Report of the Cabinet Member for Services for Children and Young People

Cabinet – March 16 2017

FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES COMMISSIONING REVIEW – OPTIONS APPRAISAL REPORT (GATEWAY 2) FOR THE OVER 11'S CLUSTER OF THE COMMISSIONING REVIEW

Purpose:	The purpose of this Options Appraisal is to outline the process, findings and set out New Models of Delivery for the Over 11s Cluster of the Family Support Commissioning Review
Policy Framework:	Sustainable Swansea: Fit for the Future Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014 (SSWBA)
Reason for Decision:	Decision on the recommendations of the preferred option on the future delivery model for the Over 11s Cluster of the Family Support Commissioning Review based on fully informed and robust evidence.
Consultation:	Corporate Management Team Cabinet Members Legal, Finance and Access to Services. Child and Family Services, Poverty and Prevention and Education.
Recommendation(s):	It is recommended that:

1) That the preferred option (2) outlined in section 3 of this report as a measure to improve performance, make the service more robust, and make efficiencies, is appropriate to take forward to implementation.

Report Author:	Julie Thomas, Jane Whitmore
Finance Officer:	Chris Davies
Legal Officer:	Lucy Moore
Access to Services Officer:	Rhian Miller

1.0   Purpose & Summary

1.1   This Review is of services supporting children and families of children over 11 where mental health, substance misuse or parenting difficulties have been identified and is a strand of the wider Family Support Commissioning Review. It is a cross-service review between Child & Family Social Services and Poverty & Prevention, but there are clear interdependencies with other service areas, principally with Education, Health and the Third Sector.

1.2   In July 2016, Members and the Corporate Management Team agreed Swansea's vision for the delivery of Family Support Services across the Continuum of Need in addition to the desired outcomes for service users.

1.3   This report is asking for approval to move forward with implementation of the recommendations.

2.0   Background

2.1   The main body of Stage 1 and 2 of the Family Support Commissioning was presented to Cabinet as a Gateway 1 report in July 2016 and is available upon request to provide context for Stages 3 and 4 of the commissioning process.

2.2   Additional Stage 1 & 2 information relevant to the over 11 Cluster and Theme has also been completed and is available upon request

2.3   As part of the additional information the Commissioning Team (the Young People and Family sub group), who are responsible for the development of these options have completed a cohesive service mapping and analysis exercise which can be located within Appendices 1.3

2.4   Alongside the mapping and analysis, a separate assessment into the 'Significant Risks' faced by the existing cohort of Young People and Families has been undertaken, providing further insight into current needs and this has been included in Appendices 1.4.

2.5   All of the work undertaken for Stages 3 and 4 of this review has been undertaken by a specific Commissioning Review Team. This team also operates under the name of the Young People and Family Sub Group and works across a number of interdependent change programmes including the EOTAS review, ensuring that all of the wider independencies are taken into account. The Terms of Reference and Membership of this group are included in Appendices 1.5

2.6   The work of the Commissioning Team as part of undertaking this review, required the clarity and definition of key terms being used and discussed. Definitions for the majority of terminology   used   within   this

document are included as a Glossary in Appendices 1.6 in order   to bring clarity and avoid any potential confusion.

KEY FINDINGS & SUMMARY

2.7   Research undertaken by the members of the Young People and Family Sub Group has provided an overview of models being used and developed across parts of Wales and England, it utilises the National Benchmarking work for Youth Services and gives further insight into the models currently being developed in Cardiff, Rhondda Cynon Taf, Bridgend, Gloucester and Surrey. These authorities were selected due to their similar urban   environments and due to working relationships that have enabled access to these authorities and organisations. Aspects of models in more rural authorities have also been given due consideration where relevant.

2.8   The Group concluded the following as key findings from our comparators:

- All areas are exploring models of greater integration between services that work with young people and families.
- A critical factor in the selection of services that have greater levels of integration appears to be their structural location within the organisation. For example, youth services that sit within an education directorate tend to have very school focussed integration and sometimes no arrangements with their Child and Family Services.
- Brokerage is a key issue in all models, although many areas still have very informal targeting and brokerage processes. The joining up of different brokerage routes has taken many different forms across authorities with no one area appearing to have mastered the perfect combination.
- Schools can provide a useful platform to engage with children, young people and families as the vast majority have to interact with school, however this has meant that there is often a very complex set of various panels and processes around schools that are often too cumbersome and complex. A number of authorities including Cardiff and Newport and brought a number of their school panels together to drive efficiencies and co-ordination. These have included their SEN, Managed School Moves and EOTAS Panels which then seek to have full representation from all key stakeholders. Aspects of these mergers have had a positive impact, but none appear to have solved all of the issues associated with these panels.
- Three authorities in Wales have merged their Youth Services and Youth Offending Services, which are Pembrokeshire, Carmarthen and Wrexham. These are all at early stages of integration and in some cases still managed as separate services, but they appear to have made efficiencies in their prevention work and have benefitted by sharing practice, improved brokerage and use of resources.
- Gloucestershire County Council has developed a very different model, where, over the course of 10 years they have matured a commissioning relationship with an organisation called Prospects. Their initial steps commissioned the Youth Service, Youth Offending

and Careers services to the service. Following steps have seen their, Looked After Children Services, Leaving Care Services, Homelessness Services, NEET and Youth Employment Services and a variety of Health Services all commissioned into the Prospects organisation.

- All authorities reported significant issues around the access for CAMHS services, although some areas such as Gloucester have different arrangements in place that have helped alleviate some aspects of this.
- Most YOS models in Wales have established positive and formalised arrangements with their substance misuse provider, but there is more mixed access, alignment and outcomes for wider prevention services.
- There are lots of examples in all authorities of evidence based practice parenting models and approaches, but there are very few that have developed significant adolescent specific parenting models. Powys utilise the Take 3 model for adolescent parenting, which follows a very specific set programme. The limitation of this type of approach is the motivation of adolescent parents to commit to such a structured programme.
- Where common risk frameworks (ie Signs of Safety), assessment framework and brokerage processes had previously rolled out across multiple services, it does appear to have enabled a faster pace of structural service integration.ie Gloucester shared that they felt the lack of an agreed risk framework led to several years of slowed progress in some key areas.

2.9   Conclusions – key factors for consideration in the development of the Options:

- Greater integration between services – ensuring all services are joined up around children, young people and their family.
- Simplified brokerage processes – ensuring that all services can be accessed easily and do not trap families between services due to complex criteria and inflexible processes
- Joint workforce development across service areas – utilising common frameworks can support service to integrate more easily and for best practice to be shared
- Solutions for any identified gaps in provision
- Improved performance management, joined reports areas of prevention and demonstrating direct links to outcomes

2.10   A full overview report on benchmarking is attached in Appendices 2.1. The full national bench marking for all Youth Services is attached in Appendices 2.2 and a full national data analysis is attached in Appendices 2.3

3.0 Options Appraisal

3.1 Based on the research, evidence and analysis gained throughout the previous stages of the commissioning review process, the Commissioning Review Team looked at options that can be considered to re-design and deliver the agreed vision. The process resulted in the development of four distinctive options which are listed below

Option 1 - As is Model - Continue to embed existing practices and structures

Key Characteristics
• Young People Services - Evolve
    ➢ Retain the existing Level 2 and 3 lead work teams with focus on 11 to 20 age group
• Western Bay Youth Justice & Early Intervention Service (WBYJ&EIS)
    ➢ Continue with planned restructure into regional area lead structure (1 prevention regional manager, 1 statutory regional manager)
• Continue existing commissioned work with Ethic Minority Groups and Young Carers
• Gap Analysis
    ➢ CAMHS – No brokerage arrangements – clinical referrals only
    ➢ No specialist support for the parenting of adolescents
    ➢ Substance Misuse support – Choices operating single brokerage pathway
• Brokerage system
    ➢ Retain existing separate referral systems to services.
 	
Workforce development to be undertaken separately by each organisation
 	
*Please see Appendices 3.1 for additional detail and 4.1 for current service structures

Advantages	Disadvantages
• No disruption to current teams or services • No HR issues • Individual services able to continue with existing individual plans • No disruption to service users • Familiarity of existing services and processes • Further time given to allow previous changes to settle and develop	• Staffing inefficiencies • Potential duplication of work • Low level of co-ordination between services • Poor co-ordination for young people with mental health issues • Complex and inefficient brokerage routes • It could stifle the speed of progress • Can create stagnating service areas that become resistant to future changes • Lack of joint brokerage • Lack of a single brokerage

	(referral) route
	• Less managerial accountability
	• Lack of capacity
	• Complexity of staff operating over pre and post 16 provisions and specialisms are diluted Less co-ordination for Children in Need of Care and Support
	• Greater potential for different thresholds to develop across different area teams.
	• Poor integration of services with Western Bay Youth Justice and Early Intervention Service
	• Lack development for future leadership
	• Lack of sharing best practice
	• Lack of accountability and performance monitoring
	• Lack of multi-agency interaction and ownership

Option 2 – Full Transformation Model – Identifies a full range of next step changes for all service structures, partnerships, processes and gaps

Key Characteristics
- Young People Services
  - ➢ Restructure existing Level 2 and 3 lead work teams into 4 geographically aligned area teams with focus on 11 to 16 age group
  - ➢ Managers and posts to have more direct alignment to specific schools and to Child and Family Area Teams
  - ➢ Refocus the Targeted and Specialist Team Resource
  - ➢ Introduce practice lead roles into the structure to enable multi agency best practice development.
- Western Bay Youth Justice & Early Intervention Service
  - ➢ Restructure into regional area leads with the commitment to evaluate the impact of changes and if required, explore alternative management arrangements to support further local integration
  - ➢ Increased partnership work across prevention elements including formalising arrangements in the areas of adolescent parenting, domestic abuse, behaviour management, restorative practice, speech and language and Education Training & Employment (ETE) related roles
- Refocus the commissioned work with Ethic Minority Groups and recommission Young Carers incorporating requirements for a joint brokerage route (including a formalised step up and step down processes with Child and Family) and workforce development.
- Gap analysis met by:
  - ➢ Establish a new post focussing specifically on the parenting of

adolescents
- ➢ Establish a new joint post between Young People Services and Child and Family focussing on step and down thresholds, co-working arrangements and the management of Children in Need of Care and Support (CINCS).
- ➢ Establish a 2 way brokerage pathway between CAMHS and lead work provision enabling more effective joined up working between services, including long arm support from CAMHS and explore the funding of a joint post to meet unmet need.
- ➢ Greater alignment of substance misuse workers from the Choices service to service areas
- Brokerage system
  - ➢ All lead work provision to come under one joint brokerage process with direct links into the early intervention services brokerage process
- Workforce Development
  - ➢ The development of a joint annual workforce development with all in scope service areas and across Child and Family and Early Intervention Services
- Performance Reporting
  - ➢ Joint monthly performance report with agreed feedback loop

Advantages	*Disadvantages*
- Reduced duplication of work - Improved efficiencies in staffing resource - Improved co-ordination of services - Improved relationships between services, especially with schools and Child and Family Area Teams. - Capacity to support schools through long arm consultation support with all cases (building on TAF in Primary Schools Approach) - Simplified and joined up brokerage process, enabling the best service to meet the need being brokered. - Brokerage routes between younger and older age groups joined up and simplified. - Improved understanding through joint workforce development - Improved support for young people with Mental Health	- HR & change processes may disrupt performance of work - Some service users may experience a low level of disruption - The length of time to implement could be significant - Some processes make take time to bed in. - Success on the implementation of emotional and mental health support carries significant risk due to the operational ability of CAMHS to implement changes - There are a large number of different challenges to develop in one go, which some service areas may not have the capacity or change culture to successfully implement

issues • Increased capacity to support young people and families aged 11 to 16. • Increased support for transition for young people and families going from primary to secondary school provision. • Increased capacity to support Adolescent Parenting • Increased support for the development of threshold levels and support for Children in Need of Care and Support • Improved co-ordination of co-working across the age range provision due to joint workforce development. • Strong model for the development of future leadership via practice leads • Strong model for sharing best practice via service alignment and practice leads • Increased accountability and performance monitoring	

Option 3 – Graduated Transformation Model – Combines elements of transformation for key areas whilst enabling other aspects further time to embed practice and processes, before identifying further changes.

Key Characteristics
• Young People Services - Evolve
  ➢ Restructure existing Level 2 and 3 lead work teams into 4 geographically aligned area teams with focus on 11 – 16 age group
  ➢ Managers and posts to have more direct alignment to specific schools and to Child and Family Area Teams
  ➢ Refocus the Targeted and Specialist Team Resource
• Western Bay Youth Justice & Early Intervention Service (WBYJ&EIS)
  ➢ Restructure into regional area leads
  ➢ Increased partnership work across prevention elements including formalising arrangements in the areas of adolescent parenting, domestic abuse, behaviour management, restorative practice, speech and language and Education Training & Employment (ETE) related roles
• Refocus the commissioned work with Ethic Minority Groups and recommission Young Carers incorporating requirements for a joint brokerage route (including a formalised step up and step down processes with Child and Family) and workforce development.

- Gap analysis met by:
  - ➤ Establish a new post focussing specifically on the parenting of adolescents
  - ➤ Establish a brokerage pathway with CAMHS enabling CAMHS to broker lead work support, but continuing all brokerage of CAMHS support via the GP and clinical routes only
- Brokerage system
  - ➤ All lead work provision to come under one joint brokerage process
- Workforce Development
  - ➤ The development of a joint annual workforce development programme with all in scope services.

*Please see appendices 3.1 for additional detail and 4.1 for proposed staffing structures

Advantages	Disadvantages
• Reduced duplication of work • Improved efficiencies in staffing resource • Improved performance and productivity • Improved co-ordination of services • Improved relationships between services, especially with schools and Child and Family Area Teams. • Capacity to provide schools with long arm support • Simplified brokerage process • Improved understanding through joint workforce development • Improved support for young people with emotional and mental health needs • Increased capacity to support young people and families aged 11 to 16. • Increased support for transition for young people and families going from primary to secondary school provision. • Maximises lead work capacity	• HR & change processes may disrupt performance of work • Some service users may experience a low level of disruption • Some processes make take time to bed in. • Continued difficulty in access for Mental Health Assessments • Reduced co-ordination for Children in Need of Care and Support • Greater potential for different thresholds to develop across different area teams. • Lack of integration of services with Western Bay Youth Justice and Early Intervention Service • Lack of development for future leadership • Lack sharing of best practice • Lack of accountability and performance monitoring

Option 4 – Full Commissioning Model – Commission all in scope services out to one single 3rd sector organisation or private sector company to transform under their guidance.

Key Characteristics
- Transform services by Commissioning out the key functions and roles.
  - ➢ All in scope parts of Young People Services and the Swansea prevention aspects of the Western Bay Youth Justice and Early Intervention Service would be commissioned to a single external provider.
  - ➢ Recommission the work with Ethnic Minorities and Young Carers to the same single external provider.
- Brokerage
  The single organisation would undertake responsibility to develop a single point of entry to their services
- Workforce Development
- ➢ The single organisation would undertake all activity in relation to workforce development

Advantages	Disadvantages
- Cost saving efficiencies - Access to match funding opportunities - Potentially less bureaucratic systems could offer efficiencies and increased performance - Single brokerage process to a single organisation - Potential for faster pace of dynamic change and integration	- Quality and capacity of organisations in the current market place - The quality of the relationship between commissioner and organisation in order to develop the high quality provision does not currently exist - Complexities of handing over such a large range of different service areas at one time would be enormous - Robust and complex performance monitoring and quality assurances would need to be established which could be problematic - Access to internal Management Information Systems and Information Sharing processes could be more difficult - Breadth of skills, knowledge and understanding are unlikely to exist in a single organisation - Timeframes to build the required understanding in organisations has not been undertaken - TUPE issues with existing staff would be complex and require long timeframes - Risk of organisation failing to

	deliver

3.2 The options were evaluated and scored utilising a delivery model matrix which involved scoring the options based on the following criteria;
- Outcomes
- Fit with priorities
- Financial impact
- Sustainability and viability
- Deliverability

3.3 These options were scored at a stakeholder evaluation event where all stakeholders took part in discussion, analysis and the scoring process.

3.4 Following a multi-agency stakeholder workshop **Option 2** was the preferred option chosen based on the discussion and scoring criteria. Option 4 was discussed and discounted as not a viable option at this stage as it was felt the service model needed to optimised.

3.5 The full scoring matrix, with breakdown of each scoring category, can be found in the   **Appendices 3.2**.

4.0   Preferred Option- Legal Implications

4.1 It is not anticipated that there will be any significant legal implications with options 1, 2 or 3. There would be more significant legal issues if Option 4 due to the potential TUPE of staff and Commissioning Contracts.

4.2 The parties will need to seek HR and Legal advice in relation to the issue of transferring staff under the TUPE regulations and other general employment issues relating to the options.

4.3 Regardless of which option is chosen, the commissioning of services must be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and the provisions of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

5.0   Preferred Option – Financial Implications

7.1 The full financial scoring matrix can be found in the **Appendices 5.1**

7.2 All options outlined in this review are achievable within the budget allocated. The list of current funding sources is outlined below.

Funding Sources		
Young Peoples Service Core Budget	£	792,400
WG Families First	£	433,127
WG Youth Strategy Grant	£	114,900
Total Budget Available for 2017-18	**£**	**1,340,427**

7.3 The purpose of this commissioning review is to bring things together and work in partnership to improve outcomes for young people and their families and reduce and manage demand, hence reducing the need for higher level complex interventions. This is a preventative agenda which can only be achieved by developing appropriate pathways to enhance partnership working and the development of a pathway from prevention to protection to be managed across the continuum of need to achieve efficiencies and economies of scale.

7.4 The preferred option is Option 2, which has a total cost of approximately 1.3 million; this is achievable in the budget available as outlined in the table above. Option 2 sees a 6.5% increase on current funding levels; this increase will be met through maximisation of grants and does not add any additional pressure to core budgets.

7.5 The funding identified for this review and outlined in the table above does not include funding for the NEETs service or anything included in the EOTAS review or ESF funding from Cynydd or Cam Nesa. These funding streams are out of scope for the purpose of this review.

6.0 Preferred Option – HR Implications

6.1 Families First would be responsible for all the Commissioning Process and any HR issues within those external organisations would be handled by the individual organisation

6.2 Western Bay Youth Justice & Early Intervention (WBYJ&EIS) changes would be overseen by the regional board and by each respective HR Department across the region. The preferred option would require HR to follow standard procedures for the creation and advertisement of a new post.

6.3 Young People Services would require a full staff consultation agreed and supported with appropriate Trade Unions. Following consultation and confirmation of any changes, a slotting and matching would take place. All timelines and feedback processes would follow current policy and best practice. No redundancies would be incurred through the proposed model option.

7.0 Consultation

7.1 The Over 11s Cluster of the Family Support review is recommending options which transform our internal processes and staffing to deliver our services as effective and sustainable as possible in addition to working more collaboratively with our internal and external stakeholders. These options will not be making changes to front end services received by our service users and so no formal consultation is required.

8.0   Equality

8.1   An EIA screening form was completed and given that the preferred
option is not proposing any changes, it is agreed that there will be little to
no impact for any protected groups. As a result, a full EIA has not been
deemed necessary.

Background Papers:
Gateway 1 Report
Gateway 2 Report

Appendices:
1.1 Stage 1 & 2 of the review – available upon request
1.2 Additional Stage 1 & 2 information – available upon request
1.3 Mapping & Analysis
1.4 Significant Risks Analysis
1.5 The Commissioning Team – Young People and Families Sub Group TOR
and Membership
1.6 Glossary of terms and definitions
2.1 Benchmarking report on detail of areas
2.2 National Benchmarking Report – Youth Services
2.3 Full National Benchmarking Data Set – available upon request
3.1 Additional detail for Options 2 & 3
3.2 Scoring Matrix for the Options
4.1 Service structure charts for options 1,2 &3
5.1 Finance Report
6.1 EIA Screening