

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	More efficient use of residential placements
Reference:	CYP1
Directorate:	Children and Young People (CYP)
Head of Service:	Executive Director Children and Young people
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
More efficient use of residential placements £800k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>The council is required to place Looked After Children (LAC) to meet their needs, protect them and enable them to thrive. The majority of LAC are placed in either in-house or agency foster care. For some children and young people however, a residential placement will be the right option. Given the high cost of such provision, the challenging national and local market, and the variable outcomes from such provision, we will look to reduce out of borough placements in residential homes. We will not remove children from settled and successful placements but we will review all existing placements and carefully scrutinise new placements with the aim of having more children in family settings or suitable residential provision in or close to Lewisham.</p>
Cuts proposal
<p>The focus of this proposal is to quickly develop a more robust approach to the management of the residential care market. This will focus on the whole market and will be linked to a new Quality Assurance Framework which measures both outcomes for children and young people and value for money of provision.</p> <p>A systematic review of the market will baseline the current costs of the commissioned services to inform intelligent and challenging conversations with service providers, including potential work with providers to develop new provision. This will happen against a backdrop of shaping new accommodation and support solutions for vulnerable children and young people in Lewisham to reduce demand for and time in residential care.</p> <p>The new approach to commissioning is based on a new relationship between the commissioning function in CYP and the provider market in Lewisham and beyond. Initial focus will be a reduction in costs on high cost placements. The review focusing on an initial cohort of 10 placements. The average cost of Lewisham's 10 most expensive current residential placements is £5,599 per week.</p> <p>In order to achieve an £800k reduction in cost over 2 years, the average weekly placement fee for each of these placements would need to reduce to £4,061 per week. 88% of London Care Services' (LCS) specialist placements are priced below</p>

APPENDIX 1 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

this level and the average rate for LCS' specialist residential provision is £3,508 (17/18) per week. This proposal is predicated on developing a robust quality assurance framework and negotiating with existing providers to step down costs over a period of time. If appropriate, commissioners will work to support alternative providers to better meet the needs of this cohort of young people.

Given the size of the budget overspend in Children's Social Care, this project is aiming for maximum efficiencies and delivery of savings, but the amount quoted in this pro-forma is a reasonable prediction of what can be achieved in the timescale.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact of the proposal is better value in terms of quality, price and outcomes for children and young people.

The proposal relates to management of providers in the market so has no direct impact on other Council Services or staff in terms of redundancies.

The proposal will require development of the Placement and Commissioning team workforce skills and capacity based on a one market approach.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Savings across different types of placements are interrelated. The delivery of savings will be governed through the Resource Management Group and will mitigate against the risk of double counting savings.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	5,300	-	5,300	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Reduction of costs on high costs placements	500	300	-	800
Total	500	300	-	800
% of Net Budget	9%	6%	%	15%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Y	N	N	N

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
		A. Strengthening Community input

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
E		B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / 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 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	

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:	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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

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

APPENDIX 1 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications

Securing sufficient accommodation that meets the needs of children who are in care is a statutory requirement for all Local Authorities. Having the right placement in the right place, at the right time, are vital factors in achieving placement stability, which itself is critical factor to securing better outcomes for children. The statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for in care children provides clarification on the 'sufficiency duty' placed on local authorities under 22(G) of the Children Act 1989, to secure sufficient accommodation to meet the needs of children in their care.

The sufficiency duty applies in respect of all children who are defined as 'looked after' under the 1989 Act. The guidance requires that, working with their partners, local authorities must be in a position to secure, where reasonably practicable, sufficient accommodation for looked after children in their local authority area.

Contractual

There are contractual/ procurement considerations which will be managed as appropriate to the contract with each provider.

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:

Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Improved process for placing looked after children and more efficient systems, enabled by improved operating model and IT.
Reference:	CYP2
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director Children and Young people
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Cttee(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Placement Processes and systems efficiencies £250k	N	N	N

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
The current process for placing looked after children is sub-optimal due to a lack of clarity of commissioning roles and responsibilities and those of Children's Social Care. This is further exacerbated by poor systems which fail to provide reliable data in relation to cost.
Cuts proposal
A recent review of current systems is informing a more cost-effective solution to the current issues and will ensure a tighter grip on spend and financial reporting. In addition, a Commissioning Project Group will focus on a re-design of the actual placement process which will inform clarity of roles and responsibilities to again ensure that there is a tighter grip on spend.
An initial exercise looking at spot purchasing in Children's Social Care identified that an average of between £1m and £1.3m in one off commitments are recorded on LCS system each year; approximately £0.6m of this relates to ancillary spend on placements and this will be the initial focus of this proposal. We will specifically target spot purchasing arrangements for transport, support and allowances.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
A streamlined process which will inform increased efficiencies and service grip on spend which does not currently exist.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
The savings are partially dependent on a re-designed IT solution. This dependency will be managed within the Children and Young People's Improvement Plan.

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	21,100	-	21,100	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
Placement Processes and systems efficiencies	250	-	-	250
Total	250			250
% of Net Budget	1%	%	%	1%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

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 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	
Medium	Medium	

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?

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

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:	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 cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

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

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:	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Systematic and proactive management of the market for independent fostering
Reference:	CYP3
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director Children and Young people
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Proactive market management of Independent Fostering Agencies £950k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>There are currently a relatively high number of looked after children placed in Residential placement provision. Our aim is to ensure children and young people are placed in a family setting wherever possible – in house fostering and agency foster carers. Every local authority works with a mixed economy between the two. Independent Foster Agencies (IFA's) will therefore continue to be an important provider in complementing and supplementing In-house fostering provision to ensure that sufficient family-based accommodation for looked after children is in place.</p>
Cuts proposal
<p>Whilst overall our intention is to reduce our current reliance on IFA's, there will be a focus on working with them to develop more local provision and to secure better value in terms of quality, price and outcomes. IFA's will continue to provide the Council with an important viable alternative to out of authority residential provision, especially for young people with complex and 'high end' needs.</p> <p>The average cost of a residential placement is £3,735 per week and average IFA cost is £904 per week (March 18 position). Initial testing of the market has indicated that good quality providers offer specialist fostering packages at a weekly cost of approximately £1,500 per week; this includes the current Family Support Service provider who conducts intensive Child Protection work. The savings represent an overall shift from residential to IFA.</p> <p>Initially this work to develop and work the local IFA market is dependent on extra capacity from investment in three additional Placement Officers to implement new Quality Assurance Framework and a new proactive relationship approach with providers.</p>

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

This cut is predicated on generating an efficiency through alternative provision; this will generate a £400k pressure on the fostering budget, but a cost reduction of £950k on residential placements spend.

Decisions in relation to these placements must be needs-led and outcomes-focused; there is a risk that some young people currently in a residential setting may find returning to a family setting challenging; this will be mitigated by working closely with and upskilling the providers and social workers.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Dependent on timely and accurate financial and performance data and the improvement in the quality of social care practice.

Capacity to deliver mitigated by request for an invest to save for additional placement officer capacity.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	7,700	-	7,700	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Proactive market management of Independent Fostering Agencies	350	600	-	950
Total	350	600		950k
% of Net Budget	4.5%	8%	%	12%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
E		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Medium		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
		1. Community leadership and empowerment

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
7	2	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	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
Positive	Positive	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	Medium	

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:	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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
<p>Legal</p> <p>Securing sufficient accommodation that meets the needs of children who are in care is a statutory requirement for all Local Authorities. Having the right placement in the right place, at the right time, are vital factors in achieving placement stability, which itself is critical factor to securing better outcomes for children. The statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for in care children provides clarification on the ‘sufficiency duty’ placed on local authorities under 22(G) of the Children Act 1989, to secure sufficient accommodation to meet the needs of children in their care.</p> <p>The sufficiency duty applies in respect of all children who are defined as ‘looked after’ under the 1989 Act. The guidance requires that, working with their partners, local</p>

APPENDIX 1 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications

authorities must be in a position to secure, where reasonably practicable, sufficient accommodation for looked after children in their local authority area.

Contractual

There are contractual/ procurement considerations which will be managed as appropriate to the contract with each provider.

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:

Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Commission semi-independent accommodation for care leavers
Reference:	CYP4
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director Children and Young people
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Commission semi-independent accommodation for care leavers £500k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
For young people leaving care we will actively encourage them to remain looked after until they are 18 where this is appropriate. We will help them to 'stay put' in their placement after they are 18. Where this is not possible or appropriate we will ensure that we have sufficient accommodation locally to meet their needs including support to enable smooth transition to independent living.
Cuts proposal
Through re-procurement alone, an assumption of 5% like for like cost reduction could be achieved on new placements. Extensive work with providers was conducted in 2018 and new providers have entered this market; it is anticipated that this will also drive down costs.
Additional savings through block purchasing, protocols for non-use of bed space and faster move-on to own tenancy (supported through the work Depaul UK social impact bond for care leavers) could also act to reduce spend.

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
There is a risk that providers will use the procurement of services as an opportunity to increase costs; this pressure is being mitigated through joint working with the Royal Borough of Greenwich and work with providers and potential providers to develop the local market. On initial viewing of tender documents, this does not appear to be the case and cost reductions from existing providers can be observed.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
This proposal also links to the development proposal for the Placements Team; it will be vital that the preferred provider framework is consistently used to ensure its benefit is realised.

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Need for Placements Team development, and improvements in social care practice, dealing with young people much sooner.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	480	-	480	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Commission semi-independent accommodation for care leavers	250	250		500
Total	250	250		500
% of Net Budget	52%	52%	%	104%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
7	6	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	
Medium	High	

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

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:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		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			

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
<p>Legal</p> <p>Securing sufficient accommodation that meets the needs of children who are in care is a statutory requirement for all Local Authorities. Having the right placement in the right place, at the right time, are vital factors in achieving placement stability, which itself is critical factor to securing better outcomes for children. The statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for in care children provides clarification on the ‘sufficiency duty’ placed on local authorities under 22(G) of the Children Act 1989, to secure sufficient accommodation to meet the needs of children in their care.</p> <p>The sufficiency duty applies in respect of all children who are defined as ‘looked after’ under the 1989 Act. The guidance requires that, working with their partners, local authorities must be in a position to secure, where reasonably practicable, sufficient accommodation for looked after children in their local authority area. In the case of Care Leavers, we have a duty of care to them until the age of 25 years.</p> <p>Contractual</p> <p>There are contractual/ procurement considerations which will be managed as appropriate to the contract with each provider.</p>	

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:	
Month	Activity

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

12. Summary timetable	
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Residential framework for young people
Reference:	CYP5
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director Children and Young people
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Residential framework for young people £400k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
Lewisham Council is part of the South London Commissioning Programme which is developing an integrated commissioning solution which will align commissioning approaches between eight South East London boroughs and hence reduce costs through removing competition.
Cuts proposal
The model is based on achieving 5% to 8% revenue savings to expenditure on residential and independent fostering placements. A new single system for searching for placements will mean that providers can look in one place for referrals and the market will be expanded to include providers that work with the other 7 boroughs. Equally, there will be a reduced pressure from the high costs associated with spot purchasing in this very specialist market as the purchasing power of the eight local authorities will allow for clear expectations to be set with providers (e.g. on transport costs and notice periods).

4. Impact and risks of proposal
Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:
Delayed implementation and increasing pressure on the residential sector could reduce achievable savings. Savings are predicated on the effective local implementation of the commissioning solution and sustaining current demand; the previous local framework for residential placements ended and now the primary framework for placements is through Lewisham's subscription to London Care Services. Nevertheless, it is estimated that only 18% of current residential placements are on framework.
The proposal will require some development of skills over time within the Placements team.
This activity could also act towards achieving the saving linked to reducing ancillary costs.

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Greater supply of providers should mitigate risk of off framework spend. Oversight through a restructured placements process could safeguard this.

5. Financial information

Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	5,300	-	5,300	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Residential framework for young people	200	200	-	400
Total	200	200	-	400
% of Net Budget	4%	4%	%	8%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / 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 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	
medium	medium	

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

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:	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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
<p>Legal</p> <p>Securing sufficient accommodation that meets the needs of children who are in care is a statutory requirement for all Local Authorities. Having the right placement in the right place, at the right time, are vital factors in achieving placement stability, which itself is critical factor to securing better outcomes for children. The statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for in care children provides clarification on the 'sufficiency duty' placed on local authorities under 22(G) of the Children Act 1989, to secure sufficient accommodation to meet the needs of children in their care.</p> <p>The sufficiency duty applies in respect of all children who are defined as 'looked after' under the 1989 Act. The guidance requires that, working with their partners, local authorities must be in a position to secure, where reasonably practicable, sufficient accommodation for looked after children in their local authority area.</p> <p>Contractual</p> <p>There are contractual/ procurement considerations which will be managed as appropriate to the contract with each provider.</p>	

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:	

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

12. Summary timetable	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Cease funding for former CYP post in Voluntary Action Lewisham
Reference:	CYP6
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director for Children and Young People
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children and Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
Cease Voluntary Action Lewisham – CYP contribution £49k	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Approximately 10 years ago, commissioners developed a CYP role within umbrella organisation, Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL). This was initially a full time role, which was focused entirely on support for smaller charities working to support children, young people and families. The post holder was responsible for running training events, facilitation of the quarterly CYP forum, for representing VAL on key strategic boards and for facilitating the nominated rep process for additional strategic boards and working groups.</p>
Cuts proposal
<p>Following a restructure in 2016, the CYP role was deleted and a further restructure this year has meant that the CYP specific responsibilities have been absorbed across other members of the team.</p> <p>CYP forums take place quarterly and have a rolling focus on key priorities such as safeguarding children or making Lewisham a safer place. Approximately 30 organisations attend each forum.</p> <p>The current CYP work programme consists of capacity build across the sector, offering a range of training and face to face support to organisations, which include finance, governance, demonstrating impact and fundraising. In 17/18, four organisations were supported to secure £60k in external funding.</p> <p>The number of organisations worked with is limited, VAL input into strategic boards across the Council is minimal and the CYP specific work could be significantly strengthened.</p> <p>However, on these grounds a suggestion is made that the CYP VAL contribution of £53,400 comes to an end.</p>

APPENDIX 1 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS

3. Description of service area and proposal

Options include:

- Taking the full amount in Year 1 19/20
- Phasing over two years, allowing time for VAL to attract funding from other sources.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Reduction in the LA contribution to VAL will result in significant budget pressures for the organisation, which may end in service closure.

VAL have been in operation for many years. With over 800 members (250 of which are CYP specific), they work to strengthen the voice of the sector, offering training and volunteering opportunities.

Any savings made, would have implications for other smaller organisations operating in Lewisham who look to VAL for advice, support and guidance. However, the full impact of this are currently unknown.

Ongoing discussions are taking place between commissioners and the CEO of VAL, any findings should be considered as part of the proposal. Early discussions have identified an appetite from VAL to strengthen strategic links and CYP outputs/outcomes.

The savings proposal is in line with expectations and process for the main grants programme.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Explore supporting VAL to source funds from alternative sources. Develop proposals for new ways of working with the voluntary community sector to generate new savings.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	710	-	710	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Cease Voluntary Action Lewisham – CYP contribution	24.5	24.5	-	49
Total	24.5	24.5	-	49
% of Net Budget	3.5%	3.5%	%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
---------------	-----------------	--------------------------

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
A		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

7. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
1	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 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	
Negative	Negative	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High	High	

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:	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			No

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

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

APPENDIX 1 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS

11. Legal implications

This is not a statutory service and was originally developed locally as an area of innovation, unfortunately, the original purpose of this contribution has changed considerably over the last 5 years and the impact of funding on outcomes for children and young people are unclear.

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:

Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Early Help Redesign
Reference:	CYP7
Directorate:	Children and Young People
Head of Service:	Executive Director of Children and Young People
Service/Team area:	Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed*:	Key Decision Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No	Staff Consultation Yes / No
a) Efficiencies	No	No	No
b) Early Help Redesign	Yes	Yes	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:
<p>Early Help is the term describing support for children and their families below the threshold for children's social care. It is vital in terms of early intervention and supporting families at the right time. It also enables families who have improved their situation to be 'stepped down' from children's social care. This proposal is for a review of the operating model for early help and its redesign taking a 'whole system' approach. The review will focus on the Early Help core offer in relation to current contracts, staffing arrangements, budgets, pathways, performance data, processes and systems. This would include the in-house and externally commissioned services for Early Help and Intervention including Youth Services, Family Support and Children and Family Centres and the offer across our partner organisations.</p> <p>The Early Help review will incorporate the breadth of Early Intervention services, not just those funded by General Fund including those funded by alternative grants such as Public Health and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Voluntary and community Sector, Schools and Health, Troubled Families Grant.</p>
Cuts proposal
<p>An initial review which will be completed by end September 2018. This will provide opportunities for efficiencies related to processes and systems in 2019/2020.</p> <p>The initial review will also inform a wider Peer Review of the early help offer across partners including schools, voluntary sector, health and police. The outputs from the reviews will enable a refresh of the Early Help strategy, the identification of gaps in provision requiring investment in early intervention and prevention provision with a view to effectively managing demand and the market efficiencies that can be sought.</p> <p>The recommendations from the combined reviews will provide opportunity for a clearer idea and case for 'invest to save' to secure longer term transformational savings from a redesign of the operating model for Early Help from 2020/21, and a sustainable Early Help offer to deliver better outcomes for children and young people. This would enable the improved design of intervention services, especially at the edge of care and improved practice using Signs of Safety.</p>

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Process and systems efficiencies will benefit service users and partners in the short term.

The impact of investment in the commissioning of early intervention and prevention support will prevent the escalation of need 'step up' and provide appropriate 'step down' provision - more effectively manage demand and delivering better outcomes for children and young people. This will be delivered from transforming the operating model and commissioning for Early Help.

The whole system approach taken to redesign of the operating model will improve partners ability like to work in a multi-disciplinary way (e.g. schools and health) for the benefit of the child and young person and increase the chance of appropriate intervention much earlier before needs escalate and become costly.

This would however require significant reconfiguration and rationalisation of provision – potentially closure of some of the many sites in the borough currently providing youth work or children’s centre provision. Any reduction in funding is bound to impact on the staff employed by providers, the majority of whom are local people.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The current landscape is one of escalating demand but improvement in social care practice and the redesign of the Early Help operating model alongside investment in the commissioning of early intervention and prevention support should mitigate this.

The delivery of savings will be governed through the CSC Improvement Board’s Resource Management Group and will this would ensure the delivery of the savings targets.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
General Fund (GF)	137.7	(7.6)	54.6	
HRA				
DSG		(75.4)		
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2019/20 £'000	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	Total £'000
a) Efficiencies	0	-	-	
b) Early Help Redesign	0	800	-	800
Total	0	800	-	800
% of Net Budget	%	1.5%	%	1.5%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	No	No	No
	This proposal cuts across both Children Social Care & Targeted Support/Joint Commissioning			

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

6. Alignment to Lewisham 2020 priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Lewisham 2020 priorities
E		A. Strengthening Community input B. Sharing Services C. Digitising our Services D. Income Generation E. Demand Management
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
High		

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 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	

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:	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:			
Following the outcome from the reviews and potential redesign a full service impact assessment will be required.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			Yes

10. Human Resources impact	
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	TBD
Workforce profile:	

**APPENDIX 1
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PROPOSALS**

10. Human Resources impact					
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	Straight / Heterosexual.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

11. Legal implications	
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:	
Local authorities have a statutory duty to secure sufficient services and activities for young people aged 13 to 19, and those with learning difficulties to age 24, to improve their well-being, as defined in Subsection 13 of Section 507B of the Education Act 1996. These fall within the scope of the Early Help Core Offer.	
Recommendations in relation to a redesign of the operational model will be the subject of public and staff consultation as appropriate.	

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:	
Month	Activity
July / August 2018	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation)
September 2018	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
October 2018	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2018	Proposals to M&C and (full decision) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
January 2019	Transition work ongoing
February 2019	Transition work ongoing and budget set
March 2019	Cuts implemented