

Children and Young People Budget Options

Reference:	CYP1, CYP2 and CYP16
Budget theme(s):	Building independence and community resilience
Service(s):	Early Years and Family Support
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	<p>CYP 1 and 2: Implement partnership model for the Children's Centres by tendering the management and day to day delivery in centres to a external provider. The authority will retain statutory responsibility for sufficiency of provision, quality of provision via a contract with a performance management process and high quality data collection as well as utilising Ofsted inspections.</p> <p>The saving of circa £500K detailed here is achieved by retaining the existing range of children's centre provision but tendering for a partner to manage and provide services. The savings would be achieved because the contract would pay only for core and targeted services. The provider would be expected to deliver the universal services via volunteers. Phase 1 of the change programme has already delivered savings from the deletion of a management tier and this is reflected in the full year effect in 15/16 which has already been implemented and delivered</p> <p>Alternative: CYP16: Close 10 out of 17 Children's Centres and implement the partnership model for the remaining 7 centres</p>
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	Staffing =£2,038,416 Building costs = £500,000 Other service delivery costs = £40,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	61 FTE

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
CYP1	237	263	0
CYP2	20	35	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	No reductions but all would be subject to TUPE process.		

Alternative:

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
CYP16	1,465	-263	
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	Approximately 36 redundancies plus remaining staff subject to TUPE		

CYP 1 and 2

Proposed savings

The saving detailed here is achieved by retaining the existing range of children's centre provision but tendering for a partner to manage and provide services. The savings would be achieved because the contract would pay only for targeted services. The provider would be expected to deliver the universal services (which are essential for CC delivery) via volunteers. A voluntary sector provider (since bidders may mainly come from this group) would also be in a better position to generate additional uses for the CC buildings.

How would this affect users of this service?

Users of the service would see a change of staff delivering universal services but overall, potentially, an increase in service provision. Quality will be monitored by the council's Early Years Team. More appropriate targeted work, early intervention will be carried out.

Key milestones

Consultation with staff and service users from November 2014.

Results of staff consultation and change management process started including TUPE regulations Feb to March 2015 then Implementation Sept 2015

Key consultations

Staff would need to be consulted over restructuring
Partner organisations since many are involved in CCs
Advisory boards
Schools and PVI settings
Users and potential users of the service

Key risks and mitigations

Risk of no suitable provider but this is a low risk as there are established providers nationally.

CYP16

Closure of 10 of the 17 Children's Centres would reduce the ability of the service to reach targeted families as well as reducing accessibility of services for all families. It would not be possible for the remaining provision to be rated 'good' by Ofsted because of the reduction in reach.

How would this affect users of this service?

Users would see a large scale reduction in services and would have to travel further if they were to access a children's centre. There would be a reduction in early intervention with the families who need it most and it would affect the meeting of targets in relation to public health outcomes and educational outcomes as well as increasing pressure on social care.

Key milestones

Consultation with staff and service users would be required from January to March simultaneous with staff consultation.

It would be challenging to achieve savings from March 2015 given the current decision-making timetable and the statutory consultation requirements.

Key consultations

Staff would need to be consulted over restructuring
Partner organisations since many are involved in CCs
Advisory boards
Schools and PVI settings
Users and potential users of the service

Key risks and mitigations

The majority of the centres are subject to large scale clawback by government of capital if they are no longer used as children's centres.

There is a strong risk of legal challenge of closure and it would be necessary to have a very careful process of consultation which followed the legal requirements to the letter.

The lack of children's centre provision would be likely to generate costs of more reactive (and expensive) services for families which had not received early support with parenting and other family issues.

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	no
Particular ethnic groups	no
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	yes
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	yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no
Marriage / civil partnership	no

EIA required?:	Yes and Restructure EIA
EIA to be completed by:	Sue Gates
Deadline:	<i>OCTOBER 2014</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Gates /Sara Williams
---------------------------------	--------------------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP3 and CYP17
Budget theme(s):	Building independence and community resilience and stopping services completely
Service(s):	Youth Service
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	<p>CYP3: Reduce management and infrastructure costs in 2015/16 and establish a new delivery model by 2016/17</p> <p>Alternative:</p> <p>CYP17: Cease all youth services and fulfil 'sufficiency' requirement by signposting non-council provision</p>
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	1,346,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	34.16

CYP3	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	100	900	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	2	26.5 FTE (52 people)	0

Alternative:

CYP17	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	1,246	-900	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	34.16 (65 people)	0	0

Proposed savings

CYP3: The first tranche of savings (£100k) would be achieved for 15/16 by deleting a managerial post and an operational post as well as reducing the budgets which support activities, such as printing and publicity. From November also the Youth Service is part of a Cabinet Office 'Delivering Differently for Young People' Programme. This funds a rapid process of developing a set of options for a new delivery model. In particular, officers have proposed exploring through this

programme the development of a 'youth trust' for Brent which could access funding which currently neither the council nor Brent's youth voluntary sector organisations are able to access. This could put Brent's youth provision on a more sustainable footing, with the 'youth trust' able to act as a consortium lead and enabler for local organisations as well as being a delivery vehicle, using the expertise of Brent's experienced and skilled youth workers. As part of this process, alternative funding sources could be identified to mitigate the loss of services from the budget reduction of £900k in 16/17.

CYP17: This option terminates all Youth Service spend for 15/16. This would involve making all the staff redundant (full time and sessional workers as well as managers). The services terminated would be:

Outreach and Detached Team and Youth Bus – which has a key preventative role in relation to youth disorder and gang violence

Poplar Grove Youth Club – year round provision targeting young people from Chalkhill and surrounding areas.

Mosaic LGBT Project – award winning provision for a key group of young people liable to risk and discrimination

Duke of Edinburgh Award – Brent is a very successful provider with a high success rate

Granville Youth Arts Centre – youth arts provision which supports re-engagement in education and work

Brent in Summer – the youth contribution to this programme has good attendance

Brent Youth Parliament

Wembley Youth Centre – high quality provision

Roundwood Youth Centre would have to be transferred to an organisation willing to meet all running costs and TUPE relevant staff since closure would require very large scale repayment of government grant.

Some of the above services have partial external funding and with alternative funding sources being found, some provision could remain and officers would work with partners to ensure this.

The council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient activities for young people but does not have to provide them itself. Some councils have almost terminated their youth offer and simply put a signposting page on their website.

How would this affect users of this service?

Young people in Brent experience high levels of deprivation, high levels of gang and serious youth violence, high levels of youth offending (especially more serious

offences), high levels of mortality in the under 17 age group and high levels of sexually transmitted diseases.

The current youth provision is located in areas of highest deprivation and is able to target crime hotspots, including key estates. It also supports young people who have arrived as unaccompanied minors, LGBT young people who are at risk of mental health issues and homelessness as well as young people who are at risk of radicalisation and involvement in gangs. There is significant work with young Aghani males and young males from Somali communities. There are also programmes targeting young females.

Young people involved in our provision, especially the Duke of Edinburgh award, contribute at least 5,000 hours of volunteering to the local community.

The loss of Brent Youth Parliament would reduce young people in Brent's opportunity to participate not just locally but nationally through the UK Youth Parliament.

Key milestones

CYP3:

Consult on staff reorganisation in December 2014 to deliver savings for April 2015
Options appraisal from Delivering Differently for Young People – February 2015, with report to Cabinet on proposed option for future delivery of youth provision – March or April 2015.

CYP17:

Consult with local communities (especially Brent Youth Parliament) on cessation of youth services/closure of youth facilities – January and February at the same time as consulting staff on redundancy/redeployment.

Approach schools and other organisations for buy back of youth services

Key consultations

Whatever option is taken forward, there will need to be extensive consultation with young people and service users including groups who may be particularly affected. Young people, especially those from BME groups, will be disproportionately affected as well as LGBT young people and young people with special educational needs.

Key risks and mitigations

The council will need to be mindful of the November 2013 ruling by the Court of Appeal that North Somerset Council acted unlawfully when it cut its youth service budget by 72 per cent. The learning from this is that there must be adequate consultation and consideration (through equality impact assessment etc) of the needs of vulnerable users.

Youth services are essentially part of the council's 'early help' offer and therefore contribute to preventing young people causing spending down the line through crime, anti social behaviour, social care, poor mental health etc.

There is also potential for 'capital clawback' on certain buildings e.g. Roundwood Youth Centre was built with Big Lottery funding.

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	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Angela Chiswell
Deadline:	<i>December 2014</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Angela Chiswell
---------------------------------	-----------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP 4
Budget theme(s):	Stopping services completely
Service(s):	Connexions
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	To cease part of the Connexions Intensive support services that support young people to enter or sustain participation and achieve positive outcomes in Education, Employment or Training
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£1,080,590
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	7.25

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	330 + 192 = 522		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	6.75		

Proposed savings

A £522,000 saving on the current operating budget of **£1,080,590 will leave a budget of £558,590**. Of the £558,590, £37k will be paid to Ealing Council as part of the West London and Pan London arrangements for discharge of the statutory duty to maintain the CCIS database.

The Prospects contract price is £438,000 per year.

Of the remaining £83,590, the proposal is to retain 1 FTE Youth and Connexions Manager with 0.5 FTE funded from this budget at a cost of £32,500. This post would manage the remaining Connexions contract and any commissioned projects, liaise with partners, bid for external funding, work with external providers eg ESF projects, Lottery funded projects, learning providers and schools in respect of the provision of support for young people in transitions including work related information, advice and guidance support for young people and oversee the reporting on the needs of young people and progress on key indicators such as the September Guarantee and performance against NEET and Current Activity Status not known indicators.

Service Reductions

In summary the reductions comprise:

0.5 FTE Youth and Connexions Service Manager	£32,500
6 Connexions Intensive Support Advisers (for young people who have offended, looked after children, young people in the NEET group, Somali heritage young people, referrals from education including Alternative Education)	£240,000
Reduce training	£2,000
Reduce travel costs	£400
Reduce commissioned projects	£242,100
Publications	£5,000
Total	£522,000

Savings will come from a reduction in the remaining staffing establishment of Connexions Intensive Personal Advisers from the current six down to zero. This provides a saving of £240,000.

The reduction will also end commissioned projects for targeted young people including the innovative Business Mentors programme for young people who have offended, and events for young people with special needs as well as events for young people in the NEET group to access employment and training opportunities. Work to support teenage parents into positive outcomes in EET will be reduced to one project at £31,000 with any balance remaining after service running costs being used to enhance the project fund.

How would this affect users of this service?

The Personal Advisers intensive support team is currently deployed in a number of settings, supporting the young people who are most vulnerable in the labour market to move into successful outcomes. This includes supporting young people who have offended and young people who are LAC or Care leavers and young people whose families are in the Troubled Families Cohort.

The proposal means that all in-house intensive support work by Connexions Advisers with young people who are vulnerable in the labour market or in terms of entering and sustaining their participation in EET would cease, including intensive support work in schools, alternative education providers, work with young parents, work with young people newly arrived in the UK, specific work with young people from Somali heritage groups and work with young people whose families are in the Troubled Families cohort. This would affect 180 young people receiving intensive support in transitions into and between learning and work at any one time.

The reduction in targeted projects will remove capacity to meet specific needs/gaps in provision for young people in, or at risk of being in, the NEET group eg, such as

the EET Conference held at transitional points in the year to promote apprenticeships and training opportunities.

The reduction would coincide with the end of the Prospects Fixed for your Future project, which has brought additional resource over the last three years to support young people returning from custody and young people who are Care leavers and is now in its final year.

There will be a greater impact on young people in wards where there are high levels of deprivation and the highest numbers of young people in the NEET Group: Barnhill, Harlesden, Kilburn, Dollis Hill, Stonebridge.

Key milestones

The reduction in commissioned projects requires no consultation.

The staffing reduction requires preparation of a proposal and a consultation period beginning in January 2015.

Key consultations

The Brent Youth Parliament has a keen interest in preparation for employment and has chosen 'Steps to Employment' as their main campaign this year. They have chosen to link to two of the UKYP's concerns ie combating youth unemployment and better work experience and careers advice. It is likely that the Youth Parliament would have an interest in the proposals.

Key risks and mitigations

Key risks would be an increase in NEET figures, an increase in the number of young people whose activity status is not known and a risk to the LA's responsibility to achieve the September Guarantee. All these are areas where Brent currently performs well.

Studies have also shown that there is a lifetime cost in terms of poor outcomes arising from youth unemployment.

A further potential issue is the likely impact of the changes to Education Funding Agency (EFA) funded institutions providing full-time education for 18 year olds from 2014, which could impact the numbers of 18 year olds in the NEET group if they face charges for a third year of post-16 education. It is the most disadvantaged young people who would be the most impacted by this along with young people for whom English is not the first language, who are more likely to need a third year post 16 to achieve in learning.

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)	Yes
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	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?	Yes and Restructure EIA
EIA to be completed by:	A Chiswell
Deadline:	30 September 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sara Williams
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP5
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Youth Support Services – Youth Offending Service
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	To remove the YOS Information Officer post capacity (£42,000) Miscellaneous spend £1000
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	Council funding - £598,403
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	24.1 FTE plus 8.83 partner or funded staff

NB The core General Fund budget is £598,403. The total budget is £1,518,243 with the remainder representing grant-funding and additional project funding.

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	43		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	1		

Proposed savings

This saving will come from reduction in staffing costs from a post partly funded by the Council, partly by the YJB. Deletion of the Information Officer post would save £42k.

The remaining £1,000 would need to be made by managing vacancies.

The original aspiration for this saving was that we could engineer savings through shared services with Barnet and Harrow, in particular at the court which the three councils share. The work initiated by Barnet on this has not progressed and the option does not appear to be there, certainly not with the potential of delivering the required level of savings.

How would this affect users of this service?

Reduction of this specialist information post in the Statutory Tier 4 Youth Offending Service would affect users.

Where there are difficulties in transmission of assessments, risk and vulnerability plans to the secure estate – these must be sent on the day of remand by connectivity owing to the high risk of suicide on day 1 and to inform the YJB of any specialist needs in placements. There would also be loss of analysis of data that helps to target resources eg re-offending toolkit analyses which can show where there are the best chances of impacting outcomes for young people who have offended.

Key milestones

Timescale

- Consultation by December 2014
- Notice by end January 2015

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

Risk of failure to comply with specialist YJB and MoJ data transmission requirements and statutory returns.

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	No
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
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	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes and Restructure EIA
EIA to be completed by:	Angela Chiswell
Deadline:	December 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sara Williams
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP 6
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Pupil and Parent Services - SENAS Team
Lead Member(s):	Councillor Ruth Moher

Proposals:	The deletion of one FTE post from the Special Education Needs and Assessment Service Team (SENAS)
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	
Total budget	629,352.80
General fund	430,223.00
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	12

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	46	0	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	1	0	0

Proposed savings

The saving would come from the reduction of one FTE Statement Writer and Conflict resolution Officer Post.

How would this affect users of this service?

The SENAS team assesses the education needs of children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability. The team determines which children need additional support, assesses the level and type of need through the coordination of reports from a range of professionals, allocates resources and secures school placements. The team consults with parents and schools to achieve the best educational outcomes for children and young people. In addition, there is a legal requirement to carry out an annual review for all statemented children.

There are four members of staff within the SENAS team who write statements, which from September 2014 will be replaced with EHC plans. By deleting one post capacity would reduce by 25%. The statutory time frame for completing statements

is 26 weeks from request to production of a finalised statement. With the introduction of EHCs in September the timeline will be condensed to 20 weeks. The team's performance has improved considerably since 2011, when only 23% of statements were completed on time. In 2012 this increased to 66%, in 2013, 95% and to date for 2014, 96%. Currently there are 1,690 statemented Brent children. Approximately 200 new statements/EHC plans will be initiated annually. There is a statutory requirement to transition all existing statements of SEN to EHCs by April 2018. The loss of this post can be mitigated for two years using the DfE SEN transition grant (see below) giving time to find efficiencies as new ways of working are established.

Outsourcing has been considered but spot purchasing from existing providers in the market has elicited an extremely low quality product and SEN pathfinder authorities all appear to be using an in-house approach to delivery.

Key milestones

The council has received a grant from the DfE in recognition of the additional work implementation of the SEND reforms will generate. Some of this grant has been used to create additional temporary posts within the SENAS team to manage the increase in workload and the transition of all statements to EHCs by April 2018. This funding would enable the deletion of the post to be deferred to 2017.

Key consultations

N/A As we would not initiate redundancy immediately we would not need to consult at this stage.

Key risks and mitigations

Risk that efficiency savings may not be achievable in 2017 so that service levels have to be reduced.

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	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	Yes, children and young people
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No – not for 1-2 years
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Carmen Coffey
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP7
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Early Years and Family Support
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	<p>To reduce the cost of the Children and Families Information Service, the provision of which is a statutory duty but which can be combined with other activities in the Early Years and Family Support Team to enable restructuring and staffing reduction.</p> <p>The proposals would bring together a new small team delivering statutory requirements across the merged services with the deletion of 1.5 – 2 posts</p>
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£246,444.48
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	6

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	75		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	1.5 – 2		

Proposed savings

These will come from staffing costs.

How would this affect users of this service?

Users of the service will not receive such a flexible service, only statutory parts of the service will be delivered.

Key milestones

- Staff consultation - Nov./Dec.2014
- Service re-design - Dec.2014
- Change process & reductions - Jan.15 to Mar.15
- Implementation - Apr.15

Key consultations

None other than staff.

Key risks and mitigations

Reduced service, may impact on promoting and brokering childcare and possibly impact on the rate of improvement in the quality of PVI / childminder provision.

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	None known at this stage
Particular ethnic groups	None known at this stage
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	None known at this stage
People of particular sexual orientation/s	None known at this stage
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	None known at this stage
People in particular age groups	None known at this stage
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	None known at this stage
Marriage / civil partnership	

EIA required?:	Yes and Restructure EIA
EIA to be completed by:	Sue Gates
Deadline:	December 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Gates, Head of Early Years & Family Support Service
---------------------------------	---

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP8
Budget theme(s):	Stopping services completely
Service(s):	Early years and Family support
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	<p>The proposal is to cease revenue funding for the Stonebridge Adventure Playground.</p> <p>The funding to Brent Play Association provides after school and holiday provision for children at the SAP which is free to the families at point of delivery. This is the only such provision funded by the council in the borough. Across the borough, families pay for after school and holiday provision. It is proposed to cease this funding as it is no longer sustainable or justifiable in the current financial climate.</p>
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	The Council contributes £118k to this service to fund some costs of running the building (a Brent owned building) and after school and holiday activities via an annual contract. The charity themselves raise additional funds which contribute to the delivery of services
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	None are employed by the local authority, and those that are employed by BPA work across a variety of projects.

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	118		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	No L/A staff affected		

Proposed savings

The saving is made by not renewing the contract with Brent Play Association for this work.

How would this affect users of this service?

Service users would need to find alternative provision which is likely to attract a cost or BPA would need to raise alternative funding e.g. from charitable sources, although

regeneration plans for Stonebridge also cast doubt upon the future of the SAP as a physical facility.

Key milestones

This would involve informing Brent Play Association as soon as possible and stopping funding after 31 March 2015 (the contract requires three months' notice but six months notice would be preferable).

Key consultations

The organisation itself needs to be consulted. The wider community will be consulted about the future of the facility as part of the wider regeneration proposals.

Key risks and mitigations

Key risks include that, this is a longstanding, very popular local service and its demise is likely to elicit negative reaction from local some residents.

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)	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	yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no
Marriage / civil partnership	no

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	November
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Gates. Sara Williams.
---------------------------------	---------------------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP9
Budget theme(s):	Building Independence and Community Resilience
Service(s):	Sports Development
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	Delete the post of PE Advisor which is partly funded by Environment and Neighbourhoods and from income from schools and other partners
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	20k
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	1

The service is funded by income from schools plus £20k from General Fund plus £30k from ENS.

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	20	0	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	1	0	0

Proposed savings

ENS has put a £30k contribution to this post as a saving. The saving in CYP would be £20k. The deletion of this post would end support from the local authority for PE in schools but this role has ended in most other local authorities unless external funding has been secured.

How would this affect users of this service?

Primary schools often struggle to provide a stimulating PE curriculum and support from the adviser supports with this, particularly in disseminating good practice. Lack of exercise and inactivity is a significant issue for children in Brent. Schools will however continue with PE without this support since they are obliged to make this provision and could develop school to school support using their own resources, in particular the PE Grant they receive from central government.

Key milestones

Consult the member of staff and then give him notice no later than December 2014.

Key consultations

Consult with Brent Schools Partnership as a matter of courtesy together with any external partners with whom the adviser works.

Key risks and mitigations

None significant

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	
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	

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	John Frankis
Deadline:	December 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	John Galligan
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP 10
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children's Placements
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	To reduce expenditure on Children's placements
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£16,400,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	64.5 FTE

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	300	700	
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposed savings

The total saving of £1m is to be achieved by changing the mix of placements between Residential Care, Independent Fostering Agencies (IFA) and Brent Foster Carers (BCF). Financial modelling on the current unit cost of placements has found that by moving 9 of the lowest need Looked After Children in Residential Placements to high end IFA placements, followed by a similar move of 9 low end IFA placements to BFC would generate savings of £1m.

How would this affect users of this service?

The placements service provides commissioned services and financial support to 327 Looked After Children. The budget provides a range of social care placements from foster care (both internal and external), residential children's homes, residential schools, semi-independent homes and all other LAC associated costs. It also provides financial support for Special Guardianship Orders, Residency Orders and adoption allowances.

Key milestones

LAC in residential care with lower levels of need will have to be identified as potentially being able to move to alternative provision. It is assumed that three LAC

can be identified by the end of 2014/15 to deliver savings of £300K and the remainder during 2015/16 to deliver savings of £700K in 2016/17.

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

The Local Authority has already made significant reductions in the number of children placed within residential care. There has been a reduction of 16% since May 2013 with a number of children moving to placements at a lower cost. The children remaining within residential care are at a higher level of need and will be more challenging to place within family settings. There is also a risk that the attempt to move on LAC within residential care is found to be not in accordance with their care plans and could be challenged judicially.

There are a number of children accommodated in residential school settings due to complex disabilities - with costs shared with the education budget. It will be extremely challenging to move children with this level of need to a family setting.

There are some issues beyond the control of the Local Authority that can result in the making of residential placements - such as remands to Local Authority care with specific bail conditions attached.

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	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	yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no
Marriage / civil partnership	no

EIA required?:	yes
EIA to be completed by:	Nigel Chapman
Deadline:	<i>OCTOBER 2014</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Graham Genoni
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP11
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children and Young People's Department- Children's Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	<i>Saving from placement budget as a result of improved early help reducing the number of looked after children</i>
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£5,532,825
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	0

NB: Residential Care budget

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	140		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

The improved early help offer aligned with the work to balance caseloads is unlikely to lead to a reduction in LAC numbers, given the increasing complexity of the local demography and the rising number of children. However, continued efficiencies derived from the WLA looked after children's project and the continued reduction in the number of children in residential care should be able to deliver this figure.

This proposed saving is not at a higher level for the following reasons:

- LAC numbers in Brent are already beneath the average for our statistical neighbours and to further reduce this number would not be prudent,
- Significant commissioning efficiencies have already been achieved and Brent's unit costs are already lower than most amongst W London boroughs. Therefore the scope for significant further reductions is reduced,
- The number of children living in Brent is increasing as is the complexity of the cases that are being presented to the department,

How would this affect users of this service?

Nil effect

Key milestones

No key milestones as savings will accumulate through the year

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

Risks relate to failure to deliver on reduced unit costs or an increase in the number of looked after children, especially those with higher needs and therefore higher placement costs.

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	n
Particular ethnic groups	n
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	n
People of particular sexual orientation/s	n
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	n
People in particular age groups	n
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	n
Marriage / civil partnership	n

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	G Genoni
---------------------------------	----------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP12
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children and Young People's Department – children's social care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr R Moher

Proposals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce spend on commissioned services for children
-------------------	--

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£550,799
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	10

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	20		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

This saving is being delivered from additional reductions achieved through re-procurement of commissioned services for children. There is no service impact.

How would this affect users of this service?

No impact

Key milestones

Already achieved for 15/16

Key consultations

None

Key risks and mitigations

None

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	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	G Genoni
---------------------------------	----------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP13
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children and Young People's Department- children's social care
Lead Member(s):	R Moher

Proposals:	Review of care packages for CWD 0-14yrs of age and other service costs, including making greater use of direct payments
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£878,216
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	0

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	100		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

This saving will be achieved through the following:

- A £30,000 reduction in funding of the summer play scheme by CYP.
- A £40,000 saving through converting all care at home packages to direct payments.
- A £30,000 saving achieved through a review of the level of support provided to families through care packages and direct payments.

This is a high need area and making these reductions would be challenging. Rising numbers of disabled children in Brent as a result of a number of demographic changes and increased longevity is putting increasing pressure on the service and mitigates against larger scale reductions.

How would this affect users of this service?

- The reduction in summer play scheme will have no effect on service users as it involves a transfer of funds from adult social care.
- Transferring home care packages to direct payments will affect service users and will require consultation with them as well as an Equalities Assessment.
- A review of care packages could result in decreased provision for some service users.

Key milestones

- Consult families January 2015
- Implement for April 2015

Key consultations

- With families
- With organisations representing CWD
- With partners affected

Key risks and mitigations

The transfer to direct payments saving is dependent on all families signing up to this proposal and will require consultation.

Any proposal to reduce the scale of care packages will require consultation and an equality assessment and is likely to generate opposition from parents and parents' groups.

The mitigation for the above risks is to ensure that parents are properly engaged in the consultation process.

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	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Y
EIA to be completed by:	Neil MacDonald
Deadline:	December 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	G Genoni
---------------------------------	----------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP 14
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children and Young People's Department- children's social care
Lead Member(s):	R Moher
Proposals:	Adoption and fostering recruitment- shared service option to be worked up with WLA

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£4,245,800
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	0

NB budget relates to Independent Finance Agency

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	108		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

The council will work with the WLA to develop shared recruitment for adoption and fostering with consequent savings.

How would this affect users of this service?

If current recruitment can be maintained, none.

Key milestones

Not known, as WLA project has not yet progressed.

Key consultations

- Foster carers

Key risks and mitigations

- WLA project may not proceed with savings having to be delivered from elsewhere.

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	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	N
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	G Genoni
---------------------------------	----------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP 15
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children and Young People's Department- children's social care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr R Moher

Proposals:	<i>Selling bed nights to other councils</i>
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£613,923
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	18

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	100		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

There is interest in providing bed nights from three boroughs which we are currently exploring. There are currently four beds not utilised within the unit that would be offered to interested boroughs. The target is to sell 660 bed nights across these four beds, which should achieve the savings target.

There is very limited scope here for further savings as the unit has set capacity and the overheads are prescribed through specialist guidance and legislation relating to the operation of disabled children's short breaks/respice units.

How would this affect users of this service?

N/A

Key milestones

Milestones are market dependent, but some high quality information is currently being circulated to potentially interested boroughs to help generate interest.

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

The key risk here is that other authorities are not interested or have identified alternative short break providers.

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	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	n

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	G Genoni
---------------------------------	----------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP18
Budget theme(s):	Driving Organisational Efficiency
Service(s):	Children's Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher
Proposals:	Re-alignment of the Children's Social Care budget through a zero based budget exercise.

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	N/A
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	N/A

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	599		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	0		

Proposed savings

The saving of £599k will be achieved by re-aligning the Children's Social Care budget to remove historical budget anomalies, for example increasing income targets for recurring income, removal of translation/interpreting budgets as provision of the service has been centralised and various other budget lines that have either been reduced or eliminated.

How would this affect users of this service?

There is no impact on users of the service. The proposed budget reductions will be delivered by re-aligning the budget to better reflect the services to be provided from 2015/16.

Key milestones

N/A

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

The risks to the service from delivering these savings are minimal as the proposed savings will correct historic budget anomalies.

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	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

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	Graham Genoni
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP19
Budget theme(s):	Driving Organisational Efficiency
Service(s):	Children's Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	Reduction in the Secure Remand placements budget of £650K. As national remand numbers have been reducing in recent years, it is proposed to reduce the budget for this service to reflect the level of cases in the last 18 months.
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£1,293,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	N/A

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	650		
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	N/A		

Proposed savings

Reduction in the Secure Remand placements budget of £650K. As national remand numbers have been reducing in recent years, it is proposed to reduce the budget for this service to reflect the level of cases in the last 18 months.

The council is responsible for meeting the costs of secure placements for children who have been remanded even though these are decided by the courts rather than the council. These costs have been lower than anticipated in the last 18 months, partly due to better arrangements for ensuring alternatives to custody for lesser offences in young people. Those going into secure placements are those who are alleged to have committed very serious offences such as rape and murder.

How would this affect users of this service?

We have to meet these costs regardless of whether we have budget provision so there is no effect on users.

Key milestones

N/A

Key consultations

N/A

Key risks and mitigations

There is a risk that remand numbers could increase and with it the need to fund secure placements. In particular if there were a single incident involving 'joint enterprise' where a group of young people was accused of murder this would cause the remaining budget to overspend. Also a serious youth disorder incident, for example a riot, could have the same effect.

The YOS work will continue to ensure that lower risk young people have alternatives to custodial remand and to support court processes being expedited to reduce remand periods.

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	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

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	Graham Genoni
---------------------------------	---------------

Budget options Information

Reference:	CYP20
Budget theme(s):	Driving Organisational Efficiency
Service(s):	Children's Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Proposals:	Staffing re-design in Children's Social Care. The total saving of £341K will be achieved by the re-design of Children's Social Care over the next 18 months as part of the DfE Innovations Project.
-------------------	---

2014/15	
Total budget for the service(s):	£10,000,000
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	125.2 FTE

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Proposed saving:	171	170	0
Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)	TBC	TBC	

Proposed savings

The total saving of £341K has been profiled as £171K in 2015/16 and £170K in 2016/17. The saving of £341K will be achieved by the re-design of Children's Social Care over the next 18 months as part of the DfE Innovations Project.

How would this affect users of this service?

Despite the overall number of case holding social workers increasing the number of management roles will be streamlined. It will be vital that any new structure enables each case to be properly supervised. In terms of good practice in safeguarding, no worker should be the sole holder of information about a child. Supervision also allows for proper assessment of risk.

Key milestones

Consultation with staff from February 2015

Key consultations

None other than staff

Key risks and mitigations

Risk that cases will not be properly supervised – this will be mitigated through careful structuring of the teams.

Risk that recruitment and retention problems are exacerbated by greater burdens on some roles – this will be mitigated by staff consultation on the changes.

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	no
Particular ethnic groups	no
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	yes
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	yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	no
Marriage / civil partnership	no

EIA required?:	Yes and Restructure EIA
EIA to be completed by:	Graham Genoni
Deadline:	<i>February 2015</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Graham Genoni
---------------------------------	---------------