



Commissioning Gateway Review Report Additional Stage 1 & 2 Information Family Support Commissioning Review – 11- 18

Contains:-

Review Overview and Details
Stages review summary
Gateway Approval

REVIEW OVERVIEW

Commissioning Stand Lead:	Martin Nichols
Service Review Lead:	Jane Whitmore and Julie Thomas
Service Review Title:	Family Support Continuum – 11 – 18 Section

1.0 PURPOSE OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this additional section is to add additional information to Stages 1 & 2 of the Commissioning Review process which aims to highlight the intended outcomes and the service assessment. Due to the scale of this review it has been necessary to add this information due to the significant impact it has on the over 11's part of the review.

2.0 Outcomes

2.1 Social Services

2.2 One of the significant implications of the Social Services and Wellbeing Act 2015 is the redefining of those vulnerable young people and families classified previously as Children in Need. The act has now defined this group as Children in Need of Care and Support (CINCS) and one of the critical changes for this group is that they must receive appropriate care and support, but that this support does not necessarily mean that statutory Social Work intervention is the most appropriate. Therefore, the service areas considered in the scope of this review maybe best placed to provide support and interventions that best meet the needs of these vulnerable young people and families. This must be a critical factor in the consideration of the options within this review.

2.3 Research carried out in 'That Difficult Age' by the Research in Practice (RIP) lends further support to this view as it raises critical questions about the application of statutory systems that have primarily been designed for the safety of young children and families and how well these translate to engaging adolescents.

When resources are strained, adolescents' needs are frequently deprioritised in favour of those of younger children.

(Gorin and Jobe, 2013)

2.4 Many existing Child in Need cases can sit within statutory case loads and can receive far less support than those currently sitting in non statutory intervention due to misconceptions about the needs of these families and the resource availability in statutory services. The challenge of this review is to ensure that this practice does not continue and that all cases and systems function to ensure that young people and families receive services from whichever service is most appropriate based on their needs.

2.5 Further research in adolescent brain and physiological development now recognises adolescent as the fastest changing period aside from infancy (Coleman, 2011). If a common understanding about the complex nature of adolescent development is not understood and consistently applied across organisations, then the research proposes a number of consequences is likely:

- Missed opportunity to work as a team with the adolescent and often their family in combatting the risk
- Misunderstandings about the fundamental drivers and contexts of risk, with the result that resources are channelled to the wrong places
- Harmful assumptions are made about adolescent choice (on the one hand they are minimised, on the other hand they are perceived as adult 'lifestyle choices')
- A failure to recognise (and therefore address) the challenges involved in preventing and reducing adolescent risk (eg. The frequent challenge to engage young people in interventions)

2.6 These consequences should be kept in mind whilst reading the analysis of the mapping of services in Swansea in a later section of this report.

2.7 In terms of the outcomes of this section of the review, there is a need to consider the reduction in number of Children In Need cases that sit with our statutory services as one of the outcomes. In turn, greater focus of statutory resource can be focussed on those young people who are on the Child Protection Register (CPR), with both areas of work contributing to lowering the total number of children and young people who become Looked After (LAC).

2.8 For those being young people and families who receive support, the outcomes should demonstrate improved wellbeing and improved resilience within the family to sustain their wellbeing and of course the safety of the young person. It should also help achieve this at an earlier stage of need, which means a less intrusive and potentially traumatic experience for the family and a lower cost of intervention.

Swansea SS Figures

Education

2.9 Equally the services within scope of this review must work with young people who have poor school attendance and struggle to engage in mainstream school. The data shows us that these are often the same young people who are categorised or at risk of being categorised as CINCS, CPR or Looked After and therefore a huge overlap in the needs of these young people. The outcomes here

are to support increased attendance in mainstream education and to reduce the demand of young people requiring Education Other Than At School (EOTAS) options.

2.10 For young people and their families, it should again increase their wellbeing, but school attendance has also shown to significantly reduce the impact and act as a resilient factor supporting lower levels of engagement in adolescent risk factors such as early sexual activity and substance misuse. Attendance levels at EOTAS provision also show significantly increased chance of significant levels of adolescent risk compared to those in mainstream including becoming 'not in education, employment or training' (NEET).

Swansea Attendance Figures

2.11 This highlights the importance of ensuring that all services are joined up around the young person and ensuring that all aspects of the family's life are considered and appropriate interventions developed. Working together across service areas to ensure that young people can sustain their mainstream education with positive attendance and results.

2.12 Transition at post 16 and post 16 services.

New NEETS Service and ESF Cam Nesa Project.

Transition at pre 11 and co-working

3.0 Service Assessment

3.1 The rationale for mapping

3.2 As highlighted in this report the impact and success of this element of the Commissioning Review process, is the complex interaction and interdependencies of a whole system involving a wide range of services, provided by organisations across all sectors.

3.3 In order to support the review of these services and processes it is essential to map out all of these services and explore and analyse these interactions to ascertain whether they are effectively joined up around the young person and family. As the preceding sections highlight, this will be carried out utilising the Continuum of Need model.

3.4 However, when conducting this mapping it is also imperative to consider other key models that interact with the Continuum of Needs to ensure we are able to map and understand the interactions in as realistic a way as possible.

3.5 This review has undertaken this challenge via the age group of the child involved in the family, due to the fact that the interacting systems are so different for children and young people at different ages. This is further evidenced by the varying national guidance and frameworks that exist for different age groups.

3.6 This section of the Commissioning Review will separate the age groups into two sections to enable effective mapping of services and systems. These will be the 11 to 16 age group and the 16 to 18 age group.

3.7 Rationale for 11 – 16 age group

3.8 Within the 11 to 16 age group it is essential that the Family Support Continuum of services is considered alongside the Graduated response that our school systems in Swansea operate. Our schools and the wellbeing processes in place through our schools is critical in the development of preventative approaches and the wellbeing of young people and their family. Therefore the mapping of services for this review has mapped these processes alongside each other. Fig.1.1 show's a visual representation of how these services and processes work alongside each other.

3.9 Further commentary of the model also describes the brokerage and panel processes which currently operate across the system and a visual representation of these can be seen in the Appendix 1.1.

3.10 The following sections then analyses the context, culture, systems and structures which exist on the mapping document utilising a signs of safety approach.

3.11 For the 16 to 18 age group it is essential that the Family Support Continuum is visually mapped out against the Engagement and Progression's 5 Tier Model as within this age group it is the interaction between these two models that is essential to understand how services interact to provide appropriate support.

3.12 Again, further commentary of the model also describes the brokerage and panel processes which currently impact across the mapping, with a visual representation located in Appendix 1.2

3.13 The following sections then analyse the context, culture, systems and structures which exist on the mapping document again utilising a signs of safety approach

3.14 In addition a further section will give an overview and analysis of the transition process between the age groups.

3.15 It should also be noted that although the mapping considers the interactions of all services and processes not all of these will fall within the scope of this review. Any services that are highlighted in Green mean that they are included within the scope and therefore recommendations could directly affect the service and or the commissioned funding that they receive. Additional analysis of these services including their funding, staffing, caseloads and practice models will be included in the Appendices. The analysis and options for change will therefore be more focussed around those services within scope, although some of the analysis maybe general to all parts of the mapping or system. Again it is essential to understand any potential changes within the context of the wider mapping.

3.16 Based on the mapping below the following services were identified as being in scope for this review:

Young People Services Evolve Level 2 and 3 Teams
Elements of the Young People Services Evolve Targeted and Specialist Team
Families First Commissioned element of support for Ethnic Minorities
Families First Commissioned element of support for Young Carers
Western Bay Youth Justice and Early Intervention Service (WBYJ&EIS) Prevention Service
Arrangements