiation of costs is increasingly difficult.

Tough negotiation on inflation costs over the last few years means that further negotiation this year may be challenging.

The contract with Independent Fostering Agencies is due to be re-procured this year, this is likely to result in an increase in unit cost.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

All placements made with external providers

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Providers of external placements

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Better value for money from external placements made.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

N/A

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

A/R 6.255 Looked After Children (LAC) - Placement Mix Changes and reducing LAC numbers

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R 6.255 Looked After Children (LAC) - Placement Mix Changes and reducing LAC numbers		
Project Code	TR001428	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.255
Business Planning Brief Description	Numbers of children in care remain at around 100 higher than they should be if our performance was in line with the average of our statistical neighbours. This business case is targeted at reducing demand in the system and delivering sustainable savings by reducing costs associated with higher numbers of children in care in the system as well as increasing in-house fostering numbers and reducing the number of independent agency placements which are more costly.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Lou Williams		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

There are two main contributors to overall placement costs: numbers of children and young people in care and placement mix. It is already likely that there will be an overspend of between £2m and £2.75m on direct placement costs in 2018/19. This includes the non-delivery of a £1.5m savings target.

There are around 715 children and young people in care in Cambridgeshire. If we were looking after the number of children at the same rate as the average of the 10 most similar authorities, we would have around 610 children and young people in care.

While numbers in care have been increasing year on year nationally for the last few years (and with a particularly marked increase in 2016/17, the last year for which comparative figures are available) the increase in Cambridgeshire has been much more rapid than national or local comparators. While the rate of increase in Cambridgeshire slowed significantly in 2017/18, from just under 700 to around 715, it is potentially too soon to say we have reached a plateau in numbers, let alone to be able to confidently predict a decline.

Higher than expected numbers of children in care is often the result of a complex interplay of factors, including:

- Current thresholds into the care system that are too low;
- Children spending too long in care as a result of a lack of focused planning;
- The failure of early help services to have an impact or lack of availability of such services;
- Too much confidence in likelihood of family to achieve sustainable change and/or the impact of earlier decisions to maintain thresholds for accessing the care system very high;
- Under use of the Public Law Outline and/or family meetings/family group conferences or use of measures too late in the progress of the case;
- A growing population of children in the general population;
- Changing demographics including as a result of a need to look after, for example, higher numbers of unaccompanied asylum seeking young people.

Because of the complexity of issues likely to be present we invited Oxford Brookes to undertake a deep dive into the reasons behind our increased care population. Our initial hypothesis was that the generic nature of the work in the small units, combined with a lack of dedicated line management oversight was leading to delays in care planning, with the result that number of care days was increased, resulting in higher overall numbers as well as delays for children who would spend more time in care than they needed to before moving on to permanent homes including through adoption, Special Guardianship Order or return home to family.

Evidence of delays in care planning was identified, as expected, and this is one of the reasons for us developing specialist teams including specialist teams for children in care. There were other factors identified by Oxford Brookes, however, which included a lack of engagement by early help services (it should be noted that most cases looked at would have been accessing early help under the previous model prior to the reconfiguration as part of children's services aligned in districts) but in a significant number of cases, an over-extended period of support as children in need or subject to child protection plans, without sufficient regard to the impact that this was having on the lives of the children concerned. Oxford Brookes noted that this was then often followed by swift decisions to accommodate and/or issue legal proceedings, with few children and young people being subject to pre-proceedings or being considered within family meetings or family group conferences. Their view was that the decision to accommodate, when taken, was the right one in almost all cases they analysed, but that this decision was often not timely and earlier opportunities had been missed.

An audit of the most recent 15 children to come into the care system identified very similar themes – the decision to accommodate being the right one, but too often after a period of prolonged over-optimism and lack of real understanding of the impact of support being provided to families in changing the lives of the children concerned.

This lack of timely action is also a feature of a generic unit system without sufficiently close management oversight and the changes proposed to develop specialist assessment and children's teams with dedicated team managers will address this issue. What it does mean, however, is that the population of children in care will include more children of an age where they are most likely to remain in care for a long period and probably to adulthood.

Children under the age of 5 years are the ones who are most likely to leave care through adoption or Special Guardianship Order. In March 2016, 86 or 14% of the 610 children and young people in care were under 5; this had increased to 115 or 16% of 698 as of 31st March 2018. Of the age group 5-11 – the group

most likely to spend their childhoods in care 28% of the population looked after as of 31st March 2016: this proportion had increased to 30% by March 2018 – an increase of 36 over this period.

Changes to the way that services are delivered are essential if we are to ensure that children receive effective and timely interventions before care, with consistent decision making based on evidence of impact on the lived experience of the child. These same changes are also essential to ensure sufficient management oversight and focused attention on the needs of children in care through the proposed specialist children in care teams.

While the changes proposed to the children's services structure will address our higher than expected children in care numbers, these changes will not be implemented until autumn 2018 and so are unlikely to begin to have any impact until 2019/20. This means placement numbers are unlikely to begin to reduce in the current financial year.

Cambridgeshire also has a higher proportion of placements made with Independent Fostering Agencies than statistical neighbours. The average weekly cost of a placement with an Independent Fostering Agency is £850 compared with the average weekly cost of an in house fostering placement which is £350. The high proportion of Cambridgeshire placements made with Independent Fostering Agencies is a major factor contributing to the overspend in the placements budget.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The savings would not be made, LAC numbers would not reduce and there would potentially be further pressures on the placement budget.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

This work will:

- Remodel the MASH and Integrated Front Door;
- Create dedicated specialist teams including for children and young people in care;
- Increase the number of in-house fostering placements through recruitment campaigns thereby reducing the need for expensive independent placements.

Project Overview - What are we doing

A full analysis of the underlying reasons for the increased volumes of children in the system was completed in Spring/Summer 2018, informed by the work commissioned from Oxford Brookes, the recent Ofsted focussed visit and the MASH Peer Review.

This has led to a major change programme and restructure which is due to be implemented by January 2019.

The various aspects of the change programme and restructure that will directly impact on LAC numbers are as follows:

- Increase in management capacity within the safeguarding teams
 - This will reduce delay and drift in social work and increase resilience of the teams
- Reduction in case loads for front line staff
- Implementation of specialised teams
 - One of the observations made by the external reviews was that balancing the demands of short-term and long-term work is challenging, particularly around balancing Child Protection work with longer term work with Looked After Children. The specialised teams will mitigate this effect by allowing teams to focus on one type of work.
- Establishment of children's practitioner role
 - Children's Practitioners will be working on with Children in Need. Children in Need are often at less risk of imminent harm than children on a Child Protection Plan. This means when there is significant demand in the service, there can be drift and delay in the support they receive which in turn can lead to an escalation of need and possibly the need to accommodate.
- Establishment of dedicated adolescent teams
 - There is a cohort of young people usually aged 14-17 who are in crisis and are on the edge of care. This cohort often needs intensive and responsive support for crises to prevent the need to accommodate. The dedicated adolescent teams will be able to provide this.
- Development of reunification support service
 - It is well understood that the likelihood of a child in care returning home diminishes progressively for every week they spend in care. Having a dedicated reunification support service will enable wraparound support to be available to support reunification, where identified in the child's care plan, from the point of accommodation.
- Additional capacity in the children in care teams

Changing the placement mix will yield benefits. Innovative recruitment campaigns are about to commence and we expect to see an increase in the numbers of households applying to become foster carers with Cambridgeshire County Council. This is important, since in-house fostering unit costs are around 50% of the unit cost of Independent fostering agency placements.

However, any enquiries by prospective carers received now will not convert into new placements for between four to six months, as all carers have to be assessed, trained and then approved by panel. This means that the benefits from the new approaches to recruitment will again only begin to take effect during 2019/20.

There are a number of metrics about the way the placement mix and reduction in overall LAC numbers will be measured:

- 45 new SGOs (Special Guardianship Orders) in 2019/20 of which 12 will convert from Independent Fostering Agency placements
- 6 young people move on to staying close, staying connected
- 43 new placements with the in house foster agency (net gain)
- 13 children exiting care, not including those aged 18, some of whom will be from districts who came into care under S20 in an unplanned or emergency way and some via the RAPS service whose caseload is identified through the permanency planning and tracking group

What assumptions have you made?

The key assumption made for this business case is that there are people within Cambridgeshire who can be recruited to increase the capacity of our in house fostering service, other assumptions are included above.

What constraints does the project face?

There is a larger than expected group of children of primary school age among our child in care population.

Children and young people should not be moved from placements where they are settled, unless this is in their best longer term interest and is in accordance with their care plans.

Due to the general lack of capacity in the market, the recruitment campaign for our in house fostering service will be in competition with recruitment campaigns from other fostering agencies.

Other constraints are included above.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Yes - The proposals were presented to members of Children and Young People's Committee in May 2018. Papers can be found on the committee website.

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

- Children's Services in Cambridgeshire
 - Safeguarding Teams
 - Corporate Parenting Service
 - Performance and Quality Assurance
- Integrated Front Door for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (including Cambridgeshire's Early Help Hub)
- Looked After Children in independent placements
- New foster carers

What is outside of scope?

- Business Support for Children's Services in Cambridgeshire
- All other Peterborough Services
- Early Help teams in Cambridgeshire (not including the Early Help Hub)
- Children's Disability Teams in Cambridgeshire

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Looked After Children, particularly those in independent placements, as well as their parents, carers and social workers.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Maintaining children and young people within stable family-based placements is likely to improve overall outcomes for children and young people in care.

These proposals are intending to ensure that children receive effective and timely interventions before care, with consistent decision making based on evidence of impact on the lived experience of the child. They will also ensure sufficient management oversight and focused attention on the needs of children in care through the specialist children in care teams.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

All decisions about children's care are based on their individual needs. There are no negative impacts anticipated.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

N/A

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Children with disabilities are overrepresented in the looked after children cohort nationwide, so they will be more affected by the positive impacts in the proposals.

Business Case

A/R 6.258 Children's Home Changes

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R 6.258 Children's Home Changes		
Project Code	TR001457	Business Planning Reference	A/R 6.258
Business Planning Brief Description	Savings attributable to the closure of Victoria Road Children's Home		
Senior Responsible Officer	Lou Williams, Service Director - Children's Services		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

There are two young people in residence at Victoria Road and on each occasion we have sought to place a third, the unit has become unmanageable. The core difficulty has been the ongoing difficulty in the recruitment of suitably experienced staff to work in a residential setting with some of our most challenging young people.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Victoria Road would remain open at a cost of £600k per annum and deliver placements for two young people. This gives a weekly cost of around £5,700 per young person per week. Appropriate alternative provision has been identified for the two young people at a cost of £3,200 and £1,200 per week respectively.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To close Victoria Road Children's Home

Project Overview - What are we doing

Closure of Victoria Road Children's Home

What assumptions have you made?

N/A

What constraints does the project face?

N/A

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Staff working at Victoria Road Children's Home and young people living there

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Staff working at Victoria Road Children's Home and young people living in Victoria Road

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Decrease in cost to Cambridgeshire County Council

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Redundancy or redistribution of existing staff team

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Placement move of the two young people currently living in Victoria Road

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

A/R.6.259 Early Years Service savings

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.259 Early Years Service savings		
Project Code	TR001450	Business Planning Reference	A.R.6.259
Business Planning Brief Description	A review of services provided by the Early Years Service in light of the link with Peterborough and growing traded services.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Jonathan Lewis		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Budget constraints within the council require that all areas are considered for savings including statutory and non-statutory services areas.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Financial pressures on the council will escalate.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Analysis has shown that relative to our benchmark statistical neighbours, we spend more per head and given the financial challenge we will look to bring ourselves down to the statistical average

Project Overview - What are we doing

We are currently reviewing the service offer, trading income opportunities and our statutory duties to decide how this reduction will be delivered. This will be complete in October.

What assumptions have you made?

The proposal will generate £200k saving for the council.

What constraints does the project face?

We have a complex funding arrangement with the Dedicated Schools Grant which will need further consideration.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Early Years Service

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Schools and Settings will be affected through a reduced service. We may be able to offset these reductions through generating more income or seeking external funding.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Schools and settings will be affected over a reduced offer that may lead to schools / settings quality being reduced and ofsted results falling.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

The reduction may hit our work with vulnerable groups including pupil premium children.

Business Case

A/R.6.260 Reduction of internal funding to school facing traded services

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.260 Reduction of internal funding to school facing traded services		
Project Code	TR001448	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.260
Business Planning Brief Description	A reduction to the internal funding to the ICT Service and the PE and Sports Advisory service recognising a reduction in LA usage		
Senior Responsible Officer	Jonathan Lewis		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Budget constraints within the council require that all areas are considered for savings including statutory and non-statutory services areas.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Financial pressures on the council will escalate

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Historically, both the ICT services and our PE advice to schools have been supported for core activities through a subsidy from the Education Director. The number of schools benefiting from this service have reduced as they have moved to academy status.

Project Overview - What are we doing

We are removing all the subsidy from ICT and half the funding to support our PE advisor. Both areas are not core statutory functions although there are some H&S requirement around PE and the remaining funding is there to support these services. This will mean less services will be provided free to schools.

What assumptions have you made?

The proposal will generate £151k saving for the council.

What constraints does the project face?

Both reductions may lead to further questioning of the viability of these services. There may also be a time lag in how quickly these changes can be made prior to the commencement of the new financial years.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Schools will face reduced services, although it is the responsibility of governors to meet their statutory duties in these areas

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Schools will be affected through the reductions as they may have to fund more as a result.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Schools with financial challenges may face more difficulties as a result of these changes.

Business Case

A/R.6.261 Schools Intervention Service

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.261 Schools Intervention Service		
Project Code	TR001451	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.261
Business Planning Brief Description	Reduction in capacity of the service in line with the reduced number of maintained schools that require a direct service.		
Senior Responsible Officer	Jonathan Lewis		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Budget constraints within the council require that all areas are considered for savings including statutory and non-statutory services areas.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Financial pressures on the council will escalate.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Analysis has shown that relative to our benchmark statistical neighbours, we spend more per head and given the financial challenge we will look to bring ourselves down to the statistical average.

Project Overview - What are we doing

We are currently reviewing the service offer, trading income opportunities and our statutory duties to decide how this reduction will be delivered. This will be complete in October.

What assumptions have you made?

The proposal will generate £100k saving for the council.

What constraints does the project face?

We have a complex funding arrangement with the Dedicated Schools Grant which will need further consideration.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Review of the School Intervention Services, including the service offer, trading income opportunities and our statutory duties

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Schools will be affected through a reduced service. We may be able to offset these reductions through generating more income or seeking external funding.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Schools will be affected over a reduced offer than may lead to schools / settings quality being reduced and ofsted results falling.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

The reduction may hit our work with vulnerable groups including pupil premium children.

Business Case

A/R.6.263 Terms and Conditions (Term-Time Only contracts)

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.6.263 Terms and Conditions (Term-Time Only contracts)		
Project Code	TR001449	Business Planning Reference	A/R.6.263
Business Planning Brief Description	A voluntary change to term time only contracts (or annualised hours) for staff within the Education Directorate where this is appropriate for their role		
Senior Responsible Officer	Jonathan Lewis		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Budget constraints within the council require that all areas are considered for savings including statutory and non-statutory services areas.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Financial pressures on the council will escalate.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

Currently there are service areas where we have staff on a '52 week' year contract supporting activities in schools that only run across a 38 week year school term. These need aligning through voluntary changes in terms and conditions,

Project Overview - What are we doing

Offer to all staff the opportunities to access part time hours and make budget savings in light of these. Each case will be considered on a business need so will vary from service area to service area.

What assumptions have you made?

The proposal will generate £30k saving for the council.

What constraints does the project face?

Nobody comes forward and volunteers to take a pay reduction in line with reduced days across the year.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

Relevant Education staff supporting activities in schools that run across a 38 week school term

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

This is a voluntary request in the first instance and if there are no volunteers forthcoming we may need to look at individual roles and considering whether restructure is the most appropriate way to realise savings.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

None

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Refusal to accept people's requests to reduce hours, as a result of business need, may lead to upset with staff.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Business Case

A/R.6.264 Decommissioning of Multi-Systemic Therapy [MST]

Project Overview

Project Title	Decommissioning of Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)		
Project Code		Business Planning Reference	
Business Planning Brief Description	Decommissioning of MST, an intensive intervention with families where children aged 11-17 are at risk of coming into care, becoming involved in offending or experiencing other poor outcomes		
Senior Responsible Officer	Oliver Haywood/Lou Williams		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

MST is a commissioned service providing high cost, intensive interventions with families with children aged 11-17 and who are experiencing a range of significant challenges. As detailed below, recent research has found that outcomes after 18 months are not statistically different to those achieved through more usual and much lower cost forms of support.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

The service would continue to be funded, meaning that savings would be required elsewhere.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

To decommission the MST programme, capturing some of the resulting savings as a cashable saving towards helping to manage the Council's challenging financial position, while securing the remainder for use in maintaining investment in other early help and edge of care support services. The outcome will be to ensure that we are providing effective support to as many young people at risk of coming into care and/or prevent involvement in offending as possible.

Project Overview - What are we doing

As aims and Objectives

What assumptions have you made?

None

What constraints does the project face?

Must be compliant with the terms and conditions associated with ending the contract for the provision of MST.

Delivery Options**Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?**

Decision to end contract based on recommendations by the Joint Commissioning Board.

Scope / Interdependencies**Scope****What is within scope?**

MST contract; associated services to close.

Early Help/Edge of Care services – options for further investment subject to needs assessment.

What is outside of scope?

N/A

Project Dependencies

Capacity building within edge of care and early help services

Cost and Savings

Full year cost of MST contract is £640K. Investment earmarked for edge of care/early help services is £319K.

£321K per annum full year cashable savings

Non Financial Benefits**Non Financial Benefits Summary**

Supporting edge of care and early help services while decommissioning high cost MST services should increase the number of young people and families able to access support owing to markedly reduced unit costs.

Risks

Some risk that a small increase in numbers of children in care may take place as the MST project ends work with some high risk young people; this should be possible to mitigate by careful transfer arrangements to mainstream support services already in place.

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

Small numbers of young people 'on the edge of care' currently accessing MST will access other services. To put this in context, 22 young people had been supported by MST in the first six months of 2018/19. Higher numbers of young people should be able to be supported through use of lower unit-cost early help and edge of care services.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Introduction to Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

MST was developed in the United States where it has had a positive impact in improving outcomes for young people aged between 11 and 17 who are engaging in serious anti-social behaviour. It was introduced into Britain in 2011 following positive research outcomes, particularly in the US but also in some European countries.

MST is delivered according to a standard model, in order to preserve the fidelity of the approach. There are two forms of the approach provided by the contractor in Cambridgeshire: A specialist form of MST that works with young people displaying problematic sexual behaviour [MST-PSB] and a standard MST programme, focused on working with young people displaying moderate to severe anti-social behaviour and at risk of very poor outcomes as a result. The expectation of volume in the contract is for up to eight young people on the MST-PSB, with one young person currently engaged as of the middle of November 2018.

The expectation of volume in the contract for Standard MST is thirty-five, with sixteen young people accessing the service as of mid-November 2018.

MST is an intensive model of intervention, which its proponents argue is effective because it reduces the likelihood of young people leaving the home network and moving into higher cost residential or other care placements or into custody. From the perspective of longer-term outcomes for the young people concerned, this is also of course beneficial.

Research in the USA, as noted above, indicated good outcomes in terms of preventing young people from the impact of family breakdown, with reduced use of residential care and custody among those accessing MST.

There is, however, always a risk in transplanting models from one country to another and expecting to see the same outcomes. This is because the context within which an approach such as MST is delivered will be

very different, even if the model of intervention is exactly the same. Specifically in this context, there are a range of other services and interventions in place to support young people at risk of severely negative outcomes that are not in place in the United States. These services, things like CAMH services, youth offending, youth work and targeted early help services, are also working to prevent young people becoming at risk of very poor outcomes.

The difficulty in evidencing impact of any intervention

There are many types of family interventions that claim to prevent children and young people entering care, which are then used to justify the cost of the intervention concerned. The difficulty is in evidencing effectiveness in a way that is statistically reliable.

The most reliable studies are large-scale longitudinal randomised control trials. This methodology takes a group of families or young people who are all eligible for the service being tested, randomly divides this group into two, and offers intervention or treatment to only one half of the overall population. The eventual outcomes can then be compared between the group receiving the intervention with the group that did not receive the service, known as the control group.

Because these trials are expensive, take a long time to complete, and need to overcome various ethical issues – for example, whether it can be justified to withhold a supposedly beneficial service from children and their families for the purpose of research – there are relatively few trials of this type that take place in social sciences.

Without a randomised control study, however, it is not possible to be certain of the effectiveness of a particular intervention. The fact that an intensive programme is implemented in a particular area and care numbers then reduce, for example, does not evidence that one has caused the other, no matter what the operators of that programme may claim. A whole host of other factors may be at play including, for example, changes in the demography or improvements in the care planning processes or better application of thresholds in the authority where the intensive programme is being delivered.

MST in the UK: A randomised control trial by University College, London ¹

Having said that studies of this type are rare, there is a very important one available – the only large scale longitudinal study comparing outcomes under MST programmes with outcomes under ‘Management as Usual’. Management as Usual was the researchers’ term for the control group of young people who having been identified as being suitable for MST were instead offered the standard range of services in the area in which they lived.

The study considered the impact on 684 young people from ten sites where MST was operating across the UK, half of whom accessed MST and half accessed the range of other available support services available where they were living. Those accessing MST did so for between three and five months, with outcomes measured at baseline and then at six, 12 and 18 months. The primary outcome measured was the

¹ The full report can be found at:

http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10037910/22/Fonagy_START%20paper%20for%20resubmission%20161117%20cleanCombined.pdf
A summary is available at <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2018/jan/intensive-behaviour-therapy-no-better-conventional-support>

proportion living in out of home placements. Secondary outcomes included things like substance misuse, participant wellbeing, as well as service and criminal justice costs.

Because the services provided under Management as Usual [MAU] were essentially the services available to young people according to where they lived, there was no standard offer of support to this population of young people. In most cases, however, these would have included mental health, youth and youth offending services as well as a variety of other family support prevention and other early help services.

Outcomes of the University College London Study

The research found that after 18 months, there was no significant difference in rates of out-of-home placement [i.e. coming into care or going into custody] between the MST group and the group supported by MAU.

There were consistent short-term symptom reductions from MST in the secondary outcomes, but no evidence that this short-term superiority was maintained over the longer term. Conduct disorders decreased by more than 40% in both groups. Time to first offence was comparable for both groups, but the number of offences was far higher for the MST group at 18 months than for the MAU group.

In other words, the findings of this study do not support MST over MAU as the intervention of choice for adolescents with moderate to severe anti-social behaviour. Differences between most outcomes were not statistically significant and there is some evidence that MST might actually increase the risk of offending behaviour among those participating.

Researchers said that their findings supported the effectiveness of the range of services already available to young people in the UK. This goes back to the point about how, when transplanting a model from one country to another, it is risky to expect the same outcomes, because the context in which the programmes are operating will be different.

Applicability of findings to Cambridgeshire

As noted above, there was no standard offer of preventative services in the above randomised control study. Young people in the control group accessed the range of support available in their home area.

Cambridgeshire is fortunate to have a wide range of early help and prevention services, including significant numbers of young people's workers and an effective youth offending service. These are likely to be at least as good as those accessed by the control groups in the above trial. In addition, and uniquely, there is an established offer of clinical support by the clinicians operating in Cambridgeshire, able to provide clinical oversight and support to those workers working with highly complex young people.

Were we not to continue with the MST contract, more than £300K would be available to further develop our edge of care offer to young people at greatest risk. Our clinical lead, Rachel Watson, is already working on what such an offer could look like, including how it would interlink with our existing edge of care services and with the current mental health offer.

In considering the Cambridgeshire context it is worth considering that the range of 'Management as Usual' services, which would include, for example, our extensive early help services are already very well developed. In this context, the added value of MST is even less likely to be significant.

De-commissioning this particular form of support enables the Council to make reductions in overall expenditure that may otherwise have had to have been made against existing early help services that offer support to vulnerable groups at lower cost. A proportion of the funding currently aligned with the MST programme will also be re-invested in protecting or supporting the range of support services available for young people across the county. This might include, for example, extending the role of the clinicians who are also a significant additional resource available to the local 'Management as Usual' services available here in Cambridgeshire that are not available elsewhere.

The annual cost of the service is £640,000; of this £321,000 will contribute to savings that Council must make, leaving a further £320,000 for investment to support investment in early help services. It is important to note that the £321,000 contribution to savings is also important in protecting continued investment in early help services, since contributions to savings targets protect other services from reductions in budget.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

There are unlikely to be any significant negative impacts from discontinuing the service.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

None

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

Numbers directly affected are very small, and other services will be available to support this population as described above.

Business Case

A/R.7.103 Attendance and Behaviour Service Income

Project Overview

Project Title	A/R.7.103 Attendance and Behaviour Service Income		
Project Code	TR001452	Business Planning Reference	A/R.7.103
Business Planning Brief Description	A review of charging models and use of school absence penalty notices within the Attendance and Behaviour service		
Senior Responsible Officer	Jonathan Lewis		

Project Approach

Background

Why do we need to undertake this project?

Budget constraints within the council require that all areas are considered for savings including statutory and non-statutory services areas.

What would happen if we did not complete this project?

Financial pressures on the council will escalate.

Approach

Aims / Objectives

A review of charging models and use of school absence penalty notices within the Attendance and Behaviour service

Project Overview - What are we doing

The project will look at all sources of income within attendance and behavior and look at opportunities to improve income collection whilst also supporting better outcomes. This will include offering more support for behaviour to schools on a traded basis and sharpening our focus on good school attendance including widening our capacity to collect income from parents for fines – this will help improve attendance including those children who are persistently late. There has been a significant increase in income since the Isle of Wight attendance judgement and those proposals seek to building this income into the budget setting process.

What assumptions have you made?

The proposal will generate £50k additional income for the council.

What constraints does the project face?

There could be changes in legislation that might impact upon this proposal.

Delivery Options

Has an options and feasibility study been undertaken?

Scope / Interdependencies

Scope

What is within scope?

What is outside of scope?

Project Dependencies

Title

Cost and Savings

See accompanying financial report

Non Financial Benefits

Non Financial Benefits Summary

None

Title

Risks

Title

Project Impact

Community Impact Assessment

Who will be affected by this proposal?

We will only extend our focus on collecting income in light of existing legislation so the impact on parents / schools should be insignificant unless they are not complying with legislation or wish to purchase more services from the LA.

What positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

Improved school attendance and less need for specialist provision for pupils with behavioral difficulties.

What negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

More potential parents affected as we focus on more fines for holidays and late arrival at schools.

Are there other impacts which are more neutral?

Disproportionate impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics

Details of Disproportionate Impacts on protected characteristics and how these will be addressed

The reduction may hit our work with vulnerable groups including pupil premium children.