

Options for the Second Phase of Children's Centres (2006-2008)

1. Introduction

The aim of Children's Centres is to give children aged 0-5 in East Sussex the best possible start in life in order to improve their health, attainment and well-being. This document sets out an option appraisal to identify the programme areas for the second phase of Children's Centres from 2006–2008.

2. The roll out of Children's Centres

In phase 1 (2004-06) Children's Centres were developed to serve families living in the 20% most disadvantaged wards (based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2000). In phase 2 (2006-08) the Government requires local authorities to ensure all of the most disadvantaged families will have access to Children's Centre services, ie prioritising families in the 30% most disadvantaged areas (as defined by ODPM Super Output Areas¹). Children's Centres will also be developed to serve families outside the most disadvantaged areas. In the longer term, 2008-2010, the Children's Centres programme will be universal across East Sussex as the mechanism to plan and deliver integrated services for children aged 0-5 years.

The Government's target for East Sussex in phase one (2004-2006) is to reach 3,205 children (of whom 1,329 children will be in areas of rural deprivation), with a childcare target of 214. The second phase of Children's Centres will take place between 2006-2008 with a target 'reach' of an additional 14,789 children. There are no specific childcare targets; these will be set locally as part of the Childcare Places Strategy. The third phase (2008-2010) will reach all of the remaining children aged 0-5 years living in East Sussex.

As the roll out extends to areas of lower social deprivation and relative affluence, the Government expects that Children's Centres should develop a "graduated model" for the delivery of services. Within the graduated model the core offer will thus differ depending on the needs of local children and their families and on whether families live within the 30% most disadvantaged areas (SOAs) and the 70% more advantaged areas (SOAs).

2.1 The Government's Roll Out Requirements

Children's Centres will provide integrated 0-5 planning within a specific geographical or 'programme' area. Where possible a Children's Centre

¹ Super Output Areas (SOAs) are geographical units developed by the Office of National Statistics (ONS). SOAs break wards down into much smaller components with each SOA having approximately the same number of household population. The Index for Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for 2004 is presented at a SOA level, rather than ward level.

programme area should be established so that families within it can access services within pram-pushing distance of their homes.

It is expected that on average a Children's Centre programme will serve a community with about 800 children under five years old, although in rural areas with a more dispersed population numbers may be smaller. If a programme covers a larger area, additional settings, linked to the main Children's Centre site, may be needed in order to facilitate easy access to services for local families. It is vital that the delivery of services and sites used reflect local communities.

Children living within the 30% most deprived SOAs will be prioritised in the second phase.

2.2 Phase 1 and Phase 2

Within the first phase a local reach target of 3,205 was set. The number of 0-5 within the geographical area of the programmes in the first phase totals 8,081, an excess of 4,876 on the target set by the Government. Within the second phase a target of 14,789 has been set and, therefore, taking account of the excess in the first phase, an additional 9,913 children need to be identified. Of the 9,913 there are approximately 2,464 children living in the 30% most deprived SOAs.

3. Option Appraisal

This paper outlines four options for the roll out of Children's Centres which have been identified after consultation with stakeholders.

1. An extension to cover the 30% most deprived SOAs across East Sussex.
2. An extension of the existing programmes to become coterminous with the Local Partnership for Children areas.
3. An extension to:
 - a) The rural programme in Rother.
 - b) The rural programme across the county.

Each option has been considered against a set of criteria, each of which has a weighing criterion, with a score of 5 being the strongest and 0 the weakest.

- Development within timescale – *the ability to deliver the core offer in the agreed timescale with all children to have the appropriate part of the graduated core offer available to them by 2008.*
- Sustainability – *Identifying the aspects of the graduated core offer that are sustainable. Identifying a clear mainstreaming strategy.*
- Programme Infrastructure – *the ability of the existing programme management infrastructure, including management, planning and finance and monitoring, to extend to an extended area.*
- Existing provision – *aspects of the core offer already delivered within the area.*
- Capital development options – *the availability of potential bases/sites for the delivery of services.*

- Natural communities – *recognising and respecting communities that families associate with.*

Option 1: An extension to cover the 30% most deprived SOAs across East Sussex

In order to identify the additional children to be reached in the second phase, the 30% most deprived SOAs relative to East Sussex could be considered. This would increase the reach by 4,885.

Option considered against criteria	Score	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development within timescale 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional reach would need to be identified to achieve the national target.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could not be clustered just around existing programmes. This raises infrastructure and sustainability issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme infrastructure 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing infrastructure would only cover some of the potential reach, which would increase the cost of delivery.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing provision 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some economies of scale could be achieved, particularly where the existing programmes are operating.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital development options 	Tba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bases would need to be identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural communities 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas would be broader than the existing programmes and the LPCs in which they sit. It may also pick up isolated SOAs that are not near to particular programmes.
Total	11	

This model reflects relative needs across East Sussex; however, it would need to be combined with another option to reach the required number of children.

Option 2: An extension of the existing programmes to become coterminous with the Local Partnership for Children areas

The increasing significance of Local Partnerships for Children (LPCs) as key areas for the integrated planning and delivery of services for children aged 0-19 in East Sussex means that logically the delivery of the 0-5 part of this agenda needs to take account of LPCs as a basis for a programme area. This option would mean that 14 of the LPC areas would have Children's Centre programmes and would increase the 'reach' by 10,221² children within the programmes (an excess of 308 on the reach target for East Sussex). This option would include all children living within the 30% most deprived SOAs based on the IMD (the national requirement) with a small number of children within the 30% most deprived SOAs based on the IDACI not reached.

Option considered against criteria	Score	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development within timescale 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option would be an extension of the existing provision. The challenge to deliver the core offer within the LPC areas would vary across the different Children's Centre programmes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability 	3 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstreaming of best practice and economies of scale could be achieved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Infrastructure 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infrastructures of the programmes are relatively well established and could adapt to cover a wider programme areas. There would be a significant extension within the Eastbourne area which may place strains on the infrastructure and management capacity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing provision 	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local experience of service delivery and best practice could be rolled out.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital development options 	Tba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital developments TBA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural communities 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the number of children aged 0-5 in these LPC's exceeds the suggested 800 children, each programme would need to be planned with a number of bases to reflect the local community. The graduated model would need to be delivered within the programme area as it combines differing levels of local needs. Service delivery is likely to be different from the delivery within the Sure Start Local

² This includes the Rural Rother programme (see option 3a).

		Programmes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Hastings it would require the reconfiguration of two of the programmes that currently 'cross' two of the LPCs.
Total	17 - 19	

The strength of this option is that it fits within the wider strategic and operational developments for integrated Children's Services. Although this option would exceed the national target by 308 children, these children would not be in the 30% most deprived SOAs and would therefore receive the less intense 'graduated model.' 887 of these children would be part of the rural programme (please refer to option 3a below). Whilst recognising the growing importance of LPCs as a mechanism for integrated planning and delivery of services at a local level, it is important to understand LPC areas exceed the recommended Children's Centre programme area of 800 and may also cover a number of distinct local communities, which would need to be addressed in the planning and delivery of services.

Option 3: An extension to the rural programme

Two options to extend the rural programme are considered. The first would be to limit the extension of the rural programme in the Rother area, making the programme coterminous with the three LPCs it covers. The second would be a more generic increase in the rural programme based on relative need across East Sussex.

a) Currently the Rural Rother programme is based in Rye and Peasmarsch and works on an outreach model in the wards of Eastern Rother; Rother Levels; Rye and Brede Valley. One option would be to extend the existing programme to encompass the wards of Battle Town; Darwell; Crowhurst; Ewhurst and Sedlescombe; Marsham; Salehurst; and Ticehurst and Etchingham; this would extend the existing programme to become coterminous with the three LPC areas it currently covers. This would extend the number of children aged 0-5 years in the rural programme from the round one target of 1365 to 2252, an additional 887 children.

Option considered against criteria	Score	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development within timescale 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wide geographical area provides a challenge in ensuring the commitment of stakeholders and facilitating integrated teams. Further work is required to set baselines for the model of a rural core offer as part of the graduated model.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability 	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstreaming of best practice and economies of scale could be achieved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Infrastructure 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management and infrastructure would be provided within the existing programme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing provision 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most key partners are already working in the Rural Rother area and working to develop a rural model; expansion to the new areas should be manageable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital development options 	Tba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying suitable venues for service delivery and the potential capital and revenue costs to ensure equity of provision across a wider area within a limited budget will be challenging.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural communities 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All communities of Rural Rother would be covered.
Total	18 - 19	

b) Alternatively an additional rural reach target could be set for a minimum of 1,000 to a maximum of 1,500 children. The hub and spoke model for service delivery could be rolled out into other areas of need, replicating the model of a hub within urban conurbations with an outreach model to meet the needs of families living in more isolated settings. The areas would be identified following a more detailed needs analysis across the remaining rural communities not reached by the existing rural programme.

Option considered against criteria	Score	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development within timescale 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific areas would need to be identified. Substantial ground work would need to be done in the rural communities in the west of the county.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing services within new areas would require additional resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Infrastructure 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links with the existing programme infrastructure could be explored but may need to be strengthened if covering a wider geographical area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing provision 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New partnerships would need to be developed and a local needs assessment to identify the gaps in provision to meet the core offer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital development options 	Tba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying suitable venues for service delivery and the potential capital and revenue costs to ensure equity of provision across a wider area within a limited budget will be challenging.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural communities 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experience from the existing rural programme could be rolled out across wider rural communities based on need and focussing on local communities.
Total	14	

This option would provide a cohesive rural Children's Centre strategy for families across rural East Sussex and would be more equitable, based on need across the county. The extent of the development would need to take account of the available capital and revenue resources. The existing rural programme is still relatively new and a more staggered development may be more manageable and sustainable.

4. Summary of the consultation feedback

Stakeholder consultations were held over the first two weeks in September. The consultation involved 107 stakeholders with representatives from the voluntary and statutory sectors and Local Members. In addition to the options considered within this paper, stakeholders were asked to consider whether a community of interest across the county should be part of the roll out as a specific group rather than integrated into existing programmes. Stakeholders were also invited to identify a more appropriate option not identified within the paper.

The total reach to be identified for the second phase is **9,913** which, combined with the excess reach from the first phase, achieved the Government's target of 14,789. It is a requirement that priority is given to children living in the 30% most deprived SOAs according to the IMD.

The table below summarises each option considered and the reach that each option would achieve.

		0-5 Reach
Option 1	East Sussex 30% Deprived SOAs	4,885
Option 2	Extension of CC programmes to LPC Areas (including Rural Option a)	10221
Option 3a	Extension of the rural programme in Rother to cover its three LPCs	887
Option 3b	Extension of the rural programme across East Sussex	1,000-1,500

Option 1: East Sussex 30% Deprived SOAs

The stakeholder consultation recognised that there were limitations with this option as it would need to be combined with another option in order to achieve the reach target. Any combination would have to include Option 2, which would then exceed the overall target. It would be challenging to secure the full core offer requirements to ensure the best outcomes for children within the timescale and budget constraints.

Option 2: Extension of CC programmes to LPC Areas (including Rural Option a)

This was the preferred option across all the stakeholder consultations. It would extend the existing programme to become coterminous with the LPC areas. The advantage of this model is that it would build on an existing infrastructure and it would provide economies of scale. It was noted that Programme areas within this option would exceed the Government's recommended 800, therefore programmes would need to plan their delivery and bases carefully to ensure that they relate to local communities. This option could be considered with a slightly different model for the rural communities.

This would exceed the national target by 308.

Option 3: An extension of the rural programme

The stakeholder consultation supported an extension of the rural programme, although there was some divergence of opinion as to which was the preferred option (often relating to the geographical base of the stakeholders involved).

Option 3a: Extension of the rural programme in Rother to cover its 3 LPCs

An extension to the current rural programme across rural Rother would extend the number of children it serves by an additional 887 and would make the current programme area coterminous with its local LPCs. There are economies of scale in extending from the existing provision and an opportunity to build on some of the emerging integrated working within the area. This option would not address the needs of rural communities within the west of the county.

Option 3b: Extension of the rural programme across East Sussex

A more generic extension to the rural programme across East Sussex would extend the current reach by between 1,000-1,500 children depending on the resources available. These areas would be identified following a needs assessment across the wider rural communities of East Sussex. Combined with Option 2, this would exceed the required targets by between 500 and 1,000 children. The cost of delivering the extended rural model would be significant, particularly in relation to potential capital developments within the hub and spoke model.

Option 4: Community of Interest.

All the stakeholders considered and rejected delivering an aspect of the Children's Centre programme based on a community of interest across the county. There was a clear message that the needs of families should relate to the community in which they live. Furthermore, the Children's Centre programme requires that any special needs are addressed within the core offer rather than a separate programme. This fits with the Government's expectation that programmes should relate to geographical communities.

Option 5: Alternative options.

Some groups developed an option five which included a combination of the options above. There was one suggestion that, since health visiting within the PCTs is a universal service, then it would be possible to include all children within the second phase of development. However, this would not necessarily guarantee that the other aspects of the core offer were available.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the current programme areas are extended to cover the LPC areas in which they already operate with a cluster of services delivered from venues that are appropriate and accessible to the local community. This would be combined with an extension to the rural programme, either through a consistent approach of making the current programme's boundaries coterminous with its LPC areas, or a more generic increase across the county based on relative needs.

Summary of stakeholder consultation on the roll out options

Details	Date	Numbers Attending
Children's Centre Programme Managers	10 August	9
Children's Centre Planning Group Early Years Co-ordinators Group Education Early Years Strategy Group	21 July	26
South Downs and Weald 0-5 stakeholders	5 September	22
ESCC 0-5 Planning Group	5 September	6
Hastings and St Leonards 0-5 stakeholders	6 September	29
Eastbourne Downs 0-5 stakeholders	7 September	27
Bexhill and Rother 0-5 stakeholders	9 September	29
Children's Centre Planning Group Early Years Co-ordinators Group Education Early Years Strategy Group	13 September	20
ESCC – Every Child Matters Group	15 September	18
	Total	186

There will be an extensive community consultation once the programme areas have been agreed through November and December 2005.

Consultation with 0-5 Stakeholders

	<u>Sussex Downs and Weald</u>		<u>Hastings and St Leonards</u>		<u>Eastbourne Downs</u>		<u>Bexhill and Rother</u>	
	<u>Monday 5 September 2005</u> <u>25 attended</u>		<u>Tuesday 6 September 2005</u> <u>29 attended</u>		<u>Wednesday 7 September 2005</u> <u>29 attended</u>		<u>Friday 9 September 2005</u> <u>26 attended</u>	
	x1 Parent, x1 PCT, x1 SEN, x1 Lewes YMCA, x 3 PLA, x1 Library Services, x2 Sure Start, x5 EYDC Team, x1 Denton Island Family Centre, x1 Homestart, x1 IPNA		x1 Early Years Inclusive Learning Tutor, x2 NCMA, x1 Library Services, x3 Sure Start, x4 EYDC, x1 Excellence Cluster, x2 Centre of Creativity, x1 HCDUFA, x1 PCT, x1 Cllr, x1 Mental Health		x3 PCT, x1 CAMHS, x2 Scott Unit DGH, x1 Oral Health, x1 Refuge, x2 Library Services, x5 Hailsham & Eastbourne Sure Start, x1 Playlink, x5 EYDC, x1 NCMA, x1 Headteacher		x5 EYDC, x1 Library Services, x3 Sure Start, x1 Rother District Cncil, x1 Cllr, x1 Sidley Com. Assoc, x1 BBUFA, x1 Rother Voluntary Action, x1 Job Centre plus, x1 Early Years Special Needs Teacher, x1 Homestart	
No of discussion groups	5 groups		5 groups		4 groups		4 groups	
Option 1	✓	Combination of Options 1 & 2, which would automatically include 3 - is preferred.				Difficult to achieve and hard to manage scattered communities.		
Option 2		Concern that some areas of deprivation, eg parts of Lewes, Chailey, and Jarvis Brook, will be lost.	✓	Option 2 with model based around geographical areas. Including too hard to reach, unspecified, satellite and reachable groups.	✓	Enables service to target needy communities based on school area – more potential for sustainability.	✓	This option could lead to service delivery from secondary schools, intimidating to young children and families.
	✓	This option is preferred, with lessons learnt from Option 3 rural services.	✓	An administrative level LPC option is very practical.	✓	Option 2 with scope for Option 5.	✓	Options 2, 3a and 3b to include Option 4.
	✓	Option 2 LPCs and 3a.		Within programme area – the graduated model might be delivered around 'specialist' needs, eg		What are funding options? Re: capacity, can we continue to provide services at the current level? LPCs seem to be best		

	✓	Combination of Options 1 & 2, which would automatically include 3 - is preferred.		domestic violence, drug and alcohol issues, debt and benefit advice and behavioural difficulties.		way, but need to look at funding.		
			✓	Combination of Options 2, 3 + 4 to make up the new Option 5.	✓	Preferred Option 2 feeding into 4.		
Option 3a	✓	Combination of Options 1 & 2, which would automatically include 3 - is preferred.	✓	Combination of Options 2, 3 + 4 to make up the new Option 5.			✓	Options 2, 3a and 3b to include Option 4.
	✓	Option 2 LPCs and 3a.					✓	Options 2 and 3a, with the addition of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0800 number, last digit for centres. • Needs led service. • Based at existing centre. • Using existing voluntary and statutory services. • Signposting, eg Post Offices.
Option 3b			✓	Combination of Options 2, 3 + 4 to make up the new Option 5.		Difficult to target/develop services for individuals across wide geographic area. Would benefit from transport funded (as in school transport) to take people to central services.	✓	Options 2, 3a and 3b to include Option 4.
Option 4		Communities of interest need to be considered more broadly.	✓	Combination of Options 2, 3 + 4 to make up the new Option 5.	✓	Excluding!	✓	Options 2, 3a and 3b to include Option 4.
					✓	Preferred Option 2 feeding in to 4.		

Option 5			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Combination of Options 2, 3 + 4 to make up the new Option 5. ✓ Look at areas that stand currently as mirror areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Align Children's Centre 'hubs' with health visiting teams (would reach/exceed targets). ✓ Option 2 with scope for Option 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Use Child Poverty to ensure new areas inc. 'all' SOAs are in the top 30% for child poverty. ✓ Options 2 and 3a, with the addition of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0800 number, last digit for centres. • Needs led service. • Based at existing centre. • Using existing voluntary and statutory services. • Signposting, eg Post Offices.
----------	--	--	---	--	--

