Appendix 3 – B – Joint Working



1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Better Care Fund
Reference:	B-11
Directorate:	Communities
Director of Service: Tom Brown	
Service/Team area: Adult social care/ Joint commissioning	
Cabinet portfolio: Cllr Chris Best (Health and Adult Social Care)	
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public	Staff
		Consultation	Consultation
	Yes	Yes and	Yes and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
	YES	YES	YES

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Better Care Fund (BCF) and Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) are funding streams that seek to join up health and social care provision. In Lewisham, the combined value of the funds is c£35m spent across health, social care and the VCS. The spend against these funds has evolved over time and so it has been agreed to undertake a strategic review of the use of the funds.

Cuts proposal*

This proposal includes a strategic review of some of the projects funded by BCF & iBCF.

Through effective partnership working and robust contract management we aim to get best value from the fund and hope to make this cut through efficiency savings. The total saving will be around £1m, which can be used to protect other social care services.

Efficiencies identified in the review will be used to protect adult social care services elsewhere.

The review must be undertaken with SE London CCG and their agreement will be needed. Equally, pressure on NHS budgets may mean that they wish to take a similar approach.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The funds are used to commission and support services across acute hospital services, community and mental health services, as well as social care and Voluntary and Community Sector provision.

Although it is intended that the review will seek to identify efficiencies, if these cannot be found, it is possible that some services may need to be reduced or stopped.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

By working in partnership with the CCG we aim to mitigate any unforeseen impacts and reduce potential impacts on residents and partner organisations.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	121.5m	55.4m	66.1m	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	1,000			1,000
Total	1,000			1,000
% of Net Budget	1.5%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
1.5	Corporate priorities			
	1. Open Lewisham			
2.1	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis			
	3. Giving Children and young			
3.4	people the best start in life			
	4. Building an inclusive local			
4.7	economy			
	5. Delivering and defending:			
5.8	health, social care & support			
	6. Making Lewisham greener			
6.6	7. Building safer communities			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact			
7.3	8.	Good governance and	
8.2		operational effectiveness	

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

8. Service equalities impa	8. Service equalities impact				
Expected impact on service	e equalities fo	or users – High / Medium / Lo	ow or N/A		
Ethnicity:	Н	Pregnancy / Maternity:			
Gender:	Н	Marriage & Civil			
		Partnerships:			
Age:	Н	Sexual orientation:			
Disability:	Н	Gender reassignment:			
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	Н		
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 cuts	Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No YES				
Workforce pi					
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	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	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

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

11. Summary timetabl	e		
Outline timetable for r	main steps to be completed re decision and		
implementation of pro	pposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),		
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:		
Month	Activity		
September 2020			
October 2020			
November to	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers		
December 2020	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities		
	assessment and initial HR considerations)		
	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing		
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where		
December 2020	required) prepared		
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments		
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest		
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget		
March 2021	Cuts implemented		

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Adult Learning Lewisham
Reference:	B-12
Directorate:	Community Services
Director of Service:	Liz Dart, Director of Culture, Libraries and Learning
Service/Team area:	Adult Learning
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Jonathan Slater
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route						
Cuts proposed:	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/ our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal			
Removal of general fund subsidy for adult learning	no	no	possibly			

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Adult Learning provides a wide range of accredited and community learning courses for adults from three dedicated centres and a range of community settings. It is primarily funded through a ring fenced grant from the GLA.

Cuts proposal*

Remove £96k of general fund subsidy that has accrued through salaries inflation allocated to the service. This reduction of funding would be managed through a range of back office efficiencies across the service in order to minimise the impact on learners.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The impact to learners would be minimal. The saving may require a reorganisation and reduction in back office staff. All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The risks attached to this saving are low although any reduction marginally reduces the service ability to respond to increasing level of need for adult skills training. It will not impact on the council's ability to meet its funding requirements for the GLA.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
			96	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Removal of general	96			96
fund contribution				
Total	96			96
% of Net Budget	100%	%	%	100%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact					
1.Building an inclusive local economy	Corporate priorities				
	1. Open Lewisham				
2.	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis				
	3. Giving Children and young				
3.	people the best start in life				
	4. Building an inclusive local				
4.	economy				
	5. Delivering and defending:				
5.	health, social care & support				
	6. Making Lewisham greener				
6.	7. Building safer communities				
7.	8. Good governance and				
	operational effectiveness				
8.					

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by 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:	Ethnicity: Pregnancy / Maternity:					
Gender:		Marriage & Civil				
		Partnerships:				
Age:		Sexual orientation:				

8. Service equalities impact					
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 i	impact assess	ment required: Yes / No			

9. Human Resources impact						
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No						
	Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	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	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known		
Disability	Yes	No				
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed		

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

11. Summary timetable				
Outline timetable for r	main steps to be completed re decision and			
	pposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),			
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:			
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities				
assessment and initial HR considerations)				
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			

11. Summary timetable				
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			



1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Early Years Funding Block
Reference:	B-13
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Pinaki Ghoshal
Service/Team area:	Early Years Quality and Sufficiency Service
Cabinet portfolio:	Education
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP Select

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
£54k cuts	No	No	No

3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Introduction:

Lewisham as a local authority has a number of statutory duties around Early Education and Childcare. These relate to section 2 of the Childcare Act 2016 and sections 6, 7, 7A, 9A, 12 and 13 of the Childcare Act 2006. Guidance was updated and republished in March 2017 and came into force on 1st September 2017.

The DfE provides local authorities with six relevant funding streams which together form the Early Years Block of the DSG.

The total of the Early Years Funding Block is currently in excess of £24.5 million. There is a requirement to pass through a high proportion of this funding, and that no more than 5% of this block can be retained. The expectation is that the 5% retained funding will be used to pay for central costs in meeting the statutory requirements of the childcare act. The 5% retention amounts to approx. £1.014 million.

Cuts proposal*

There is currently a potential to recharge associated costs that support Early Years from the wider CYP areas to a maximum of £54k based on current numbers of children accessing provision. There will be no reduction in the LA service.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Please see below. If a reduction in numbers has significant impact on funding and subsequently the centrally retained pot, mitigating actions will be considered to ensure statutory duties can still be met. The 54k contribution to associated costs is considered to be a reasonable prediction of the capacity of the pot even given some fluctuation.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The above figures are based on current figures, which are derived from the Early Years Census in January of each year. This determines the amount of funding that the LA will receive and therefore what the 5% central retention budget will be and is therefore subject to change.

If the numbers of children accessing early year's education, particularly post Covid reduce the amount we will receive from DfE will reduce and as such the central retention will reduce.

If numbers reduce significantly this will impact on the service budget and the ability to fund existing posts. This will impact on the service that can be offered and our ability to meet our statutory duty. Any mitigation plan will take this into account.

The 54k contribution to associated costs is considered to be a reasonable prediction of the capacity of the pot even given some fluctuation.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

It should be noted that the funding is directly related to pupil numbers so a reduction in EYFB could impact on our ability to deliver on this saving. It should be further noted that the saving is based on the current legislation that enable LA's to hold back a max of 5% to facilitate the delivery of the Early Years Agenda. Any amendments to this policy would also impact on the ability to deliver on the savings option

There is a risk that the central retention budget will reduce due to the fluid nature of the funding and reduction in birth-rate that Lewisham and other London councils are currently experiencing. This is particularly high risk as a result of Covid and the anecdotal evidence of a trend to move outside of London. It is therefore prudent to ensure we maintain some flexibility within the budget, which has been considered here.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
HRA				
DSG EY Funding Block	1014	1014		
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Potential to recharge	54			54
associated costs that				
support EY from the				
wider CYP areas				
Total	54			54
% of Net Budget	5%			%

5. Financial information					
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG		HRA	Health
Yes / No		yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		Grant Maximisa within the allowed centrally retained budget			
6. Impact on Corporate	priorities: list		of DE	CREASING im	pact
Giving Children and yo start in life		best	Corpo	orate priorities pen Lewisham	
2. Delivering and defending & support	ng: health, soc			ckling the Hous ving Children ar	
3. Building safer commun	nities	4		ople the best st illding an inclus	
4. Good governance and Effectiveness	operational	5		onomy elivering and def	ending:
5. Building an inclusive lo	ocal economy	6		alth, social care aking Lewisham	
6. Tackling the Housing C	risis			ilding safer con ood governance	
7. Open Lewisham			ор	erational effecti	veness
8. Making Lewisham gree	ner				

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	All, but worst in super output areas or wards in greatest need
	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	N/A		
		Partnerships:			
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					
9. Human Resources impact					

8. Service equalities impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					No
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vacant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	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	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Potential impact on ability to deliver statutory duty.

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			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

