

**Appendix B2 –
Children’s Services
Proposals for
Change –
For decision for 2019
– 2022**

Proposal for Change:

Chil1920-01 Support for School Improvement

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Education
Director:	Julian Wooster
Strategic Manager	Dave Farrow
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
x	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>To use the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant (SIM&B) to fund the salaries of the Primary School Improvement Advisers currently funded by the Local Authority (LA).</p> <p>The salary costs are £287,400. This value includes £67,000 savings identified as part Peopletoo's financial improvement plan that are included within a separate proforma, therefore net saving of £220,400.</p>

2a. Confidence level
<p>Salary costs of Primary School Improvement Team - 100%</p> <p>This transfers the salary costs of the Primary School Improvement Team from an LA budget to a grant received from the Department for Education (DfE).</p> <p>Should the grant cease these costs will need to be re-stated against an LA budget.</p>

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

None

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None

5. Impact on staff:

N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Finance support required to ensure grant is allocated appropriately.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
Grant allocated		1 April 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

The DfE may cease the SIB&M grant in the future, however this would presumably be aligned to a change in LA responsibilities and therefore a cost reduction would also be expected.

9. Dependencies:

The grant is calculated annually based on the number of maintained schools in the LA at that time and there is no guarantee that the grant will continue indefinitely. If it ceases and the LA still has maintained schools and the existing statutory responsibilities related to those schools, the LA will need to ensure that funding is available to deliver those responsibilities.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

N/A

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No

12. Legal Implications:

No legal implications – the terms of the Grant allow for staffing costs to be covered from it.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?					
Please note: these figures should be cumulative					
£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£220,400	£	-£	£220,400	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£220,400	£	-£	£220,400	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change:

Chil1920-02 Reduction in Early Years Capital Programme Support

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Schools and Early Years Commissioning
Director:	Julian Wooster
Strategic Manager	Dave Farrow
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
X	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
X	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
Reduction in staffing capacity supporting Early Years (EY) capital programmes as a result of reduced capital programme for 2019/20 and potential cessation of capital grants to private providers.	
This reduction is linked to CAF12 Restructure of Early Years Teams developed as part of Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) proposals taken to Cabinet in September 2018.	

2a. Confidence level	
100%	£27,200 is 100% of costs but saving depends on level of reduction. £13,600 therefore added as a prudent figure

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

By ceasing the Early Years Capital Programme there is a risk that there will be some areas of the county that will not have a sufficient number of early years places. This in turn may mean that some parents may not be able to work as childcare may not be available. We will work with private provider organisations to inform them of our needs, so they can develop provision in shortage areas. We will also continue to promote childminding as an opportunity for individuals to set up their own business.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

N/A

5. Impact on staff:

Proposals would be achieved through review of the staffing structure.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

HR support will be required to manage any redundancy process

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Milestone	Date
Where there are shortages of places will seek to increase numbers of childminders, this will form part of an annual review of supply against demand across the county.	31 st March 2019
The corporate timescale in relation to staff consultation highlighted will be followed.	

8. Risks and opportunities:

There is a risk that SCC may be challenged in relation to not meeting its duty in relation to ensuring an appropriate supply of early years places in an area. There has been no such challenge to date in areas where demand exceeds supply.

There are opportunities for us to work with larger childcare organisations for them to deliver places where they are needed and we will also continue to encourage individuals to become childminders in areas where there is a shortage of places.

Where there are shortages of places will seek to increase numbers of childminders.

9. Dependencies:

Dependency on decision in relation to the ceasing of Early Years Capital Programme

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Consideration has been given to the public-sector equality duty and a separate Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed to support this proposal.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Staff consultation is required.

There will be no public consultation undertaken as part of this proposal.

12. Legal Implications:

There is potentially a reduction in service provision (childcare places) therefore statutory duties to ensure an appropriate supply of early years places (under the Childcare Act 2016 and 2006) apply and relevant government guidance will be considered before any reduction occurs. It should be noted that statutory duties will become harder to meet if we are not able to develop provision through capital investment.

In developing this proposal, officers have adhered to statutory guidance on Early Education and Childcare and are satisfied that SCC will continue to be able to ensure sufficiency taking into account the seven factors mentioned in paragraph B1 of the guidance, in particular i) the state of the market and ii) the quality and capacity of childcare providers and childminders in the county.

Consideration has also been given to the public sector equality duty (especially in relation to SEND and vulnerable children).

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
If no, when is the evidence expected?	[Enter date]

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£13,600	£	-£	£13,600	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£13,600	£	-£	£13,600	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):

£s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£

	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Organisation prepared for	Somerset County Council		
Version	V1.0	Date Completed	
Description of what is being impact assessed			
<p>Ceasing of Early Years Capital Programme for 2019/20. This impact is being assessed as part of reduction in staffing capacity supporting Early Years (EY) capital programmes as a result of reduced capital programme for 2019/20 and potential cessation of capital grants to private provider. The Capital programme supported the delivery of universal early years and childcare places and was not specifically focussed on any protected groups.</p>			
Evidence			
What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?			
<p>SCC holds details of numbers of children entitled to Early Years funding.</p>			
Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?			
<p>The Capital programme supported the delivery of universal early years and childcare places and was not specifically focussed on any protected groups. The Early Years Capital programme has been ongoing for a number of years but has been reduced significantly over the past few years.</p>			

Analysis of impact on protected groups				
Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	There is a possible indirect impact on children aged 0-5 years and their families in that the Local Authority may not be able to ensure that there are enough childcare places in some areas of the County.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	There is a possible indirect impact on children aged 0-5 years that have a disability and their families in that the Local Authority may not be able to ensure that there are enough childcare places in some areas of the County. This may for example result in private providers not taking the necessary steps to make reasonable adjustments to settings to support disabled children to attend early years settings.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender reassignment	• There are no impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and civil partnership	• There are no impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and maternity	• There are no impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race and ethnicity	There are potential cost implications as increasing demand for childcare places exceed supply leading to providers increasing costs which could potentially adversely affecting those from BME who are more likely on a lower income.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	• •There are no impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are potential cost implications for working single parent families, and the likelihood that this is more likely to affect women as they are more likely to be the primary care provider. 	☒	☐	☐
Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no impacts 	☐	☒	☐
Other, e.g. carers, veterans, homeless, low income, rurality/isolation, etc.	<p>There may be an indirect negative impact on low income families as increasing demand for childcare places exceeds supply leading to providers increasing costs, this could result in those on low incomes not being able to access the childcare places to enable them to work.</p> <p>There could potentially be an impact on those affected by rurality where there may be insufficient strength in the childcare market to generate additional space where required without funding from the local authority.</p>	☒	☐	☐

Negative outcomes action plan				
Action taken/to be taken	Date	Person responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
The LA will monitor the requirements for early years places across the County to identify potential areas of shortfall in sufficiency and inform private provider organisations to seek expressions of interest in developing provision in those areas	31/10/2018	Alison Jeffrey	Through ongoing performance management arrangement and the annual reviews of the Early Years	☐

			and Schools Infrastructure Growth Plan	
The LA will ensure that where it is identified that new building developments will result in the requirement for additional early years provision in an area we will seek to ensure that appropriate Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy funding is secured to enable the development of the necessary provision	31/10/2018	Alison Jeffrey	Through ongoing performance management arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/>
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
We cannot totally remove the impact that the implementation of this proposal will have on employees but the actions will ensure employees are aware of the support and options available to them.				
Completed by:	Dave Farrow			
Date	21/11/2018			
Signed off by:	Dave Farrow			
Date	21/11/2018			
Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:	Tom Rutland 04/12			
To be reviewed by: (officer name)				
Review date:				

Proposal for Change: Chil1920-03 CSC realignment savings

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Children's Services
Director:	Julian Wooster
Strategic Manager	Paul Shallcross
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
X	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:
The proposal aims to re-align social work services within the county around an East / West split, with the aim of improving the quality of practice, supporting the journey to a 'Good' Ofsted rating and realising year on year savings in the region of 500k.

2a. Confidence level
90%
A significant proportion of the savings stem from deleting posts which are not currently recruited to. The remainder of the proposed savings have been thoroughly scrutinised by the Children's Social Care Senior Management Team and are felt to be robust and achievable with no impact on service provision.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:
The proposal is aimed to improve the efficiency of the provision of Social Work services and as such will benefit the users of these services. Bringing the East and West of the county under the management of one Strategic Manager will improve the flow of work between community and Children Looked After (CLA) services and will support relationship-based practice with children and families.
Multi-agency partners within Somerset will not be negatively impacted by the proposed changes

4. Impact on other services we provide:

None identified.

5. Impact on staff:

A number of posts will be deleted from the service and as such this will impact on a number of staff members.

Within the total number of posts lost, 5 are not currently filled

The number of FTE that might be lost is:
The number of posts that might be lost is:

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

Support will be needed from HR and finance in implementing the proposal and managing consultation processes.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
	New structure to be in place by	01/04/2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks – uncertainty around the proposal may cause short term anxiety and worry amongst the existing management group. This may result in managers leaving the organisation.

Deletion of the Next Steps Team Manager post may impact on the capacity of the organisation to recruit to Newly Qualified Social Workers (NQSW) posts in the future. This is mitigated by an increase in the number of Consultant Social Worker (CSWs) for NQSWs

Opportunities – the re-aligned structure will support more effective and efficient working across areas and reduce ‘silo’ working. The new structure will also support future work which will look to reduce the number of transitions for children and families within the system, supporting the development of relationship-based practice.

9. Dependencies:

None identified.

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

No – as the proposal does not affect service delivery, an equality impact assessment is not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

Yes – a 45-day staff consultation is planned to take place prior to the end of December 2018.

Communications will take place via the usual internal channels and via 1:1 meetings with affected staff.

12. Legal Implications:

In developing this proposal officers are satisfied that the effect of this proposal will not cause the Local Authority (LA) to fail to meet its statutory duties to ensure and promote children's safety and welfare. Any legal implications of proposed staffing changes will be identified and addressed within the HR business case.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)? Yes - salaries

If no, when is the evidence expected?

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£573,400	£	-£	£573,400	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£573,400	£	-£	£573,400	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):

£s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: Chil1920-04 Children's Staffing Vacancies

Corporate Plan Priority:	
Service Area:	Children's Services
Director:	Julian Wooster
Assistant Director	Claire Winter
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
X	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>The proposal is for a one year saving (2019/20) of £775,300 in social work staffing costs.</p> <p>Recruitment of permanent social workers remains a challenge with 47 vacancies across Children's Social Care currently. A number of posts have been vacant with neither permanent or locum staff filling them for over 12 months. This proposal equates to not recruiting to a number of these vacant posts.</p>	

2a. Confidence level	
	<p>90%</p> <p>Case numbers continue to reduce slowly, and further partnership work may reduce this further.</p> <p>There is a risk that case numbers will increase unexpectedly. Were this to occur it is likely that locum social workers would need to be recruited at higher cost for a period while longer term trends and impacts are assessed.</p>

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Communities and partners can be empowered to support families at an early stage reducing the need for specialist social work services. This is current practice but is slow to develop effectively with some partners struggling to understand their early help role.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

No.

5. Impact on staff:

No staff impact as these are vacant posts and the proposal is for a one year saving only.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

None

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

	Milestone	Date
No milestones as plan is to reduce budget for one year – full year effect - from vacant posts		

8. Risks and opportunities:

Risks – that social work referrals increase unexpectedly, and current FTE cannot cope with demand, leaving children potentially at risk.

Opportunities – to work with partners and communities to enable them to identify concerns early and address them locally.

9. Dependencies:**10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:**

No

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

No.

12. Legal Implications:

In developing this proposal officers are satisfied that the effect of this proposal will not cause the Local Authority (LA) to fail to meet its statutory duties to ensure and promote children's safety and welfare.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	
---------------------------------------	--

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£775,300	£	-£	£775,300	One-off
2020/21	-£775,300	£	-£	-£775,300	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£775,300	£	-£	£775,300	

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):		
£s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
TOTAL		£

Proposal for Change: Chil1920-05 Early Years Entitlements

Corporate Plan Priority:	Chil1920-05
Service Area:	Inclusion Group
Director:	Annette Perrington
Strategic Manager	Phil Curd
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
X	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:	
<p>The proposed change is in relation to the processing of payments of the Early Years entitlement and funding for 2 years olds including the extended entitlement paid to early years providers. The saving will come from the reduction of a single post.</p> <p>Currently, the Admissions and Entitlements Team process estimates (paying 90% of each claim) to early years providers followed by actual forms which pay the remainder and adjustments which capture any changes (starters and leavers) for early years providers. The adjustments process is non-statutory and many other Local Authorities (LA) do not operate the opportunity for adjustments. The payment process as outlined runs for 3 funding periods in a year. The LA is paid based on the Early Years census in January so is not funded for children accessing the entitlement post census.</p> <p>Adjustments are paid in arrears therefore to cease this support by the end of March 2019 Early Years settings would need to be notified of the change by Christmas.</p> <p>Recognising that removing this will provide a challenge to providers it is proposed that a request is taken to Schools Forum Early Years subgroup in January 2019 seeking funding to support a post at the cost of approximately £20,000 from April</p>	

2019-March 2020 to limit disruption to Early Years settings from the ceasing of this activity. It is expected that School Forum will support this request.

Assuming School forum agree to fund this post until March 2020 the proposal would subsequently remove the post from 1st April 2020 therefore, making it an ongoing saving.

The saving, to include salary and on costs is approximately is £20,000.

Other advantages include:

- The settings should get a higher hourly rate as we will not be paying for hours the LA has not been paid for;
- Statistical information will be available by the time the term finishes rather than currently when the earliest it is available is the following half term; this will aid finance colleagues;
- We will not have the high volume of data issues that Core Data/Entitlements/Application Support need to resolve because claims are being submitted after a child has left the setting. This would save the LA time and data on Capita will be more accurate;
- It will save Core Data time as they will not have to clear suspense from the Adjustments;
- Entitlements team can request claim information earlier which means they should be able to complete Early Years census by the deadline without having to work the significant number of additional hours they do currently for census.

2a. Confidence level

75%

Confidence level reduced due to reliance on School Forum. If School Forum reject this proposal the removal of the post will take place from July 2019.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

Disadvantages for Early Years providers and parents from removing this post immediately are outlined below;

1. By funding this role for 12 months Schools Forum will be able to support SCC in minimising the disruption from these changes
2. It would remove the flexibility that allows parents to move settings part way through a term;
3. Funded 2 years who are awarded funding part way through the term will probably have to wait to access a space until the start of the following term;
4. If settings don't send in the appropriate documentation with their claim/claim appropriately/complete a 30 hours check, there will be no opportunity for them to claim later using an adjustment form therefore they will not be paid. This has the potential for more complaints and could potentially lead to sustainability issues/closures of settings. However, it is settings responsibility to comply with the requirements of Provider agreement and they are sent clear instructions by the team in advance so there should be no reason for settings to lose money;
5. When children overclaim at multiple settings neither provider will be able to amend their claim (on the summer actual claim, there were nearly 200 children

that overclaimed their hours); there is no action that can be taken to mitigate against this.

- Settings will need support to amend their policies to reflect the change. The Entitlements and Early Years Team will continue to support settings as capacity allows.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

As above. Once the post is permanently removed in April 2020 there will be a reduction in work for the Core Data Team.

5. Impact on staff:

Proposals would be achieved through review of the staffing structure.

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

It is likely that support will be required from HR around any staffing changes required.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones

	Milestone	Date
	Inform Early Year settings	By end of Autumn Term 2018 or by March 2019
	Schools Forum Decision to fund role for 1 year	16 January 2019

8. Risks and opportunities:

The risks for 1 & 2: The Local Authority has a statutory duty to secure a free place offering 570 hours a year over no fewer than 38 weeks of the year for all 3 & 4 year olds, including new starters and eligible 2 year olds. Families of eligible 2 year olds are the most economically disadvantaged in Somerset.

Recognising this the proposal is for Early Years sub group to extend the processing of adjustments for another financial year by agreeing to fund a post from their current DSG surplus

9. Dependencies:

No dependencies

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

Agreement with the Corporate Equalities Manager that an Equalities Impact Assessment is not required.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

There is no legal requirement to consult with Early Year providers however the team will communicate the change as soon as possible, providing advice and guidance immediately and on an ongoing basis.

Assuming the Early Year subgroup agrees to fund the post for another year, it will give the team chance to review processes properly and prepare settings for the change which could include organised events.

12. Legal Implications:

Under the Childcare Act (2006), SCC has a duty to secure sufficient childcare places for working parents (s6) and to secure early years provision free of charge (s7). The potential impact on SCC's ability to meet this duty must therefore be considered.

The statutory guidance states that SCC **should** ensure that providers are treated in an equitable way and that the proper use of funding does not place undue administrative burdens on them. SCC **should** be mindful of the concerns of smaller providers (re. their cashflow) when making decisions about payment methods. SCC **should** regularly review how they pay providers to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of all providers in their area. **As far as reasonably practicable**, SCC **should** ensure that eligible children who move into the area are able to take up their place at any time. SCC are not required to secure additional free hours (extended entitlement) where the parent has applied after the set deadlines.

SCC **must** be clear with providers on their policy in relation to how a child will be funded if they take up their place outside of any regular headcount or if they choose to change providers during the term. SCC **should** encourage providers to work together in this regard. Consideration should therefore be given to these requirements when amending the Provider Agreement and steps must be taken to ensure that the changes are clearly communicated.

The Provider Agreement will need to be amended in line with the above. The Agreement cannot be amended unilaterally (unless to reflect legislative changes). Any changes will therefore need to be made to the 2019-2020 Agreement before any Providers sign up for the 2019-2020 entitlement.

13a. Financial Savings – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based (evidence should be included with this template)?	Yes
---	-----

If no, when is the evidence expected?	N/A
---------------------------------------	-----

Please note: these figures should be cumulative

£s	Savings	Income Generated	Cost Involved (also see 13b)	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	Ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
2022/23	£	£	-£	£	
2023/24	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£20,000	£	-£	£20,000	Ongoing

13b. One-off project costs and income (not included in above):

£s		
2019/20	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of Redundancy costs	-£

	Estimate of Resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2020/21	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
2021/22	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£

Proposal for Change:

Chil1920-06 Reduce the cost of providing transport to specialist provision

Corporate Plan Priority:	Childrens 1920 – 06 (CAF 10b)
Service Area:	Inclusion – School Transport
Director:	Julian Wooster
Strategic Manager	Annette Perrington
SAP Node	

1. The proposal is to:	
√	Managing Demand - <i>Examine what can be done to influence our demand and reduce service pressures/costs or increase income, including raising fees and charging for services. How could we work across the wider local system with partners, are we picking up costs that should be paid by a different part of the system? Evidence of current and expected future demand will be required as part of future planning.</i>
√	Increasing Productivity - <i>Since 2011/12 the Council has made most of its savings through efficiency measures. Like most Councils there is now less scope for traditional efficiency savings. What efficiency/productivity savings are available? What are the biggest expenditure items in your service? Are we getting best value from our contracts? Are we exploring opportunities to negotiate?</i>
√	Service Delivery Models - <i>Are you aware of any alternative delivery models that could deliver services differently? What examples from other authorities could we adopt? E.g. commission from another party, joint venture... recognising that some options will have a long lead in times and would not necessarily impact on the financial gap in 2018/19.</i>
√	Reductions in Services - <i>Are there services which partners could provide instead? Are all your services adding value? Are there any services which could safely and legally be stopped? What would the impact be on residents? Could residents be empowered to do it themselves?</i>

2. Outline of the proposed change:
<p>Building on the 18/19 proposal (CAF 10a) this proposal coordinates the activity which links the strategic Capital investment programme to children and young people attending their nearest appropriate specialist resource base, school / college. Children and young people attending specialist resource base or special school provision all have an education, Health and Care plan (EHCP)</p> <p>The Children and Families Act 2014 requires the Local Authority (LA) to consider any school provision requested by parents. This is known as parental preference. The Local Authority will also consider the nearest appropriate provision. Final decisions are determined on individual circumstances which take into account the appropriateness of the school / setting to meet the child's SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) needs and the most efficient use of resources. The final decisions must be named in the EHCP and once named this is legally binding upon both the LA and School setting. Before a school can be named the LA must consult with a school and consider any responses. The LA can in most cases overrule the school / setting where they are in receipt of state funding. The LA can also disagree with the parent and name a school/ setting of LA choice, however this could be subject to further challenge via Tribunal, which in turn could</p>

have further financial implications on the High Needs and Local Authority travel budgets. In order to ensure efficient use of resources case workers should take into account travel time, distance and cost. Children and young people have an annual review of their Education, health and Care plan. This will also apply to all new EHCP's.

Key stage transfers occur nationally at the end of Year 6, end of Year 11. These transitions should be undertaken in the year proceeding transfer to support effective and successful transfer to a new school with parents/ carers and young people at the point of their annual review. Such points of transition provide an opportunity for existing school placements and travel arrangements to be reviewed and for savings to be made where previous school placements may not be the nearest appropriate.

In line with National trend the demand for places in specialist provision continues to increase. This is exacerbated by the Children and Families Act 2014, which increased the age up to which young people with SEND may have an EHCP to 25. Children and young people can also attend local mainstream schools and colleges, where children and young people are over statutory walking distances where a school has been named in their EHCP this also requires consideration of travel eligibility and the same criteria as above apply.

Children and Young People who need specialist provision often must travel to receive this, and where this isn't available or of a good quality parents will often request specialist independent provision. To offset demand a large capital investment programme has been implemented in Somerset since 2016 to make sure that children and young people are placed as close to home as possible. Work is underway to mitigate this increase by ensuring there is sufficient capacity to meet needs locally and ensuring information, advice and guidance and SEND casework is robust and effectively manages parental expectation from an early stage. In addition to this, Somerset County Council has adopted the use of (personal Travel Payments (PTPs)). These are offered to all parents of children that would otherwise have to be transported individually in a taxi.

Additional risks include market variances and whilst we are making best use of internal fleets but remain vulnerable to the commercial market, where costs have risen sharply in recent years. Under this proposal we intend to limit our call on the market for the number of individual journeys we require. This can be supported by placing children in their nearest appropriate provision, so they can be transported in groups.

This is a statutory duty and must be fulfilled. The policy has been revised to reduce the offer to a statutory minimum.

Key aspects of the proposal to achieve the identified saving are as follows. Improvements in practice will lead to outcomes 1 and 2 below, and the increase in capacity will lead to SEND placements being made more locally with a corresponding reduction in costs:

1. Cost avoidance through SEND Placements – moving 25% of the cohort of children identified as relevant for this proposal to schools closer to their homes address.
2. Improvement in case work through challenge provided at panels.
3. Developing capacity in special schools from September 2019 resulting in 25 new starts.

2a. Confidence level

75%

Each case must be considered on individual circumstances and in conjunction with the young person and parent/ carers. In some circumstances such a change may be difficult to achieve. Risks include parental resistance and challenge, delayed building programmes and impact upon multiple travel opportunities.

3. Impact on residents, businesses and other organisations:

This would impact on children and parent/carers where they are not attending their nearest appropriate school and where transition is required. However, as the service user has the option to decline a change then there is no impact unless the local authority disagrees, which carries the additional risk of appeal.

4. Impact on other services we provide:

This change is an improvement on current working practices only.

5. Impact on staff:

N/A

6. Resources and support needed to make the change:

This work will require coordination between the SEND Casework Team and officers in Transporting Somerset. This change to existing working practices has begun but requires continued monitoring and nurturing to ensure these relationships are robust and effective.

7. Timescale to deliver and major milestones:

Identify all children that could be moved to provision closer to home	Already undertaken
Identify the next suitable transition point for those children	Ongoing
Commence relocation conversations during the next available appropriate annual review	Ongoing
Move children to the nearest appropriate provision	Ongoing

8. Risks and opportunities:

There is a risk of reputational damage to the LA and additional challenge where children and young people and / or their parents differ in their views of the most appropriate specialist provision.

Where such challenges proceed to the possibility of a tribunal, the LA will have to consider further each case as determined by case law precedence.

9. Dependencies:

This proposal is dependent upon Ofsted inspections of special schools, where any special school which moves into a category is likely to impact upon parental confidence for their child to attend

10. Initial Equality Impact Assessment:

All children identified will be considered to have a disability under the 2010 Equality Act. Some parents may also have disabilities under the Equality Act and should have reasonable adjustments considered as part of individual circumstances.

11. Consultation and Communications plan:

All conversations would be undertaken on a case by case basis. There is no need for any public consultation exercise.

12. Legal Implications:

Any SEND Casework activity will have to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant Code of Practice. The risk relating to tribunal have been outlined in sections 2a and 8.

13a. Financial Implications – net change to service budget in each year:

Are the savings evidenced based?				Yes	
If no, when is evidence expected?					
Please note: these figures should be cumulative (as per the approach for MTFP and savings)					
£s	Savings	Income	Growth/Costs	Total	Ongoing or One-off?
2019/20	£98,325	£	-£	£98,325	ongoing
2020/21	£	£	-£	£	
2021/22	£	£	-£	£	
Total	£98,325	£	-£	£98,325	

13b. One off project costs and income (not included in above):

£s		
2018/19	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£

	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
<i>2019/20</i>	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
<i>2020/21</i>	Capital Costs	-£
	Capital Receipts	£
	Estimate of redundancy costs	-£
	Estimate of resource costs to deliver	-£
	Sub-total	£
	TOTAL	£