

Driving Organisational Efficiency
Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE001
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Support Planning, Reablement, Mental Health
Lead Member(s):	Councillor Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Increased use of direct payments
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	Support Planning £39,990 Reablement £32,059 Mental Health £ 5,412
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	Support Planning 63.0 Reablement 72.0 Mental Health 67.8

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	50	50
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	-	-

Proposed savings

This will mean that people pay for their home care/community support through independent Personal Assistants or direct purchasing of support from providers. A market for Independent Personal Assistants will continue to be developed in the local area to maximise the benefit.

How would this affect users of this service?

Direct Payments should give people more choice and control, but as outlined above it will also transfer some of the addition transactions to the service user or their carer, which they are not always keen to do.

Key milestones

To be confirmed.

Key consultations

This is not a change of policy, so we will continue to work with our service user and carer group to develop these changes, but we are not proposing a formal consultation.

Key risks and mitigations

The key risk in this project is whether we can set up a thriving Independent Personal Assistant market. The mitigation will be to support more people to move to Direct Payments through providers – the saving is slightly less, so we would need to move more people. There is also a limit to the people we can move to Direct Payments with providers without needing to change (increase) our Direct Payment rate.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No. This is not a change in policy. It will still be a choice to take up Direct Payments, and if someone does take them up they will have more choice about the services and support they receive.
----------------	--

EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A
Lead officer for this proposal:	Amy Jones

Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE002a
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP Efficiency savings - Early Help Transformation
---------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	4,200
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	129

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	£350	£550
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	TBC	TBC

Proposed savings

How would this affect users of this service?

This proposal assumes a transformation of the design and delivery of Early Help to children and families in Brent. Effective and co-ordinated early intervention will build resilience and independence which will in turn move cases out of high risk and high cost services. As far as possible there will be a one worker to one family approach. Savings will be achieved through three main workstreams:

1. More effective co-ordination and signposting and to early intervention services delivered by partners including schools and the voluntary sector. The local authority will achieve savings by reducing direct delivery in some areas which are already well supported by partners. We will however increase the quality of professional supervision to ensure that we have a strong oversight of safeguarding

2. Improved use of research to ensure a greater strategic focus on high impact interventions and more effective assessment of individual need. Savings will be achieved by reducing delivery of low impact or repeat interventions.
3. Planned structural change across CYP. In the first instance this will enable the delivery of a more coherent offer which is expected to reduce demand for high cost services. Any reduction in demand will then enable a further reduction in headcount.

Key milestones

Early Help Project Board to be established by December 2015 – Chaired by Strategic Director Children and Young People.

The objectives of the board will be to plan and design a transformed early intervention offer that is able to manage demand, signpost effectively, engage with key partners to realign services (schools, voluntary sector, charities, etc) share costs and reduce duplication.

Key consultations

Initial capture of current early intervention offer – NGDP Graduate interviews with key staff across CYP and with main delivery partners.
Further consultations will be directed by the board.

Key risks and mitigations

Key Risks: There is ongoing growth in the numbers of children and young people in Brent and therefore an increase in demand for services at the same time as we are trying to transform the service offer and reduce demand.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	YES
Particular ethnic groups	YES
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	YES
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	

Marriage / civil partnership	
------------------------------	--

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	EIA will be completed once more detailed proposals have been developed
Deadline:	TBC

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gail Tolley
---------------------------------	-------------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE002b
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP efficiency savings – Signs of Safety and Social worker recruitment
---------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	£6,341
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	184

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	£'300	£'200
Proposed staffing reduction	0 FTE	0 FTE

Proposed savings

The proposed savings are related to increased efficiencies from within children's social care driven by the Signs of Safety programme and a linked, but separate, reduction in the reliance on agency staff across the division.

The department has been working with the Signs of Safety England Innovations Programme to introduce the Signs of Safety approach to the work of the Children and Young People's Department since November 2014. The approach takes a strength based approach to working with families, supporting staff to develop a more robust approach to their work with children, young people and their families. The approach will create a more efficient and effective department and will make Brent a more attractive authority to work for, hopefully attracting more high calibre permanent staff to the borough.

Linked to the Signs of Safety approach is the need to increase the number (and percentage) of permanent staff working in the department and decrease our reliance on those employed on an agency basis. There is a national and London wide issue

in relation to the recruitment of social workers and social work managers, one aspect of which, being the increasing reliance on agency staff to fill vacancies. Agency staff are of variable quality, are by their nature transitory (on the whole) and expensive. There are approximately 70 agency social workers, deputy and team managers in children's social care currently. The proposal is to reduce this number over the two year period.

If the number of agency staff could be reduced by 40, this would realise a saving of approximately £300k. This will link into the work on Signs of Safety, creating a more efficient and effective department staffed by a more stable, committed and high quality staff group, which will in turn mean that cases can be closed more quickly (greater throughput), that only the right cases require allocation (reduced input) and that social workers are able to manage greater caseloads (greater capacity). We anticipate a further saving of £200k in 18/19 linked to these efficiencies.

How would this affect users of this service?

This proposal will only have a positive effect on service users who will benefit from more continuity with permanent staff with whom they are better able to develop an effective working relationship.

Key milestones

Nov 2015. An external partner will be recruited to assist with a permanent recruitment campaign for social workers and social work managers. Other key milestones will be identified following discussion with preferred provider.

Key consultations

The process of recruitment is being jointly managed between HR and children's social care.

Key risks and mitigations

The key risk relates to the failure to hit the agreed target reduction of agency social work staff due to the national staff shortage and the fact that all local authorities are in completion for the same limited numbers of staff. This will be mitigated by working alongside a well reputed national recruitment expert targeting social work recruitment in the borough.

Equality impact screening

There will be no differential effect on protected groups as there is little difference between the profile of agency and permanent social work staff.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	no
Particular ethnic groups	no
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	no
People of particular sexual orientation/s	no
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender	no

reassignment	
People in particular age groups	no
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no
Marriage / civil partnership	no

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gail Tolley
---------------------------------	-------------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE002c
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP efficiency savings – Regionalising Adoption
---------------------------	---

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	680
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	13.5

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	100	-
Proposed staffing reduction	TBC	

Proposed savings

The proposed savings are as follows:

1. Adoption staff reduction resulting from the regionalisation of adoption services. Government has indicated its intention to regionalise some or all of local authority adoption services by 2017. In London the preparatory work is being led by the London Adoption Consortium which is currently conducting a scoping exercise on the model that this regionalisation could take and the scale and type of services that could be regionalised. This piece of work is due to conclude in March 2016 with a view to delivering from April 2017.
2. Whilst the regionalisation programme will progress, what it will actually involve and whether it leads to a whole London adoption agency or one that is delivered sub regionally is as yet unclear.
3. The Local Authority will not be able to stop providing adoption services but they will be delivered differently; whether through a collection of Local Authorities or commissioned with a single provider. This will lead to some

efficiencies – particularly in the area of the recruitment and assessment of adopters as well as the provision of post-permanency support.

4. On the basis of this rationalisation, our analysis at this stage indicates that we will be able to deliver a £100,000, which is 15% of the total current budget for the service.

How would this affect users of this service?

This proposal is unlikely to have any significant effect on service users as the efficiencies created by rationalising the deliver model combined with the decreasing number of adoptions means that we fully expect service standards to be maintained. There is risk, but this is linked to the regionalisation, rather than the reductions, and this is outside of local control.

Key milestones

March 2016. Scoping for the regionalisation programme completed by London Adoption Board and decisions will be made by the DfE about the delivery model.
March 2017: Implementation of new approach, aligned to staff reductions (2 SW posts).

Key consultations

This process is being managed in the first instance by the London Adoption Board. Once a decision has been made about the delivery model, Brent will follow its own Managing Change procedures.

Key risks and mitigations

The risks are minimal as the reductions are linked to the increased efficiencies that will be derived from a pan London approach to adoption.

Equality impact screening

It is not anticipated that there will a differential impact on any of the protected groups as the impact of the reductions should be minimal.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	no
Particular ethnic groups	no
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	no
People of particular sexual orientation/s	no
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	no
People in particular age groups	no
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no

Marriage / civil partnership	no
------------------------------	----

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gail Tolley
---------------------------------	-------------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE003
Budget theme(s):	Driving Organisational Efficiency
Service(s):	Community Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllrs Southwood, Denselow, Mashari

Savings Proposals:	To review staffing structures and spans of control across the eight services that comprise the Community Services Division. This will particularly include a review of contract management and strategy development arrangements so that these can be standardised and rationalised across all large operational contracts in a way that creates consistency of approach and improved service outputs.
---------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	38,614
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	459

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	1,125	1,125
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	46	46

Proposed savings

Savings of £2.25m would come from a 20% reduction in FTE across all eight services.

How would this affect users of this service?

It is not anticipated that users of the services will be adversely affected. The intention is to reduce FTE so that services are more efficient but no less effective. Currently, contract management, policy work and projects are managed independently of each other and in silos. A centralisation of contract management, policy and projects resource would reduce numbers, standardise our approach to create better consistency, create integration, create expertise and drive excellence.

A busy programme of strategy development work this year will see the need diminish in key areas from 2016.

Key milestones

- Restructure proposals drafted April – August 2016
- Restructure consultation from September 2017
- Revised staffing arrangements implemented from April 2017

Key consultations

- With all staff within Community Services.
- With any staff in other departments on whom there may be an impact.
- With Members.
- With any service users on whom there may be an impact.

Key risks and mitigations

- A key risk is the impact on staff morale through the restructure period.
- A key risk is the loss of key personnel.
- A key risk is the potential for adverse impact on service delivery during and after implementation.
- A key mitigation is full and meaningful consultation with all staff affected.
- A key mitigation is to use the process to create career opportunity for ambitious and talented staff.
- A key mitigation is to use vacancies and the offer of VR to offset the need for compulsory redundancies.

Equality impact screening

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	Y
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	Y
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Y
Marriage / civil partnership	Y

If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	TBC
Deadline:	<i>TBC</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte
---------------------------------	-------------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	DOE004
Budget theme(s):	Driving Organisational Efficiency
Service(s):	All Support Services
Lead Member(s):	TBC

Savings Proposals:	<p>The proposal for Support Services savings of up to £500k per annum can be achieved through challenging and innovative approach to modernised services. The savings meet the external financial pressures for change whilst addressing efficiencies for the future of our Support Services.</p> <p>We are proposing to review the level of support services provided within the council– human resources, legal, IT, business support and finance – in the future to create a leaner more efficient service to users.</p> <p>Our support services makes significant contribution to our frontline delivery so, if we can make savings in the “back office”, we can spend more money on delivering services direct to our residents.</p> <p>The options are: restructuring, merging, outsourcing, shared services, and driving greater efficiency through technology and self-service.</p>
---------------------------	---

Financial and Staffing Information

2015/16	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	TBC
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	TBC

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	500	500
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	TBC	TBC

Proposed savings

- £500,000 - 2017/18
- £500,000 – 2018/19

How would this affect users of this service?

A leaner more effective and efficient service

Key milestones

- Benchmarking cost/quality - (March 2016)
- Define core service offer and future vision - (April 2016)
- Review options for shared services/efficiency - (July 2016)
- Move into shared service models - (by end March 2017)
- Build on what works [review] - (December 2017)
- Further changes agreed + implemented - (March 2018)

Key consultations

Directors consulted on future needs (Jan – March 2016)

Key risks and mitigations

Service unable to meeting organisational demand

Equality impact screening

TBC