

Public Document Pack

Children and Young People Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Wednesday, 18 November 2015

7.30 pm, Committee Room 1

Civic Suite

Lewisham Town Hall

London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Katie Wood (Tel: 020 8314 9446)

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded and/or filmed except for Appendix 5 of item numbered 6 on the Agenda. For legal reasons, this item will be considered in private with the press and public excluded.

Part 1

Item		Pages
6.	Future of the Youth Service Please note Appendix 5 is Exempt	1 - 2
7.	Lewisham Future Programme - update on savings proposals Report to follow	3 - 30

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Accounts Select Committee		
Report Title	Exclusion of the Press and Public	
Key Decision	No	Item No. 6
Ward		
Contributors	Chief Executive (Head of Business & Committee)	
Class	Part 1	Date: 18 November 2015

Recommendation

It is recommended that under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of this item because it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Item

6. Future of the Youth Service Appendix 5 (Part 2)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Children and Young People Select Committee			
Title	Budget Savings 2016-18 Further Consideration	Item No	7
Contributors	Head of Resources and Performance		
Class	Part 1	Date	18 th November 2015

Reason for Urgency and Lateness

The report has not been available for 5 clear working days before the meeting and the Chair is asked to accept it as an urgent item. The report was not available for dispatch on Tuesday 10th November because there was a slight delay in finalising one of the pro-formas.

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to bring to the attention of the Committee those savings proposals the Mayor did not make a decision on 30 September 2105 pending further comments from this Committee.

2. Background

- 2.1 At Mayor and Cabinet on 30th September 2015 the Mayor agreed that the following proposals should be referred to Children and Young People Select Committee for their consideration and comment before he would make a final decision on the savings proposals. The detailed proposals for consideration are attached as an Appendix to the report.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 To consider the contents of the report and comment on the proposed savings.

4. Proposals for further consideration

A11 Transitions paper.

Further information on the proposals was requested as to the young people that would be affected by the proposal. The pro forma now contains additional information on the proposal.

J2b Attendance and Welfare proposals

There were questions raised by the Select Committee which have now been addressed in a re writing of the pro forma.

Q3 a – e Targeted Services

A number of questions were raised and these have been addressed in a re writing of the pro forma Q3 attached.

N5 Transport

The Mayor asked that the Select Committee comment on whether they are satisfied that the savings proposal takes account of the current overspending.

J2a Increased Charges for Schools SLAs

The Select Committee wanted to be aware of the view of the Schools Forum on these increases before indicating its support. The Next meeting of Schools Forum is 12 December and their views will be brought to the Committee in January 2016.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 There are none arising from this report however the financial implications of the individual proposals are set out in the pro-forma for each saving.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 There are none arising from this report

6. Crime and disorder implications

- 6.1 There are none arising from this report.

7. Equalities implications

- 7.1 There are no specific equalities implications arising from this report. Equalities Implications are addressed in each pro-forma.

8. Environmental implications

- 8.1 There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report.

Appendices

- A11 Re-configuring support for young adults
J2 Schools related services
Q3 Targeted Services savings
N5 Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Re-configuring support for young adults
Reference:	A11
LFP work strand:	Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health)
Directorate:	Adult and Community Services
Head of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	Adults with Learning Disabilities
Cabinet portfolio:	Health, Wellbeing and Older People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Transition planning	Yes	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>A number of young adults aged 18 with disabilities will transfer to adult social care so that their eligible needs can continue to be met. Most of the young people who come through this transition process continue into tertiary education, we forecast that there will be 7 in 16/17 and 15 in 17/18 who will require support. At present there are limited facilities in Lewisham where specialist requirements can be met. Therefore many of these young people attend out of borough facilities and are often residents of colleges outside the for the majority of the year. These costs further increase when the young person comes home during college breaks as additional packages of care need to be provided whilst they are living in their parents' or carers' homes.</p>
Saving proposal
<p>The development of supported living arrangements for young people along with access to adult education and supported employment will reduce the need for high cost out of borough placements. Young adults will be able to attend college in the borough and either be supported to continue to live at home with their family or in supported living schemes within the borough.</p> <p>Adult Social Care will also be working with CYP to further develop local education offers for young people with challenging behaviour which will enable more young people to stay in the borough.</p>

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
<p>The impact on young people should be positive; they will stay within the borough and be near family, friends and local groups with whom they are familiar. The new supported living schemes will enable young people to gain independent living skills in their own homes.</p>
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

There is a risk of a lack of suitable accommodation for young people with disabilities within the borough. In mitigation, existing housing provision can be reconfigured to support young people without a physical disability. Where people have a significant physical disability, officers from ASC will work with housing colleagues to consider medium term options.

CYP and ASC will work with the young person, their parents and carers at an early stage in the transition process and will ensure that the requirements of a young person's Health, Education and Care plan can be met by provision within the borough thus reducing the need for reliance on colleges out of borough.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	1,000	0	1,000
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Transition	200	300	500
Total	200	300	500
% of Net Budget	20%	30%	50%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
2	8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	M	Pregnancy / Maternity:	L
Gender:	M	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	L
Age:	H	Sexual orientation:	L
Disability:	H	Gender reassignment:	L
Religion / Belief:	L	Overall:	M
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
<p>The nature of these proposals are targeted at younger people with disabilities. However, the equalities impact is a positive one rather than detrimental and therefore no specific mitigation will be required.</p>			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>The Children and families Act became law on the 1 September 2014. The new law makes it clear that children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) should be supported on a consistent basis across Education, Health and Social Care from 0-25 years of age. Education Health and Care plans need to consider the needs of younger people in receipt of education. How those needs are met can be highly flexible.</p>

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	
April 2016	

11. Summary timetable

May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	Savings implemented for new academic year

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Schools Related Services
Reference:	J2
LFP work strand:	School Effectiveness
Directorate:	CYP
Head of Service:	Alan Docksey
Service/Team area:	Standards and Achievement, Education Psychology, Attendance and Welfare, Estates Management, Pupil Support?
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Schools SLAs £100k: Introduce a 2.5% above inflation increase to the charges to schools for service level agreements.	NO	NO	NO
b) Attendance and Welfare: (£150k) The proposal is to focus council spend on meeting statutory duties and increase the range of services that schools can receive if they pay.	YES	NO	YES
c) Schools Infrastructure ICT: (£118k) Schools Strategic IT post costs to be covered by charges to schools	NO	NO	NO
d) Educational Psychologists £5k: Increase in charging for training to PVI sector	NO	NO	NO
e) School Estates Management	NO	NO	NO

2. Decision Route

£220k: To increase charges to schools, reduce budgets for consultancy services and management re-organisation			
f) Free School Meals Eligibility Assessment £17k: A re-organisation to reduce costs of service	NO	NO	NO
g) Standards and Achievement team £50k: Management re-organisation to reduce costs of service	NO	NO	NO

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The services and activities being reviewed all provide support to schools in support of their responsibilities.

The Local Authority already charges for services provided to schools with an annual income of £3.3m (2015/16). The proposals set out below would increase the level of traded services by £0.4m representing 0.2% of the totality of schools' delegated budgets.

Saving proposal

a) To increase the charges to schools for all existing SLAs 2.5% above rate of inflation to raise **£100k** in 2016/17. This would better reflect the actual cost of delivering the services. The increase represents 0.2% of the budgets delegated to schools

b) This proposal is to increase the proportion of **Attendance and Welfare services** traded with schools and reduce the cost of the core service. The increased income is estimated at **£150k**. While the attendance of vulnerable pupils would continue to be the subject of attendance casework centrally, schools would be charged for routine casework currently undertaken as part of the core service. Under this proposal, the AWS would better reflect the statutory duties of the LA and there would be greater clarity about the responsibilities that schools must deliver either by doing the casework themselves or paying for the LA to undertake it. Primary schools will in the main be affected by this proposal as secondary schools already have the in-school resources to absorb the impact of this change.

The current council funded budget of £498k represents a cost of £19 per pupil

3. Description of service area and proposal

which benchmarks against average English spending of £12 per pupil. The budget has in last two years been reduced to move towards national and local comparators and this further saving would achieve the English average benchmark.

c) The **Schools Strategic IT** post grew out of the BSF programme providing advice on whole school ICT infrastructure set up and options for curriculum IT devices to support the curriculum. More recently the role has supported primary expansion works and the delivery of the new special school. The proposal is that the role is to be covered by the DSG through charges to schools or to no longer provide the service. The post currently costs **£118k**.

d) Increase in charges for training by **Education Psychology service** to PVI child care providers raising £5k.

e) **School Estates:** Some savings have already been made through the voluntary severance scheme releasing **£30k** not already accounted for in previous savings proposals.

It is anticipated a further efficiency of the estates team can release savings of **£190k** through greater collaboration within the Council and a reduction in provision for property consultancy fees.

f) **Free School Meals Eligibility Assessment:**

It is proposed to transfer the service to the Customer Services financial assessments team. The saving would delete the remaining GF contribution of £17k towards costs but there would still be a cost borne by the DSG. This will be achieved by the deletion of a vacant post and a change of line management.

g) **The Standards and Achievement Team** monitors the performance of schools, identifies where action is required to secure improvement and broker or provide that support to the schools requiring it. A management restructure is in process which would ensure the senior capacity required for the school improvement agenda especially for secondary schools and continue work for primary and early years while delivering savings. The re-organisation would deliver **£50k** of savings through reduction in staffing budget, with the remaining staffing/commissioning budget sufficient to meet the local authority's duties to secure improvement of schools.

There continues to be a challenge concerning the improvement of secondary school results however the aim is, that through increased use of school to school support and the focussing of the savings on management posts, there will not be an impact on the support and challenge provided to schools. It may however take until 2017/18 for the changes and savings to be achieved fully.

The reduction in staffing costs will not result in redundancies because of existing vacancies.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

General

School budgets and the dedicated schools grant have come under increasing pressure over the last few years. For 2015/16, funding allocated to schools in respect of children with special educational needs has been reduced by £2.1m to help balance the central DSG budget. The Schools Forum agreed to this change, recognising that schools had already been funded for some of these costs within their delegated budgets.

Recent publicity, nationally, has highlighted that real terms funding of schools budgets will reduce over the life of this parliament by at least 7% in real terms if the funding level per pupil stays cash frozen. Some forecasts suggest up to 12% (an analysis by the Institute of Fiscal Studies).

A 7% reduction would reduce schools' spending power across Lewisham by £17m. There are other budgetary pressures on the Dedicated Schools Grant that will need to be funded. The national rates revaluation which will take place in 2017 is expected to increase the rates bills falling to the DSG. Some of this pressure will however be eased by the continued increase in pupil numbers.

In respect of the individual proposals:

- a) The increased income would represent 0.2% of the delegated budgets of schools so the impact on both take up of services and on schools budgets will be minimal.
- b) There is a risk that if schools do not buy in to this, that children who have some vulnerabilities and who are not in school may be missed. However the LA's 'missing from education' procedures should mitigate this. If the service is not successful in securing buy back from schools, there is a risk that up to 3 FTE staff may need to be made redundant.
- c) Schools not buying the Strategic IT service may make poorer decisions on renewal of their IT infrastructure and equipment.
- d) The increase in training charges by EPS will not have a significant impact over 120 child care providers in the borough
- e) There will be a reduced capacity to respond to major incidents across the schools estate that no one individual school could manage on its own.
- f) It should be possible to maintain the free school meals eligibility service with the budget reduction of £17k
- g) There will be reduction in support to schools which are good and outstanding, with a greater expectation that they are sustained and improved through school to school support.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

General

4. Impact and risks of proposal

It is likely that there will come a point when schools feel the increased charges through SLAs will result in them having to purchase fewer services, a reduced level of support or reducing expenditure on other services in support of pupils' education. This will make the traded services much more sensitive to price increases than has been the case in the past.

In order to mitigate the likelihood of the increased levels of income failing to be achieved there will be consultation with schools forum on the proposals with the opportunity to influence the final shape of the proposals for the services to be charged for and the value of charges. Other mitigation for each specific proposal is set out below:

- a) Consultation with schools forum with the results of that available for subsequent scrutiny and decision making.
- b) There is a need to ensure that schools have robust systems in place to identify vulnerable children and refer to the appropriate agencies.
- c) Promotion of the IT goods and services framework contract negotiated by the Council for schools
- d) n/a
- e) Closer alignment of service with corporate property services and wider spread of expertise to draw upon.
- f) There is a need to ensure that the close working with the free entitlement Child care provision team to ensure national objectives are being delivered. The implementation of IT solutions for the application process should assist this.
- g) None significant

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund	5,844	3,670	2,174
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	100		100
b)	150		150
c)	60	58	118
d)	5		5
e)	220		220
f)	17		17
g)		50	50
Total	605522	108	660
% of Net GF Budget	28%	2%	30%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	Yes	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	The DSG provides additional support to these services £634k.		

6. Alignment to Political priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Political priorities
		A. Strengthening community input

6. Alignment to Political priorities		
D	E	B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating / Assets E. School places and improvement F. Housing delivery G. Waste strategy and change H. Social Care and Health transformation I. Violent crime
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
MEDIUM	LOW	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
2	10	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
NEUTRAL	POSITIVE	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
LOW	LOW	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			NO

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					NO
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

12. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
The main savings timetable has been included here FYI.	
Please amend for proposal if different.	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations with Schools Forum 1 October 2015
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C

12. Summary timetable

	for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service
Reference:	N5
LFP work strand:	Environmental Services
Directorate:	Customer Services
Head of Service:	Nigel Tyrell
Service/Team area:	Fleet and Passenger Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Public Realm
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Sustainable Development

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
Review of Lewisham's Passenger Transport Service	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

The council's Fleet management service and the Door to Door service sit within the Environment division. The fleet management service procure, run and maintain the council's owned fleet and procure specialist hired in vehicles when needed. The direct revenue cost of this service is in the region of £4.1m. The costs of the service are fully recharged to end service users such as Door to Door and Refuse collection.

The Door to Door services provides home to school transport to children with special educational needs and also transports adult social care clients to and from day care provision. The council spends approx. £5.3m p/a operating passenger transport made up of direct staff and management costs and vehicle costs recharged from Fleet (fuel, staff costs, vehicle on the road costs and maintenance etc). In addition to this, the council (primarily CYP SEN and ASC) spends a further £2m p/a on taxi provision for clients that can't be accommodated on Door to Door vehicles (due to capacity of vehicles, the logistics of the routes etc.) The total spent on providing transport for this client group therefore equates to £7.3m p/a.

Saving proposal

A. Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service: The relationship with the transport provider (Environment) and the client services (primarily CYP and ASC) and the funding model for these services are interwoven and complex. As such a corporate approach is being taken in order to identify opportunities to reduce spend and demand whilst continuing to meet statutory duties and support the residents that rely on passenger transport. It is expected that the savings identified for this review will be achieved via the following approaches:

3. Description of service area and proposal

1. Operational efficiency

Identify opportunities within the current Door to Door operational model to reduce costs through more efficient use of resource and increasing operational efficiency.

2. Promoting Independence

Recent legislative changes (e.g. the Care Act and the Children and Families Bill) make the need to promote choice, independence and 'ordinary lives' essential in the delivery of services to both children and young people with SEN and clients accessing adult social care support. This extends to how we meet a client's transport needs. However the legislative changes also increase the age range applicable for travel assistance from 5-18 years to 0-25 years. Within CYP we will be exploring the potential to further embed and offer a wider range of alternative travel assistance options (such as direct payments and independent travel training) in order to better support independence and reduce reliance on local authority provided transport. Whilst direct transport provision will continue to be the most suitable option for some clients, we expect to be able to at least maintain, and possibly reduce, demand through growing and improving the range of travel assistance options we offer. It should be noted however, that there is currently an overspend on the CYP SEN budget (of approx. £700k) and as such any reduction to spend achieved as a result of this approach will be required to reduce the overspend in the first instance.

Adult Social Care will also continue to promote Direct Payments in line with the previously agreed saving for remodelling day services (A4).

The council's waste services account for a significant proportion of the costs attracted by the Fleet service. The influence of demand on those costs are being considered by the waste strategy review as a part of a separate savings strand.

3. Alternative delivery models

Explore opportunities to pursue alternative delivery models for local authority provided transport provision (e.g. via an outsourced contract).

4. Policy review

The council is required to provide transport for eligible young people of statutory school age. Other local authorities (e.g. Coventry) are now exploring removing or charging for discretionary travel for under 5s and over 16s. As part of this review we would like to explore the legal position of this approach to determine the extent to which this could be applied in Lewisham. This is a work in progress and any proposed changes to Policy would be returned to Mayor and Cabinet.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The impact of the approaches detailed in this proposal are as follows:

- Possible re-organisation within the Door to Door Service (to respond to a reduced

4. Impact and risks of proposal

demand from client services as a result of higher take up of direct payments/independent travel training, or as a result of operational efficiencies identified).

- Changes to process within the client service areas – to promote and embed a wider range of alternative travel assistance options.
- Market development – to ensure we have a suitable range of travel assistance options to offer to suitable clients (e.g. commission an independent travel training programme for SEN clients).
- Service users – Eligible clients within ASC will be offered Direct Payments as a matter of course. Within CYP, new and existing clients will be encouraged to take up travel assistance options with direct transport provision being seen as a last resort.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

For any changes the current Door to Door operating model or a reduction in service requirements as a result of reduced demand from client services (due to an increased take up of direct payments/independent travel training) staff consultation would be required.

For CYP- Consultation with service users would be required prior to the introduction of new travel assistance options, or if changes to the processes for application or the transport policies were to be pursued.

For ASC Clients – Discussions about transport requirements will form part of an individual's care plan. For those who the service is changing – consultation has already taken place as part of the previously agreed saving.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,884	(660)	7,224
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Review of Lewisham's Fleet and Passenger Transport Service	500	500	1,000
Total	500	500	1,000
% of Net Budget	7%	7%	14%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
		1. Community leadership and

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		empowerment
9	10	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	3. Clean, green and liveable
Positive	Positive	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	5. Strengthening the local economy
Medium	Medium	6. Decent homes for all
		7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older people
		9. Active, healthy citizens
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact on a single ward.
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	0	0	0
Scale 3 – 5	61	61	61	0	0
Sc 6 – SO2	48	48	51	0	3
PO1 – PO5	7	7	9	0	2
PO6 – PO8	2	2	2	0	0
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1	0	0

9. Human Resources impact					
JNC					
Total	119	119	124	0	5
Gender	Female	Male			
	53	66			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	52	64	3	0	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
TBC

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Targeted Services Savings
Reference:	Q3
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	WARWICK TOMSETT
Service/Team area:	Children and Young People
Cabinet portfolio:	Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Sensory Teachers: A Reduction in the Equipment Budget	NO	NO	NO
b) Sensory Teachers: The DSG regulations indicate that any individual support would be from DSG resources so costs can be recharged to DSG.	NO	NO	NO
c) Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff	NO	NO	YES
d) Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	NO	NO	YES
e) Reduce Carers funding	NO	NO	NO
f) Review of MAPP	NO	NO	NO
g) Joint commissioning Increased contribution from health toward joint commissioning work for children's services.	NO	NO	NO

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

Children with Complex Needs

The Children with Complex Needs Service provides the following services to enable Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities to achieve better life outcomes, they include:

- Multi-Agency Planning Pathway Service;
- Portage Service;
- Short Breaks Service;
- Occupational Therapy Service;
- Special Educational Needs Service;
- Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities.

The overall budget is £2.9m excluding placement costs but including support and packages of care. The overall reduction would be 13%. In 2013/14 savings of c£200k were made following a service restructure. The service is involved in the implementation of the latest SEND reforms (Children & Families Act 2014) which has put a significant pressure on the service in terms of case work delivery.

Multi-Agency Planning Pathway Service (MAPP): £240k

MAPP is a care co-ordination service across health, education and social care. MAPP also provides a care co-ordination for Discharge Planning, Joint Initial Assessment Clinic (JIAC) and Continuing Care.

MAPP also undertakes a statutory role with Education, Health and Care plans for children and young people under the age of 5 years of age.

Portage: £183k

Portage is an educational home visiting service for pre-school children with developmental needs. The aim of Portage is to support the development of young children's play, communication, relationships and full participation in day to day life at home and within the wider community. Support offered through Portage is based on the principle that parents are the key figures in the development of their child and Portage aims to help parents to be confident in this role, regardless of their child's needs. The service plays a key role in managing expectations and reducing dependency on services.

The Short Breaks service: £1200k

- enables eligible parents/carers with disabled children and young people to have a short break from their caring responsibilities;
- ensures that while the parents/ carers are receiving a break from their caring responsibilities that their disabled child or young person additional needs are being met and that they benefiting as much as their parents/ carers from this short break.

Occupational Therapy Service: £100k

The Occupational Therapy Service provides specialist equipment and adaptations within the home to ensure safety and to increase and maximise the potential of independent living and participation in daily living activities for children and young people with disabilities.

Special Educational Needs Service:

3. Description of service area and proposal

The Special Educational Needs (SEN) team works closely with parents, young people, education settings, social care and health services on undertaking Education, Health and Care Needs assessments to ensure that children and young people with SEND have improved life outcomes and maximise their educational potential. They have a statutory role under the Children and families Act 2014.

Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities:

The Social Work Service for Children with Disabilities provides assessment and support to disabled children and young people and their families. The Social Work Team operates across the full spectrum of social work interventions this includes child protection, Children in Need, Looked After Children and Transition.

STEPS – Specialist Teachers and Educational Psychology Service £848k

STEPS is made up of three teams:

- Sensory Specialist Teachers Team
- Specific Learning Difficulties Specialist Teachers Team (SpLD)
- Educational Psychology Team (EP)

The SpLD and EP Teams provide assessments and consultations to settings and families to enable CYP to maximise their learning opportunities and for settings to increase their capacity to address the needs of CYP with special needs. Both teams provide training to settings and SENCOs. Both teams are involved in the implementation of the latest SEND reforms and have a statutory role in providing advice as part of the EHC assessments. The EP team provides psychological advice to every CYP who has an EHC assessment. This is a significant pressure on capacity.

The Sensory Team provides assessment, monitoring and specialist support for children and young people with a visual or hearing impairment, including direct teaching of visual/hearing impaired children and young people as appropriate. The team works with the young person/child, their families/carers and partner agencies to ensure the child can fully access education and make progress in order to fulfil their aspirations. The team carries out assessments as part of the SEND pathway, contributing to EHC assessments. The team provides training to settings and partner agencies as well as providing specialist equipment furniture and materials for CYP. The budget for these specialist resources is currently.

STEPS contribute to raising the achievement of all CYP and contribute to safeguarding, as well as being integral to the multidisciplinary work which is integral to the recent SEND reforms.

Joint Commissioning

£545k

The current budget is £545k which includes £150k from the CCG.

The joint commissioning service undertakes commissioning on behalf of the Local Authority and the CCG for CYP services. This includes:

- Services for the early years, including Health Visiting, Family Nurse Partnership and Children's Centres
- Early Intervention and Targeted Services, including Targeted Family Support, Family Intervention Project
- Children's Community Health Services, including children's community nursing,

3. Description of service area and proposal

community paediatrics service, special needs nursing, school nurses and immunisations, care and support in the home, and therapies services

- CAMHS services
- Looked After Children's commissioning (such as foster carer recruitment, residential placements, independent visiting)
- Maternity services

The service also undertakes service redesign and analysis, including supporting the restructure of the Youth Support Service in 2014, and implementing Personal Health Budgets (for the CCG, and in partnership with the SEND programme)

In May 2015, the CCG will be transferring responsibility for Maternity commissioning to the CYP joint commissioning team, and a financial contribution will accompany this transfer to reflect the work undertaken by the team on behalf of the CCG.

In October 2015, NHSE will be transferring responsibility for commissioning for 0-5 services to the Local Authority. There is a contribution of approx £30k for this. As the team has effectively managed HV services prior to the transfer, it is anticipated that this can be offered up as a saving and included in these saving figures

Saving proposal

a) Sensory Teachers: A reduction in the Equipment Budget to reflect actual levels of demand would provide a saving of **£60k**. This would amount to a reduction of 33% in the budget and could be achieved without impact on service delivery as the budget would support the level of past spending and the service can continue at its current level.

b) Sensory Teachers: The DSG regulations suggest assessment and monitoring should be funded through the General Fund but any individual support can be funded from DSG resources. An assessment of the time on activities provided by the team is that 2.5fte would count as support and can be charged to the DSG. This would provide a saving of **£190k** to the General Fund or 40% of the budget with no reduction in staffing levels.

c) Educational Psychologists: Further reduction in staffing through not replacing staff or replacing vacant roles on lower grades to save **£35k** or 10% of the budget. This would involve the employment of a Trainee EP rather than a qualified EP and the service would need to provide support to the appointee to achieve qualification. In terms of the provision of advice, support and statutory assessment the reduction in time available can be absorbed within the service to ensure the same level of support to schools and pupils is achieved

d) Occupational Therapy – The management restructure will align the OT service within the LA with the health OT service provided by L&G Trust. This would produce a saving of **£50k or 50%** of the budget.

e) Reduce Carers Funding £40k

This saving is achieved through reducing the commissioning of Contact a Family to co-ordinate and deliver the provision of events to families with disabled children and young people (£14k). This is possible as there is a short breaks team that has responsibility for the coordination of access to short breaks activities. This can be achieved without significantly impacting on service delivery and makes a small impact on the overall commissioning from Contact a Family. The remainder of this saving

3. Description of service area and proposal

(£26k) results from the non-renewal of a small contract with Carers Lewisham. Carers Lewisham has a larger contract with the council which will continue. These grants are funded from the Short Breaks Budget of £1.2m.

f) Review of MAPP Team - This saving to the GF is achieved through increasing the Health contribution to the service by **£120k**. This saving is under negotiation and would represent 50% of the current budget provision.

g) Joint Commissioning of Health services

This saving is achieved through increasing the contribution from the CCG towards joint commissioning work for children's services. This will deliver **£50K** in savings to the GF (9% of the budget).

In May 2015, the CCG will be transferring responsibility for Maternity commissioning to the CYP joint commissioning team, and a financial contribution will accompany this transfer to reflect the work undertaken by the team on behalf of the CCG.

In October 2015, NHSE will be transferring responsibility for commissioning for 0-5 services to the Local Authority. There is a contribution of approx £30k for this. As the team has effectively managed HV services prior to the transfer, it is anticipated that this can be offered up as a saving and included in these saving figures.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The proposals where there are risks are as follows:

It is considered that for (a) to (c) and (g) can be achieved without impact to families and any actual risk.

d) The management restructure will align the OT service within the LA with the OT service provided by L&G Trust. The focus of the service in both teams is arguably different, and may make alignment difficult; there may also be an impact on casework capacity which will need to be addressed.

e) The Children with Complex Needs service established a new targeted Short Breaks service in 2013. The new service enables eligible parents/carers with disabled children and young people to have a short break from their caring responsibilities. This service is now well established and as a result we no longer require Contact a Family to provide short breaks. We will be continuing to work with Contact a Family to ensure that we continue to support the families that were known to them. The budget provision for this continuing work is £48k. On the ending of the contract with Carers Lewisham the organization will continue to be supported for work with children and young people through their Community Sector Grants award.

f) The negotiations to secure additional financial contributions from Health may not be successful.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

--

5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	3540	682	2858
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	60		60
b)	190		190
c)	35		35
d)	50		50
e)	40		40
f)	120		120
g)	50		50
Total	545		545
% of Net Budget	29%	0%	29%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
		YES	
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	Increased pressure on central expenditure budgets of DSG that will need to be agreed by Schools Forum. The DSG provides £100k support for two social workers to work with schools.		

6. Alignment to Political priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Political priorities
H	D	A. Strengthening community input B. Sharing services C. Digitisation D. Income generating / Assets E. School places and improvement F. Housing delivery G. Waste strategy and change H. Social Care and Health transformation I. Violent crime
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
LOW	MEDIUM	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	2	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Impact on main priority – Positive /	Impact on second priority – Positive /	

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Neutral / Negative	Neutral / Negative	5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
NEUTRAL	NEUTRAL	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
LOW	LOW	

8. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

9. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	LOW	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			NO

10. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					YES (OT Service)
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	3	2.6	2.6		
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
	3				

10. Human Resources impact

Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	1	2			
Disability	Yes	No			
		x			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
		x			

11. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

12. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

The main savings timetable has been included here FYI.

Please amend for proposal if different.

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	
May 2016	
June 2016	
July 2016	
August 2016	
September 2016	
October 2016	