

**LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015**

**APPENDIX 14 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION Q**

**Contents page**

**Section Q: Early Intervention and Safeguarding**

Q3: Targeted Services Savings	243
Includes: Sensory Teachers	
Educational Psychologists	
Occupational Therapy – management reorganisation	
Reduce Carers funding	
Review of MAPP portage with increased health contribution	
Joint commissioning	
Q4: Safeguarding Services	251
Includes: Social care supplies and services reduced spend	
Social care financial management through continued cost control	
Placements: continuing strategy	
Q5: Youth Service	257



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

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

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<b>Children with Complex Needs</b> The Children with Complex Needs Service provides the following services to enable

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

#### 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):

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:

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:

- 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:

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:

The Special Educational Needs (SEN) team works closely with parents, young people, education settings, social care and health services on undertaking Education, Health

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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**

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.

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**

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

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

- Children's Community Health Services, including children's community nursing, 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

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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 (£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

TBC

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	3,540	(682)	2,858
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Sensory Teachers	60		60
b) Sensory Teachers	190		190
c) Educational Psychologists	35		35
d) Occupational Therapy	50		50
e) Reduce Carers Funding	40		40
f) Review of MAPP Team	120		120
g) Joint Commissioning of Health services	50		50
<b>Total</b>	<b>545</b>		<b>545</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	YES	NO
<b>If impact on DSG or HRA describe:</b>	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. Impact on Corporate priorities

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



6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		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
	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:	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

9. 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				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	1	2			
Disability	Yes	No			
		x			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

There is a statutory framework for joint commissioning of social care and health services and each year the Council and the CCG agree their respective financial contribution towards the budget required to deliver the services and make decisions as to the letting of contracts to providers. Each partner can delegate its function to the other, if this is considered to be in the interests of stakeholders and the efficient delivery of the services. Any reductions in budget will involve negotiation and agreement with the CCG. Where the Council holds the budget it must ensure this is managed to avoid any overspend.

As these services are provided to vulnerable young people, to the extent that there is a change to the provision, then consultation will be required and a report setting out the outcome of such consultation placed before the decision maker. The recipients of the service have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 and the Council must comply with its statutory duty under this Act

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) 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

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Safeguarding Services
<b>Reference:</b>	Q4
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Alastair Pettigrew (Interim)
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Children & Young People
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Children & Young People

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Social Care Supplies and Services reduced spend	NO	NO	NO
b) Social care financial management through continued cost control on all areas of spend.	NO	NO	NO
Placements: continuing strategy to use local authority foster placements where possible.	NO	NO	NO

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Children's Social Care service currently has c500 Looked After Children for whom it is responsible and has placed in fostering or residential placements. The budgeted cost of this in 2015/16 is £31m with social worker costs of £10m. In support of these costs the service incurs a range of Supplies and Services expenditure, with a value of £1.5m, covering: conferences, consultancy, advertising, subscriptions, equipment, and third party payments.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p><b>Social Care Supplies and Services:</b> A detailed review of budgets, totalling £1.5m, that fall under the classification "supplies and services" including payments to third parties has been undertaken. Some of the budgets were being used to offset the spending pressures on placements costs and salaries. The review has reduced proposed budgets to be in line with most recent spend experience and to reflect actions to further reduce planned expenditure.</p> <p>So for instance a new contract for the social care work management system has been agreed with annual costs reduced by £25k. In another case the budget for care</p>

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

leavers bursaries is persistently underspent by £80k so the budget has been reduced to the level of spend and this will not impact on the current levels of support to young people.

The proposal would produce a saving of £370k over two years. The budget concerned covers equipment, conferences, consultancy, advertising, subscriptions, equipment, and third party payments. The reduction proposed represents 25% of the past budget.

#### **Social Care:**

This proposal is to improve social care financial management across the £42.5m of social care spend through a wider review of processes for financial decision making at the frontline. In the first instance the focus is on the management of placement costs with the objective of reducing unit costs from their current position. This will involve a more detailed analysis and monitoring of placement decisions, costs and ensuring closer control of placements that are ending or changing. This is being introduced in 2015 but it is not clear yet what the full scale of any cost reductions may be. The proposal is currently estimated to produce a saving of £100k. It is also planned to review procurement of and arrangements for supporting young people who are categorised as leaving care.

#### **Placements:**

The proposal is to continue to reduce spend in 2017/18 through a further focus on the use of specialist foster carers for challenging young people. These placements are very expensive ones costing in the region of £3,000 a week. This proposal would propose to pay £800 for fostering costs plus say, £800 for additional support, giving a total of £1600 instead of the £3000. The saving of **£200k** is based on 3 placements using these specialist carers.

A similar saving has been agreed for 2015/16 and covers 4 placements, this proposal would need to be reviewed in the light of the progress of that proposal. This additional saving is not expected to be delivered until 2017/18 and will require some careful thought and planning during 2015 and 2016 to avoid any unintended consequences in its implementation. The saving represents 1% of the placements budget this compares with the savings of 6% agreed for 2015/16.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

- a) This saving may impact on staff training and development, and reduced scope for access to external expertise. This may impact upon the skill levels of social workers in the service. Also, a budget with a degree of under spending each year will not be available to support other over spending areas in children's social care. No direct impact on young people is anticipated from this proposal.
- b) Potentially, additional management time will need to be dedicated to oversight of placements and costs rather than care planning and staff management that could have an impact on care arrangements for some young people and children.
- c) If we are able to attract specialist foster carers to care for challenging teenagers this will have a positive impact on those service users. The risk is that some of the identified target group will not be ready to live in a family, the placement will break

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

down and the young person will end up in more expensive residential units. There may also be pressure from existing foster carers who have been caring long-term for young people who become challenging as they get older, that they should receive enhanced rates. These arrangements have been made in other LAs and, in their experience, this has not led to “bidding up” by Foster Carers of less challenging children in terms of foster care rates.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

##### General

If the number of Looked after Children (c500 currently) increases in line with the rising population (10 per annum) or the rise in child protection work leads to a rise in care proceedings this will offset the financial impact of the savings.

- a) This proposal would not impact upon children and young people directly.
- b) Changes in the recording and analysis of placements is underway to ensure better management of placement costs and decisions it may however be difficult to ascribe any reduced expenditure to the impact of these changes as opposed to other management and procurement activities.
- c) There is an increased possibility of placement breakdown for more challenging children if specialist foster carers are not successful in their support of these young people.

The current demand for foster placements in Kent and London will make the identification of foster placements, especially for more challenging children, more difficult to achieve. The savings proposal will rely on the ability to identify and train local foster carers to take on and support more challenging children.

Existing foster carers may expect higher rates for current children but the additional support proposed, for the most challenging young people, will be considered on a case by case approach.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	34,504	(200)	34,304
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Social Care Supplies and Services	130	240	370
b) Social Care	50	50	100
c) Placements	0	200	200
<b>Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>670</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	NO	NO
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

<b>6. Impact on Corporate priorities</b>		
Main priority	Second priority	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 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
<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>NEGATIVE</b>	<b>POSITIVE</b>	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
<b>LOW</b>	<b>LOW</b>	

<b>7. Ward impact</b>	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

<b>8. Service equalities impact</b>			
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:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
There is no major equalities impact other than the fact that it will impact on children			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			NO

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

<b>10. Legal implications</b>
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>The Council has statutory responsibility to provide services appropriate to meet assessed need for Children in Need, and also Looked After Children, for whom we may or may not be exercising parental responsibility.</p> <p>There are differing levels of regulation applicable to services, ranging from a wide discretion as to meeting need pursuant to s17 Children Act 1989, to clear regulations relating to Looked After Children and those leaving care.</p> <p>More detailed legal implications will be prepared appropriate to the individual</p>

## 10. Legal implications

proposals.

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) 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





1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Youth Service
Reference:	Q5
LFP work strand:	Safeguarding and Early Intervention
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Warwick Tomsett
Service/Team area:	Children & Young People
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Youth Service tapering of financial support	YES	NO	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>Lewisham Council's Youth Service budget covers a two-pronged statutory obligation: facilitate access to positive activities for young people to build life skills, and track young people's current education and employment statuses in order to report to Central Government the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) and then ensure these young people receive appropriate support.</p> <p>The Youth Service provides and facilitates access to a range of activities for young people through a combination of direct delivery, support to access delivery provided by other organisations, and commissioning and partnering with the voluntary sector. The activities are now focused on developing young people's life skills as agreed in the previous reorganisation of the service.</p> <p>Provision includes positive activities for young people, offering them places to go and things to do, including social and cultural activities, sports and play, and early intervention services. The Youth Service also offers informal education, advice and guidance on career choices and healthier lifestyles, and information concerning the dangers of substance misuse.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p><b>Youth Service (£1.7m)</b></p> <p>The service is currently developing proposals for the creation of a staff and young people led mutual for the youth service. A separate report on this, outlining the business plan and demonstrating the viability, will be presented to Scrutiny and Mayor and Cabinet in the late autumn, including the potential savings that will be achieved. If officers are not recommending in that report that the mutual proceeds, the report will set out further options.</p> <p>This proposal is to include an initial financial tapering for the mutual at £150k per</p>

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

annum, to a total of £300k by the end of 2017/18. This is expected to reflect the level of leveraged in resources that are anticipated in years 1 and 2 of the mutual's existence. This will be included in the financial modelling as part of the business plan.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The proposal to taper the financial support to the mutual increases the challenge in establishing the mutual successfully. However this will be mitigated through the detailed business planning process. It may be that the delivery of the £300k is not split as evenly across the two years as shown here, but will be factored in for the full delivery by the end of 2017/18.

The expectation that the mutual proposal will achieve further savings will be addressed in the business plan and report to be presented firstly to CYP Select Committee, then Mayor & Cabinet later in the autumn.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,000	(300)	1,700
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	150	150	300
<b>Total</b>	150	150	300
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	9%	9%	18%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	YES	NO	NO
<b>If impact on DSG or HRA describe:</b>			

### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>2</b>		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
<b>Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	<b>Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	
<b>Neutral</b>		
<b>Level of impact on main priority –</b>	<b>Level of impact on second priority –</b>	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
High / Medium / Low	High / Medium / Low	people
Low		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
	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:	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:	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			Not for this proposal. A full EIA will be needed for the separate report covering the mutual proposal.

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:
A full report will go to Mayor and Cabinet setting out the proposals for the development of a mutual to deliver the youth services. This report will contain detailed legal and financial implications. If the formation of a mutual is agreed, then the Lewisham mutual would have to compete in the market for a contract for the youth service for a period of up to three years although only mutuals will be permitted to tender. The Council will have to specify the nature of the services it requires the mutual to deliver although this can be in the form of an output specification to allow the bidders to come forward with their own proposals as to how to deliver the services and to offer, if they so wish, any innovative proposals. It is lawful to offer Initial

## 10. Legal implications

financial or other support to the mutuals provided that it is fair to all bidders and not discriminatory. There will be employment implications which will be set out in the Report.

## 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 ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	CYP Select 17 November 2015 with Draft Business Plan
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