

CABINET PORTFOLIO: Children's Services**SERVICE PLAN AREA:** Children and Families**A. Key Lead Cabinet Member Policy Steer for this area:**

- Secure effective Children's Trust arrangements in East Sussex, including integrated processes for planning and commissioning services.
- Keep children safe by further developing safeguarding arrangements and family support services.
- Continue to improve the achievement and wellbeing of Looked After Children
- Implement the outcomes of the Review of Special Educational Needs, including the establishment of an integrated service to support children and young people on the autistic spectrum.
- Establish effective integrated services for children under five and their families through the creation of a strategic network of Children's Centres, and raise the quality of learning provision at the Foundation Stage.
- Improve access to services, particularly in the rural area, and promote equity and equal opportunity.
- Develop and maintain an effective strategy to support vulnerable teenagers
- With partners, further develop measures to reduce bullying and anti-social behaviour.
- Develop disability services jointly with Health focusing on community support and ensuring effective transitions to adult services.
- Further develop arrangements for consulting with service users, and involving children and young people in service development.
- Promote healthy lifestyles, through the promotion of healthy eating and the attainment of the Healthy Care Standard and Healthy Schools' Standard

B. Resources

1. Current net 2005/06 Budget (broken down by sub-divisions of main service area):

			Schools Budget	CSA Budget
Figures after base budget adjustments	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Youth Development Service		2,026		2,026
Access to Education				
Management and Support	171		94	77
English as an Additional Language	474		474	
Education Welfare Service	762			762
Reintegration	21		21	
Behaviour Support and central PRU provision	284		284	
Pupil Retention Funding (devolved to schools)	980		980	
		2,692		

Special Educational Needs				
SEN Team	797		132	665
Agency placements/recoupment	7,015		7,015	
Speech Therapy	143		143	
Additional Services	236		236	
LSC grant for post 16 special educational needs	(1,344)		(1,344)	
		6,847		
Education other than at School (Home and Hospital)		315	315	
Youth Offending Team		933		933
Locality and 16+ Services		11,248		11,248
Disability Services		5,640		5,640
Looked After Children		9,462		9,462
Children's Services Commissioning Unit		194		194
Other Children's and Families services		531		531
		39,888	8,350	31,538

2. Current Budget by Type:

(e.g. Employees, Transport, income etc.)

	£'000
Employees	22,105
Premises	348
Transport	780
Supplies & services	2,623
Third party payments	21,173
Transfer payments	1,259
Internal recharges	51
	Gross expenditure
	48,339
Income	(8,451)
	Net expenditure
	39,888

3. Current FTE staff numbers:

4. Currently assessed Standstill Pressures over the next 3 years): (These will be supplied by the relevant FMT Member)

	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
Inflation	1,050	1,114	1,171
Other Standstill			
(list by sub-division:)			
C&F Agency placements	200	200	200
Looked After Children placements	200	200	200
Other C&F pressures	100	100	
Total Standstill Pressures	1,550	1,614	1,571

5. Other Financial Risk and Pressure Areas over the Medium Term:

	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>		<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
	Schools Budget	CSA	CSA	
➤ PRESSURES				
▪ ACCESS TO EDUCATION				
- Implementation of Anti Social Behaviour Act		10		
- Essential training and changes to coding/inputting for EWS		20		
- Home tuition	100			
▪ SEN				
- Pressure on agency and recoupment budgets	700			
▪ CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE				
▪ DISABLED CHILDREN SERVICE				
- Pressure on agency placements		340		
- Above inflation fee increases and small increase in new placements		210		
- Expansion of respite care options				
- Revenue cost of refurbishment of Dorset Road (part year)		40	140	
- Expansion of direct payments		30	30	
- Expansion of family link placements		50	80	
▪ LOCALITY AND 16+ SERVICE				
- Court ordered mother and baby assessments		100		
- Court ordered 'expert' assessments		50		
- Implementation of private fostering requirements of Children Act 2004		70		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SERVICE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of Adoption & Children Act (assumes 30k increase in government grant) 60 - Increase in inter-agency adoption placements for 'hard to place' children 40 ▪ COMMISSIONING UNIT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development work for Youth Matters Green Paper, Change Management, Family Support Strategy; 2 LPC Co-ordinators 214 				
	Sub-total	800	1234	250
	LESS Standstill Pressures	-	500	
	TOTAL	Schools 800	CSA 734	250
➤ RISKS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACCESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early Transfer to FE Colleges 20 ▪ YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of government grants/external funding 370 ▪ YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure Remands 50 ▪ LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of Adoption & Children Act (if Government grant not increased) 30 - Income reduced due to vacancies in secure unit up to 200 				
		20	650	

1. C Performance Current Relative/Comparative Performance based upon

2004/05 Outturn:

Being Healthy

Outcomes are good

- Health of looked after children well provided for
- Reduction in teenage pregnancy
- Effective multi-agency support to reduce substance misuse
- Services for disabled children improving

Staying Safe

Outcomes are good

- Child protection is effective with robust procedures, management oversight and guidance
- CSCI inspection in February 2005 judged that children were safeguarded well (in line with recommendations from Victoria Climbié audit) with excellent prospects for further improvement
- Number of young people placed in residential care is stable and rate of placements is one of lowest in comparator group
- Significant investment has been made by ESCC in improving long-term stability of looked after children and performance is good
- Foster placements have increased; with more use of in house service
- Children and young people are actively involved in initiatives to reduce bullying and racial harassment in schools

Enjoying and Achieving

Outcomes are good

- Support provided for young people looked after has been strengthened; standards achieved by looked after children have improved at all key stages; but despite being in line with national average, remain low overall
- Proportion of children with statements is in line with national average; BVPI 43a – 100% in 2004/5; BVPI 43b 79.6% achieved – likely to be second quartile
- Number of children placed in special schools is higher than average
- Action to improve attendance has been effective in reducing authorised absences in both primary and secondary schools, but level of unauthorised absences is consistently higher than average in secondary schools and the rate has increased in primary schools
- Level of exclusions is in line with national averages; although time taken to make alternative arrangements for excluded pupils has reduced dramatically, proportion of pupils receiving alternative tuition for more than one year is high. Performance against BVPI 159 improved by 67% in 2004/5.

Making a Positive Contribution

Outcomes are good

- Pupils with statements of SEN are supported through well developed multi-agency procedures for transition planning
- A range of projects have been established to support and engage vulnerable children and young people and to reduce youth offending rates; there has been some recent reduction in re-offending rates and a lower than average proportion of young people receiving custodial sentences
- Performance in the rate of final warnings and convictions for looked after young people has remained below average for several years
- Youth offending team has been effective in improving the proportion of young people under their supervision continuing education or training or progressing to employment
- Young people, including hard to reach groups are being involved in consultative processes through the youth service
- Good use is made of direct payments
- Quality of social work in specialist disabled children's teams is good
- All looked after children are encouraged to express their views on issues affecting their care and education

Achieving Economic Wellbeing

Outcomes are satisfactory

- Proportion of young people not in education employment and training (NEET) is well below the national average
- Inequalities suffered by looked after children and by those from minority ethnic groups are being addressed but services are not yet sufficiently responsive to differing cultural needs
- The leaving care teams are effective; 90% care leavers are accommodated in appropriate settings; all have pathway plans; 70% progress to appropriate education, employment or training opportunities.

Service Management

Outcomes are good and improving

- Gross expenditure on children in need remains stable
- Weekly costs of children's homes and foster care are at an acceptable level and are in line with the comparator group
- Social care staff turnover and sickness levels are low; the workforce is stable
- Social care services are showing sustained improvements year on year and achievements in education have improved steadily
- There is excellent capacity for further improvement

2. Assessment of Relative/Comparative Performance by the end of 2005/06:

Being Healthy

Outcomes likely to remain good.

- Some risk of dip in performance in meeting health needs of LAC due to vacancies in key posts in Health. Key area for improvement is CAMHS.

Staying Safe

Outcomes likely to remain good.

- However, there is a drop in the number of children placed for adoption, due to difficulties in finding placements for the most 'hard to place'. Could result in poorer outturn for key PAF indicator on adoption.

Enjoying & Achieving

Outcomes likely to remain good.

- LAC performance improved at KS2 in 2005 and in 5 A*-C GCSEs and 5 A*-G GCSEs; however, performance dropped slightly in 1 A*-G GCSEs, due to one third of cohort having statements of SEN.
- SEN BVPIs remain very good.
- Overall, level of absences from school is reducing, but level of unauthorised absence is relatively high.
- Level of exclusions unlikely to reduce.

Making a positive contribution

Outcomes expected to remain good.

- Reduction achieved in LAC offending rate.
- Good involvement of young people in planning services and giving feedback, including LAC.
- Key area for improvement is expansion of range of respite care options for disabled children, including those with autism.

Achieving economic wellbeing

Outcomes unlikely to improve from satisfactory to good.

- Proportion of young people who are NEET is not reducing quickly enough. Performance of leaving care service remains good.

Service Management

Outcomes likely to remain good.

- In order to retain excellent capacity for improvement, need to maintain current good performance and show improvements in:
 - CAMHS
 - Respite care for disabled children
 - NEET reduction
 - Services for BME children
 - time taken to make alternative arrangements for excluded pupils/reintegrate them into school
 - and make good progress in implementing Every Child Matters / Children Act 2004 and Adoption & Children Act 2002 (full implementation from December 2005).

3. Potential Local Area Agreement (LAA) Priorities/targets

Being Healthy

- promote healthy lifestyles with particular focus on nutrition (includes health of LAC target)
- reduce teenage pregnancy

Staying Safe

- reduce injuries to children
- reduce incidence of bullying experienced by children and young people, including cases of racial harassment
- reduce number of young people who are victims of crime
- reduce domestic violence

Enjoy & Achieve

- increase engagement in culture, sport & leisure opportunities for young people, particularly priority groups (includes disabled children and those who attend special schools)

Making a positive contribution

- reduce days lost through exclusion from school, particularly in Hastings
- increase young people's involvement in decision making

Economic wellbeing

- reduce number of young people aged 16-19 who are NEET

D. Key Improvement Aims and Actions over the Medium Term:

- delivery of a comprehensive CAMHS with reduced waiting times
- continued reduction in teenage pregnancy
- establishing an effective Safeguarding Board from April 2006, incorporating community safety for children
- improve protection of privately fostered children
- reduce incidence of bullying
- continue to improve number of LAC in permanent placements (adoption & permanent foster care), by focusing on those hardest to place and recruiting carers to meet their needs
- develop effective adoption support services
- continue to improve LAC attainment
- reduce number of children placed in special schools outside the county (implementation of SEN review)
- reduce days lost through exclusion from school, particularly in Hastings
- continue to improve school attendance
- reduce youth offending rates (including by LAC) and the proportion remanded
- develop a range of integrated early intervention services, with particular emphasis on the needs of BME children (focus on family support and behaviour support)
- develop a range of respite care services for disabled children, including those with autism, to reduce agency placements in the medium term
- reduce number of young people who are NEET
- maintain high standards and safeguard children while managing change to more integrated service delivery, including youth support teams for young people aged 11+
- review youth development service in light of Youth Matters Green Paper

Key risks to achieve service improvements

- lack of engagement of key partners
- impact of government initiatives on headteachers/governors
- continued pressure on SEN agency placements/agency placements for disabled children, because of increase in number of children with complex disabilities, including ASD, and because maintained schools do not have sufficient capacity for BESD children
- investment in range of support services for families, including respite and after school activities, is unlikely to reduce agency budget pressure in the short-term
- likewise, implementation of the SEN Review is a medium term strategy to reduce SEN agency placements
- capacity to develop new initiatives/implement new legislation while maintaining high quality services.

E. Key Risks to delivery of policy steers in short term

- reduction in external ring fenced grants – eg Youth Justice Board, Positive Activities for Young People, Adoption Support Grant, Standards Fund, DfES funding for Children Index
- Significant investment is necessary to maintain more disabled children and BESD children in county
- A relatively small investment could deliver the strategy to recruit adopters/permanent foster carers for the children who are 'hardest to place'
- Loss of relatively experienced stable social care workforce, resulting in reduction in service quality
- Loss of key managers, who are critical to manage change successfully during the next few years
- Loss of foster carers, resulting in need for more expensive independent fostering agency placements
- Unplanned budget pressures eg secure remands, drop in secure unit occupancy that require compensatory savings elsewhere in the overall budget
- Ability to recruit to key posts both 'in-house' and in partner agencies (eg paediatricians, child psychiatrists, speech and language therapists).

F. Efficiency and other savings

Over recent years differential savings have been part of the budget setting process and that is likely to continue. Indeed, reliance on improved efficiency to meet increasing service demands will grow. These will now also be subject to external audit.

1) Efficiency Savings in 2004/05 and 2005/06

Description	£	Shown in AES	Comments inc whether it leads to spending reductions (referred to as 'cashable' by Government).
<u>2004/05</u>			
Adoption orders and permanent placements	475	Yes	Cashable
<u>Total 2004/05</u>	475		
<u>2005/06</u>			
Youth Development Service Efficiencies in Management Costs	50	Yes	Cashable
<u>Total 2005/06</u>	50		

G. Responding to the initial Financial Guidelines for 2006/07 onwards

1) Plans for internal reinvestment within Portfolio (net nil effect)

	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
Savings <i>(list from where)</i>			
Reinvestment <i>(list to where)</i>			

2) Efficiency and VFM Savings – towards RPR&R to be included in AES as cashable'

	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE			
➤ DISABLED CHILDREN SERVICE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End contract with Independent agency (saving = 8.4% of Outreach Service) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is anticipated that the current service could be provided differently from April 2006 	30		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency savings in short term agency placements (saving = 0.8% of agency budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although this budget is volatile, it is anticipated that efficiency savings of 20k could be made without serious detriment to children. 	20		
➤ LOCALITY AND 16+ SERVICES			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce use of agency social work staff (saving = 1% of Social Work staff budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable without serious detriment to children 	50		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce value of voluntary organisation grant (saving = 14% of contract with voluntary organisation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable through efficiencies in service delivery. 	82		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Delete vacant admin post (saving = 1.9% of Admin staffing costs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable with no detriment to service delivery 	18		

<p>➤ LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SERVICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce management costs (saving = 14% of management costs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is achievable, but redundancy costs would be incurred. 	30		
<p>➤ COMMISSIONING UNIT (saving = 6% of Unit budget)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce costs of conferences/printing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable. 	10		
<p>➤ MANAGEMENT & TRAINING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce Management costs (saving = 19% of management costs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely to be achieved from September 2006 but will incur redundancy costs. ▪ Efficiencies in Training Budget (saving = 5% of budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable 	100	70	
Total	350	70	

3) Efficiency improvements planned which would not count towards RPR targets (to be included on AES as “non-cashable”) e.g. Improvements in unit costs due to higher volumes.

Details	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>

4) Contribution from income generation opportunities

Details	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
<i>(please list)</i>			

Income Generation (supporting information to G (4) above – list i) in all areas in which charges / income are currently generated and details of proposed changes. Also list ii) areas where consideration has been given to raising income (on-going or one off) and known comparison with other similar authorities.

5) Other Savings – list actions and impacts and risks arising (including on the delivery of policy steer), of other savings proposals required to achieve set guidelines

	<u>06/07</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>07/08</u> <u>£000</u>	<u>08/09</u> <u>£000</u>
<p>➤ SEN Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction in staffing (9.4% of staffing budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased risk of not meeting statutory requirements, unsuccessful defence at SENDIS Tribunals and increase in agency placements. 	69		
<p>➤ ACCESS TO EDUCATION MANAGEMENT & SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce admin support/database work (saving = 5% of budget) Managers will have to undertake admin work. 	8		
<p>➤ YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce budget allocated to community colleges (saving = 7% of college budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community college budget was reduced by 52k in 2005/06. However, several colleges have significant underspend. 	50		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce Central & Area Budgets (staff and activities) (saving = 10% of central budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - YDS has had to absorb 90k backdated pay award in 2005/06, which has necessitated staff reductions; there was an additional staff reduction of 48k as part of RP&R for 2005/6. Risk is to service delivery to young people and ability to meet expectations of the Green Paper. 	114		
<p>CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>➤ DISABLED CHILDREN SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce staffing establishments (saving = 5.1% of staffing budget) Could be achieved through efficiencies but will reduce the number of children that will be allocated a social worker who may then have to be supported in other ways. 	115		
<p>➤ LOCALITY AND 16+ SERVICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce staffing and associated staff travel costs by 1.9% 	167		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable, if necessary, through vigorous vacancy control but with risk of increasing pressure on staff. 			
<p>➤ LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SERVICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce mean number of 'in-house' fostering placements by 5 (saving = 1.8% of Fostering Allowance budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This could be achieved by reducing the net number of Looked After Children during 2006/07. However, the number of LAC has been stable over the last two years so this may be difficult to achieve. 	65		
<p>➤ COMMISSIONING UNIT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce development work (saving = 26% of original budget) 	50		
<p>➤ YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Renegotiate SLA for Appropriate Adult Service (saving = 27.6% of SLA contract value) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable ▪ Maximise opportunities from range of preventative initiatives (saving = 10.7% of budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievable ▪ Rigorous vacancy control (saving = 1.7% of staffing budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is achievable. There is a risk however, as the YOT has absorbed several new initiatives in the past 2 years with no increase in resources 	13 35 15		
Total	701	0	

H) Overall Summary of Financial Savings Impacts for 2006/07.

	06/07
Efficiency/VFM	350
Income Generation	
Others Savings	701
(Shortfall)/surplus compared to target	n/a

I) Efficiency/Productivity

For this service area please provide answers to the following questions:

1. How do you know your specific service area is productive and efficient? (i.e. how do measure productivity, evidence from re-tendering exercises, benchmarking information etc).

- **LAC SERVICES**
 - All components highly regulated and inspected regularly
 - Value for money achieved through robust market management independent sector
 - National performance indicators indicate very good performance
 - Unit costs deemed 'acceptable' in CSCI performance appraisal
- **LOCALITY AND 16+ SERVICES**
 - spend on children in need/family support is low relative to comparative authorities, but deemed acceptable by CSCI
- **SEN SERVICE**
 - good performance on BVPIs
- **ACCESS TO EDUCATION**
 - Recent best value review of Education Welfare Service concluded service is efficient and good value for money
- **DISABLED CHILDREN SERVICE**
 - Respite care units and family link scheme highly regulated and inspected regularly (very good inspection reports)
 - CSCI inspection in February 2005 described significant improvement in service quality compared to Joint Review in November 2001
- **YOT**
 - Service has absorbed an increase in workload of 60% over past 2 years within existing resources
- **YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SERVICE**
 - DfES target is for service to be in contact with 25% youth population – 2004/5 performance was 22% contact.

2. How does the productivity and efficiency of your service compare to that of other organisations?

- Services for localities, looked after children and disabled children all inspected in 2005 – very positive outcome; 3 stars rating
- National Youth Agency audit in 2003/4 showed that YDS had reduction in budget for spending on young people compared to the previous year, but maintained same level of contact with young people aged 13-19
- There are no reliable comparisons for YOT efficiency, however, YOT performs well on most national performance indicators
- SEN BVPIs are in the top quartile of county councils

- BVPI on alternative provision for excluded children has been below average (although significantly improving over past 2 years)
- Improvement in school attendance over 3 year period compares very favourably with statistical neighbours, especially for secondary school attendance

3. Which areas do you regard as being the most productive or efficient, and why?

- Investment in training, recruitment and retention of qualified SWs ('growing our own') and developing skill mix
- Directly managed foster carers in general and kinship carers in particular – in terms of the relative costs of care placements
- Preferred provider contract for mainstream agency placements
- Management cost of YDS kept to a minimum to enable maximum face to face work
- YOT caseloads have increased by 25% in past 2 years
- Meeting SEN statutory deadlines; higher than average success rate at SENDIS Tribunals
- Support to primary aged pupils to reduce risk of exclusion
- Fast track to prosecution (attendance panels) reduces length of time pupils are out of school

4. Which areas do you regard as being the least productive or efficient and why?

- Family support services – relatively high proportion of activity in relation to LAC rather than effective services to support children, parents and schools to prevent exclusions and family breakdown, which results in high cost care placements
- Disabled Children's Service – relatively high cost spot purchased care placements – need to develop robust commissioning strategy and improve management of market of independent providers
- Partnership contracts with voluntary sector – need more robust monitoring of activity levels and outcome measures
- Accommodation options for care leavers and young people on remand are limited; reduces capacity to move on young people aged 16+
- High number of SEN agency placements; high number of placements in maintained special schools; high number of appeals to SENDIST
- Delegation of YDS budgets to community colleges
- Expenditure on secure escorts for small number of young people on secure remand is demand led and provides little opportunity to provide VFM

5. What are the main barriers to improving productivity or efficiency?

- Management capacity and skills
- Skills base of workforce
- Reinvestment opportunities limited (eg in early intervention services)
- Providers for children with the most complex needs unwilling to enter into preferred provider agreements

6. List the key unit costs you manage and monitor in respect of productivity and efficiency and show how that has changed over recent years.

- Foster care unit cost remains high compared to national average,

- but compares well to neighbouring SE authorities
- Residential care – unit cost ‘good’ (CSCI rating); in-house children homes represent good VFM, and investment in ‘in-house’ fostering service has reduced reliance on high cost mainstream placements. However, disabled children placements represent poorer VFM
- SEN agency placements – cost is relatively high, but SE regional partnership is starting to improve commissioning and market management
- Adoption – development of SE consortium has reduced cross authority placement costs to £10k per child

7. Are you satisfied that the actions identified in the Council’s published Annual Efficiency Statement, in respect of this service area, are being progressed satisfactorily?

- There has been excellent performance against PSA target to increase number of children in adoptive and permanent fostering placements, representing efficiency savings of 475k. However, there is now a small number of ‘hard to place’ children waiting for permanent placements. Because we are unable (at present) to recruit carers to meet their needs, we anticipate having to purchase agency placements for them during the next year, while we try to develop a more robust recruitment strategy

8. From your service planning to date, have you identified opportunities for better productivity and efficiency over the medium term (including better management of the growth of costs which might otherwise occur)?

- Improve family support services, especially for young people aged 11+ to reduce numbers looked after
- Maximise efficient use of new YJB grant for youth crime prevention
- Implementation of elearning to reduce costs in home tuition service
- Implementation of SEN Review, including investment in maintained special schools and development of integrated service for ASD children
- Improve commissioning of services for disabled children
- See 7 above
- Maximise use of Connexions funding when transferred to East Sussex in 2006/2007 and improve commissioning of all services for young people age 11+ maximising use of the various funding streams
- Reduction in accommodation costs through flexible working

9. In respect of this service area how would you respond to the follow challenging question?

“ Could this service be delivered more productively or more efficiently in some other way or in combination with partners or by someone else?”

- Children’s Trust offers opportunity for better joint commissioning with partners, especially Health. Need to be creative in exploring opportunities for improved partnerships with independent and private sector (especially for SEN) and with the voluntary sector. However, voluntary sector infrastructure is under developed in East Sussex.

- Most of the C&F service is statutory and is likely to continue to be delivered 'in-house'.

10. What are your views on the CPA VFM Self Assessment as it relates to this service area? (if appropriate).

- SEN – relatively high number of pupils with statements and high use of external provision for these pupils.
- Behaviour support profile is inconclusive
- Education welfare data is for primary schools only which is not main focus of EWS work; therefore difficult to draw conclusions.
- Youth service data merged with adult and community learning; therefore, difficult to draw conclusions

CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE

- Although the number of looked after children is fairly high, it is broadly in line with deprivation indices. Because a very high number of children are fostered, this keeps the unit cost of looked after children below average (in 2nd quartile). However, the average weekly spend on foster care is relatively high, which is to be expected in the South East, as there is stiff competition from the independent sector, which drives up prices. The number of children in residential care is relatively low and average weekly spend is relatively low. Therefore, the strategy to invest in in-house foster care and retain 16 residential placements 'in house' is delivering value for money. Spend on children in need (ie those not looked after) is average and overall spend for Children's Social Services is at 75th centile. Given the positive CSCI inspection report and the 3 stars rating, this represents reasonable value for money.

J) 'Invest to Save' bids and use of one-off resources.

1.	<p>Do you have any suggested 'invest to save' bids which would deliver significant productivity and efficiency improvements in the future?</p> <p>Reducing SEN Agency placements, in line with SEN Review</p>
1.1	<p>➤ St Mary's Horam redesignation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As an outcome of the SEN Review it is proposed that St Mary's Horam becomes an 80 place boys' BESD school for 9-16 age group with 20 residential beds. Subject to consultation and the normal statutory procedures the school could be operational in September 2007. - Revenue costs (full year) – it is estimated that the school will require an extra £200,000-£300,000 per year over and above its current budget. - Capital costs –works will be needed to upgrade the residential and teaching accommodation estimated at around £600,000 (one off cost). This is a provisional figure and more detailed analysis will follow. Some of these costs could be offset by the sale of the two detached houses at the entrance to the site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estimated saving on agency budget (full year) - £300,000 (net) from April 2008 (based on the additional 30 places being taken up by pupils who would otherwise have been placed at agency schools). <p>1.2 ➤ Cuckmere House Extreme BESD Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The establishment of a new class for 6-8 Key Stage 3 & 4 pupils at Cuckmere House School, Seaford for young people with extremely challenging behaviour who are needing an alternative curriculum based on outdoor adventurous activities as well as basic skills and vocational courses. - This class could be established by September 2006 if funding were to be available from April 2006. - Revenue costs (full year) - £139,080 (6 funded places at 14 band) - Capital costs - none - Estimated saving on agency placements (full year) - £100,000 (net) per annum from April 2007 when fully operational and with full complement of pupils <p>1.3 ➤ Heathfield ASD/Asperger's Syndrome Resourced Facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are currently 2 pupils attending Heathfield CC with diagnoses of Asperger's Syndrome who have been advised by Health that they should seek expensive agency placements but whose parents would prefer them to attend their local school. The agency placements for these two pupils would cost between £160,000 and £200,000 per annum. In addition there are up to 5 pupils currently in primary school who will be transferring to secondary in September 2007 in the Heathfield area who are likely to be seeking an agency placement who would be well suited to the Heathfield facility. This unit could be operational in April 2006. - Revenue costs (full year) - £139,080 (6 funded places at 14 band) - Capital costs – creating a separate facility to ensure the pupils are able to be maintained in the busy mainstream secondary environment – estimated at £200,000 (one off cost). This is a provisional figure and more details will follow. - Estimated saving on agency budget (full year) - £150,000 (net) per annum from April 2008 when fully operational and with full complement of pupils <p>1.4 ➤ Integrated ASD Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development of an integrated team can be achieved through contributions from existing budgets such as the early years team, the educational psychology service, the SEN agency budget, the Disabled Children's Team and the Family Intensive Support Service as well as the special schools. However, in order for the development to be well managed and consistent across the county there is a need to appoint a
--	--

	<p>co-ordinator who would lead and manage the development and the team. It will be important to ensure that the team is established in the coming academic year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revenue costs (full year) - £50,000 per annum - Estimated saving to the agency budget – £50,00 net from 2008/9. the saving would be achieved through the ability to ensure that fewer families sought agency placements as the local provision in the county would be better prepared and more confident in catering for these children. Once placement at St Mary’s School, Bexhill costs about £30,000 per year. Currently there are 25 placements at this school. <p>1.5 ➤ Speech and Language Therapists – special and mainstream schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many SEN and Disability Tribunals are upheld for St Mary’s, Bexhill each year due to the lack of therapy provision to our special schools in particular but also our mainstream schools. If each special school had one therapist to plan programmes and provide one to one therapy where appropriate this would greatly increase the chances that appeals would be dismissed. The therapists could also contribute to the specialist integrated ASD team and provide outreach to mainstream schools as appropriate. If skilled therapists could be found and this is not certain as there is a national and regional shortage this could be initiated in the 2006/7 financial year. - Revenue costs (full year) - £50,000 per therapist – 2 posts initially, totalling £100,00 from April 2006 - Capital costs – none - Estimated saving to agency budget – £50,000 net from April 2007. Potential of reducing placements at St Mary’s, Bexhill; Frewen College; St John’s and Northease Manor by at least 25% - current total spend on these schools is around £1.5m per year.
<p>2.</p> <p>2.1</p>	<p>Do you have any bids for one-off resources which would deliver.</p> <p>a) significant ongoing productivity or efficiency improvements, and/or b) significant advance on policy steer without generating on-going commitments, and/or c) significant ongoing mitigation in a particular risk area.</p> <p>➤ Permanence - £50,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment and assessment costs to implement strategy to find local families for children who are ‘hardest to place; waiting for adoptive or permanent foster care placements. (possible reward for successful achievement of PSA target?) - Would achieve minimum of £50,000 full year savings over next 8 years – ie difference between paying in-house foster care rates for permanent

	carers compared to IFA rates for 5 children.
2.2	<p>➤ Adoption - £60,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- One-off funding for a small number of inter-agency adoption fees to place small number of children whose needs cannot be met in-house. Would achieve full year savings of £24,000 – ie difference between cost of foster carer payment and adoption allowance for 4 children – for next 10 years.

DRAFT