



Children's Spending Review Post Consultation Report:

***Early Help Remodelling: Children Young People and Family Centres
& Adventure Playgrounds***

Decision to be taken by: Assistant Mayor, Children, Young
People and Schools

Decision to be taken on: 27 March 2017

Lead director: Frances Craven

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report authors: Jackie Difolco - Head of Service Early Help (Targeted)
Nick Furini – Project Manager
- Author contact details: Jackie Difolco 0116 454 6106, Nick Furini 0116 454 1124
- Report version number 1045 version 12 14022017

1. Summary

- 1.1. Early Help is defined and outlined within Working Together 2015 as ‘providing help for children, young people and families as soon as problems start to emerge or where it is likely that issues will impact negatively on children’s outcomes’.
- 1.2. This report presents the responses received following the public consultation on a preferred Model B, which took place between 14th September 2016 and 6th December 2016. The outcome of the consultation has been taken into consideration and informed the recommendations within this report. It is proposed that as a result of the responses received that changes should be considered to 12 of the 25 original proposals that go to make up Model B. The revised Model B is recommended as a new proposed service offer for the council’s targeted early help service.
- 1.3. In August 2016, the Executive approved proposals for a public consultation, which looked to reduce the targeted early help service and save £4million annually from the Education and Children’s Service’s budget for early help services that are either delivered or commissioned by the council.
- 1.4. In developing proposals and a vision for future service provision, considerable information was reviewed by the project team and scrutinised by the council’s Early Help Remodelling project board. This included a review of:
 - a) quantitative data regarding usage of services in relation to postcodes and volume;
 - b) the evidenced based approaches used in early help and what works best;
 - c) the impact of service provision on service users;
 - d) the impact of cross working objectives with both internal departments and external partners;
 - e) all commissioned services, applying best value principles; and
 - f) the impact on children’s social care and Ofsted improvement work.
- 1.5. The vision for the proposed new service continues to be underpinned by the Education and Children’s Service’s priorities, which ensure that:
 - a) children and young people are involved in the planning and delivery of services;
 - b) we target and support children, young people and families who are most in need (0-19, or 25 for young people with special educational needs or disabilities);
 - c) services are accessible across the city;
 - d) childhood services and family support teams work closely with children’s social care to minimise escalation of issues;
 - e) families can easily access information and advice about availability of services and support;
 - f) we monitor and record the impact of services on children;
 - g) we provide our workforce with the skills and confidence to deliver key services;
 - h) we engage communities in the delivery of services; and

- i) we develop and strengthen statutory and voluntary partnerships to ensure co-ordinated delivery of services and response to need.
- 1.6. The public consultation presented 25 proposals to members of the public and stakeholders for feedback: refer to Appendix H – Consultation Analysis for full details. Consultation was carried out in line with advice from the council’s communication, legal and equality services and in-line with the Local Authority’s statutory consultation duties set out in the Childcare Act 2006 and revised Best Value guidance.
- 1.7. Consultation was undertaken in three main ways: an online questionnaire for the public and stakeholders (including staff); a paper booklet for parents; and focus groups for parents, children and young people, stakeholders and staff. Some people also provided a response by email, letter and social media (e.g. face book comments). Consultation was supported by a communication plan that identified the key groups that could be impacted by the proposals – these were contacted with consultation details and the list formed the basis of organising some of the focus groups, (e.g. 23 parent forums).
- 1.8. In total, 1,224 people took part in the consultation, which is broken down as follows:
- a) 374 (31%) individuals took part online;
 - b) 210 (17%) individuals completed a paper booklet; and
 - c) 640 (52%) individuals took part in 62 focus groups with parents, children, staff and stakeholders.
- 1.9. For 15 of the 25 proposals, which present a key change to the current early help service offer, we asked respondents to tell us how the proposal would affect them and provided a tick box option for them to do this (e.g. it will affect us negatively/positively/not at all). Summary results are given below and full details are given in table 5, page 16.
- a) For 5 of the 15 proposals, a majority of both the public and stakeholders were in agreement that the proposals would have a negative effect.
 - b) For one proposal, considered by stakeholders only, a majority of stakeholders were in agreement that the proposal would have a negative effect.
 - c) For 8 of the 15 proposals, members of the public said the proposals ‘would not affect me/us’ but stakeholders responded to say the proposal would affect ‘me/my clients’
 - d) For one proposal, both the public and stakeholders said the proposal ‘would not affect me/us/my clients’.
- 1.10. The consultation also provided an opportunity for the public and stakeholders to provide comments about the proposals. We analysed the comments and grouped them into ‘comments about the service/proposal’, ‘suggested potential impacts (of the proposal)’, ‘suggestions concerning the service/proposals’ and questions.
- 1.11. The council also received a petition that met the threshold for a debate at full council, i.e. greater than 1,500 signatures. This was submitted by Playfair on 9 November 2016 and a debate took place at full council on the 24 November. The petition asked the council to withdraw the proposed cuts affecting 9 of the 10 adventure play providers represented by Playfair.
- 1.12. Some of the responses will also inform our lessons learned log and the questions will be answered in an FAQ document to be distributed on Citizen Space at the appropriate time and will also inform our future communication strategy.
- 1.13. The revised proposal (see Table 1, page 5 or Appendix G – Final service proposals), if approved, will result in:
- a) an indicative recurring financial saving of **£3.5million**; refer to Appendix F – Summary of

Early Help Budget Proposals, for proposed budget and percentage reductions.

- b) an estimated reduction of approximately 115 (FTE) posts from 300 (FTE) posts that fall within the scope of the proposals (this is dependent on the outcome of the staff organisational review). Of those posts, 53 are either vacant or being filled on a temporary basis. In addition 59 members of staff requested voluntary redundancy as part of the corporate VR trawl. The majority of requests were postponed to be considered as part of the VR trawl for this service as part of an organisational review. Please note there are 383 members of staff due to a large part time workforce.
- c) a reduction of Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) Centres¹ from 23 to 12 with the remaining 11 centres transferred to organisations who meet the objectives as per the grant conditions of the Surestart Capital Grants Programme (SSCG) for children aged 5 and under in the first instance. In the event that the proposal to transfer the 11 CYP&F Centre buildings to alternative providers is not viable, closure and disposal of the buildings is the alternative option, which may result in the Department of Education (DfE) clawing back capital grant funding.
- d) a reduction and ceasing of both universal and targeted service provision; and
- e) a new service model focused on targeting families identified as most in need to improve outcomes.

1.14. Key risks, impact and mitigation are outlined in table 8, page 24 to 26.

1.15. We took the initial service proposals - the '**Model B**' that was agreed by the Executive for consultation - and considered them in light of our analysis of consultation feedback and our equality impact assessment. This resulted in us developing a final set of proposals - a revised 'Model B' for consideration and endorsement by the Executive for implementation. The proposed changes aim to minimise impact and to take into consideration the alternative proposals submitted in the consultation that are viable, whilst still achieving the required level of savings.

1.16. Table 1 below on page 5 provides the results of the work outlined above at 1.15. It sets out:

- a) the current service offer;
- b) the initial service proposals that we consulted upon; and
- c) revisions to the initial service proposals, leading to a final set of service proposals for approval and implementation.

How to read table 1:

- bold text in column two shows a change from the current service offer pending consultation
- red text underlined in column three (or underlined text if reading in black and white) shows the proposed revisions made to the initial service proposals, after considering consultation feedback and the equality impact assessment.

(Please note that all activity is per week per cluster, unless otherwise stated. As a reminder the city contains 6 cluster areas)

2. Recommendations

The Assistant Mayor, Children, Young People and Schools is asked to:

2.1 Note the contents of the paper and direct any comments, observations and actions to the Head of Service: Targeted Early Help.

¹ The name given to Leicester's children centres

2.2 Note and consider the risks and mitigation for the proposed revised service offer as outlined in section 7.

2.3 Approve the proposed revised model and its implementation, including the transfer of buildings in order that the targeted £3.5M saving can be realised.

Table 1 – The early help service offer - final service proposals

(Please note that all activity is per week per cluster, unless otherwise stated. *Children, young people and families who meet eligibility criteria only, refer to Appendix D)

	(1) Current service offer	(2) Initial service proposals (pre consultation)	(3) Final service proposals pending a decision (post consultation)
Posts	300 full time equivalent (FTE)	172.5 FTE (dependent on staff org review outcome)	185 FTE (depending on outcome of staff org review)
Buildings	23	12 – (transfer/close remaining 11)	12 (transfer/close remaining 11)
Base Budget	£8,960,600	£4,960,600	£5,460,600
Saving	N/A	£4 million saving	£3.5 million
Early Childhood Services For children aged 0 - 5	Antenatal programmes x 1 Telephone Advice Point in each cluster (6) & 23 centres Stay & Play x 5 Toy & Book Library from 23 buildings Weekly parent engagement activity Annual events and 2 x activities per wk of school hols 2 x Volunteer/ community dev sessions 4 x Targeted EY Education & Development sessions 2 x Parenting groups 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 x Crèches to support overall delivery Home learning service Children Centre Teacher service Welfare rights Service Bookstart service Early Help co-located with the Healthy Child Prog. Adult & Family Learning provided from centres	Antenatal programmes x 1 One telephone advice point for the city & access through the centres Stay & Play x 2 Toy & Book Library from 12 buildings Fortnightly parent engagement activity Annual events & 1 x week school hol for ages 0–8 1 x Volunteer and community dev session 3 x Targeted EY Educ. & Development sessions* 1 x Parenting groups* 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 x Crèches to support overall delivery Cease Home learning service Cease Children Centre Teacher Service Cease Welfare rights service Cease Bookstart service Early Help co-located with the Health Child Prog. Adult & Family Learning provided from centres	Antenatal programmes x 1 One telephone advice point & face to face access through the 12 centres Stay & Play x 2 co delivered with HCP and flexibility to deliver 3 sessions Toy & Book Library from 12 buildings Parent engagement in decision making delivered as part of everyday practice Annual events and 1 x activity per week of school hols for ages 0 – 12 Volunteering and community projects delivered by citywide team 3 Targeted sessions* with flexibility to deliver 3rd session as Stay and Play 1 x Parenting group* 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 crèches to support overall delivery Cease Home Learning service Children Centre Teachers service funded until April 2018 initially Reduce funding to Welfare Rights Service by 40% * Bookstart service will continue - funded by alternative source Early Help co-located with the Health Child Programme Adult & Family Learning provided from centres
Whole Family Working	Advice Point as above 14 x FTE Traded Family Support Family Support service Early Help Response Team £1.1 million grant - Adventure Playgrounds (AP) Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes focused on teenagers	Advice Point as above 14 x FTE Traded Family Support Family Support service * Early Help Response Team & one central telephone Advice Point 50% tapered reduction to AP's by 2020 & potential transfer of buildings Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes focused on teenagers	Advice Point as above Citywide Traded Family Support (14 FTE) that is not restricted by criteria Family Support service* Early Help Response Team & one central telephone Advice Point Further analysis to be undertaken before decision on reductions taken. Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes responding to need and demand
Interface with Social Care	Step down of cases from social care to Early Help Joint casework incl. single assessments Short term response and crisis support Weekly surgeries for social workers	Reduced capacity: Step down of cases to EH Reduced capacity: joint casework Reduced capacity: Short term response and crisis support	Step down of cases from social care to Early Help Development of EH Partnership Allocations Hub for Early Help Assessments Cease joint work on social care cases apart from joint work with single assessment team as part of step down process Edge of care response as part of overall delivery model above One telephone number and route to access EH and SC

3 Report

- 3.1 'Early Help' is defined and outlined within Working Together 2015 as ' providing help for children, young people and families as soon as problems start to emerge or where it is likely that issues will impact negatively on children's outcomes'
- 3.2 Several key reports have been published that support the need for Early Help: The **Allen**² report on intervening early in a child's life; the **Field**³ report on preventing generational poverty; the **Munro**⁴ review of children's care services; the **Tickell**⁵ review of early years (iv); and, the **Marmot**⁶ review of health. All make a strong and evidence-based case for Early Help, asserting that no agency can provide this support alone and that greater coordination and joint working across and within agencies is required.
- 3.3 Recommendation 10 of Munro's report advises that local authorities and other partners should secure sufficient provision of local early help services, as well as set out the arrangements for early help.
- 3.4 '**Working Together**' (2015) requires local agencies to have effective ways of identifying emerging problems and potential unmet needs for individual children and their families. It also requires local agencies to work together to put processes in place for the effective assessment of needs of individual children who may benefit from early help services. 'Working Together' is clear that it is the responsibility of all partners to adhere to the guidance, not just local authorities.
- 3.5 The purpose of this report is to inform the Executive of the outcome of the public consultation and the proposed revised model of service delivery, which will result in achieving recurring savings, a reduction of early help services for families, and the transfer or potential closure of some Children, Young People and Family (CYP&F) Centres.
- 3.6 The content of this report is set out in the table below:

Section	Page
Section 4: Background information and rationale for remodelling early help	7
Section 5: Information about the Early Help Targeted Service	10
Section 6: Consultation analysis	15
Section 7: Proposed revised service offer (including risks, impact and mitigation)	17
Section 8: Key financial risk and sustainability	27
Section 9: Conclusion	28
Section 10: Details of Scrutiny	28
Section 10: Financial, legal and other implications	29
Section 11: Background information and other papers	31
Section 12: Summary of appendices	32

² Allen, G. (2011) "Early Intervention: the next steps", London: HM Government Cabinet Office <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/early-intervention-next-steps.pdf>

³ Field, F. (2010) "The Foundation Years: preventing poor children becoming poor adults - The report of the Independent Review on Poverty and Life Chances", HM Government <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110120090128/http://povertyreview.independent.gov.uk>

⁴ Munro, E. (2011) "Munro review of child protection: final report - a child-centred system", Department for Education, London: TSO <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/munro-review-of-child-protection-final-report-a-child-centred-system>

⁵ Tickell, C. (2011) "The Early Years: Foundations for life, health and learning", Department for Education, London: TSO https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180919/DFE-00177-2011.pdf

⁶ Marmot, M. (2008), "Review of Health Inequalities – Fair Society, Healthy Lives", Institute of Health Equity <http://www.instituteofthehealthequity.org/projects/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review>

4 Background information and rationale for remodelling early help

- 4.1 The **Early Help Remodelling (EHR) project** is part of a programme of spending reviews initiated by the council in response to budgetary pressures and ongoing funding reductions imposed by central government since 2010 and which will continue at least until the end of this parliament. For the Council this means that we will need to have found savings of £155m over the period 2010-2020, £100m of these savings were found before 2016/17 but a further £55m is still required. These further savings are being addressed through a series of spending reviews across the council, including the Education and Children's Service, which has a £58m budget and a spending review target of £5m.
- 4.2 The need for savings comes at a time when the Education and Children's Service is facing pressures to increase spending on Children's Social Care (CSC). Although CSC has made good progress since the inadequate judgement from Ofsted, there could be a risk to continuous improvement by reducing the core funding of the early help service, which contributes significantly to CSC's service objectives. A viable option available to the Education and Children's Service is to make savings from its Early Help services, however, the dilemma faced by the Education and Children's Service is that the council's early help services are evidenced to be a key factor in improving outcomes for families and reducing the need for expensive statutory services delivered by Children's Social Care.
- 4.3 In presenting proposals to achieve savings, the service has thought about new ways of supporting the needs of children, young people and families, in line with legislation, statutory guidance and improving outcomes for our most vulnerable families, and to ensure that the council's early help service continues to support these needs.
- 4.4 The aims of the EHR project are to develop a reduced, remodelled and effective council early help service and achieve up to £5m savings by April 2018.
- 4.5 To achieve the project aims we undertook a piece of scoping work that resulted in the development of three draft service models (Model A - £3M savings, Model B - £4M savings, and Model C - £5M savings). The Executive gave approval in August 2016 to undertake a public consultation on Model B (£4M savings) based on the evidence identified through our scoping work.
- 4.6 The scoping work was overseen by the EHR project board, which is responsible for managing the project and putting forward options and recommendations to the Executive for a decision. The team undertaking the scoping work was subject to regular scrutiny and challenge by the EHR project board, which includes a range of key stakeholders including representatives from the Using Buildings Better (UBB) programme and from the council's legal, procurement, property and finance services. Scrutiny was also provided by senior council managers and the Lead Member (Education and Children's Service).
- 4.7 The scoping work included a range of tasks, the purpose of which was to develop the three draft models outlined above and evidence their efficacy. The key tasks undertaken were as follows:
- a) benchmarking the council's early help provision against five other local authority areas, selected because they had either similar demographics, similar Ofsted grades for children's services or were identified as delivering excellent practice. Visits were undertaken and a range of information was collated to demonstrate the comparisons;
 - b) mapping access to services via the Children, Young People and Family Centres and services and by whom;
 - c) reviewing a range of both quantitative and qualitative data to evidence the impact of the council's early help service, for example,
 - case studies
 - a cost calculator demonstrating the reduction of problems as a result of intervention

- outcomes and distance travelled for families in achieving their desired goals
 - the reduction of contacts and cases open to social care due to the robust interface and stepping down of cases from social care to early help, (which resulted in a low re-referral rate)
 - improvement in national data sets that Leicester's early help service contributed towards, e.g. school readiness;
- d) reviewing the impact of commissioned services from the monitoring information they submit;
 - e) testing the proposed service models with legal in relation to sufficiency of provision for childhood services and risk of capital clawback in relation to the buildings;
 - f) testing the proposed service models with senior managers and elected members.
 - g) bespoke planning sessions with operational managers within Early Help Targeted services; and
 - h) developing a comprehensive communications plan to inform those affected by the proposals, which include council employees, commissioned services, partners, trade unions and service users.

4.8 We also considered a range of factors to determine which CYP&F Centre buildings to retain, in order to support needs and the remodelling options (i.e. Model A, B and C). The factors considered in arriving at the CYP&F Centre buildings' proposal are as follows:

- a) reach and engagement, (e.g. numbers of families accessing the buildings and services once and more than three times, numbers of priority families that accessed buildings and services);
- b) services delivered from the CYP&F Centre buildings and outreach venues,
- c) partners and community groups delivering services from the CYP&F Centre buildings;
- d) types of services accessed, universal or targeted and the demographics of the families who access these;
- e) location and accessibility; and
- f) running costs and income generation.

4.9 The considerable work outlined above resulted in the identification of a proposed Model B which focuses on supporting young children in need of early childhood services, families identified as vulnerable through the Council's 'Troubled Families' programme and children who are known to children's social care or at risk of being subject to a statutory social care intervention. This model was further refined following the consideration of consultation feedback (see section 6, page 15), which resulted in a revised model B which we outline in section 7 and table 6, page 18.

Overview of reports/ proposals and decisions that interface with the EHR project

4.10 The EHR project is made up of a number of work streams, each of has been subject to a separate report as outlined below.

- a) Charging Policy for colocation of services within Children's Services buildings
- b) Procurement of Healthy Child Programme
- c) Future of Local Authority Pre School Provision
- d) Future funding for Children Centre Teachers
- e) Children's Spending Review: Remodelling of Targeted Youth Support

Clarification of scope

4.11 A list of commissioned services in scope of the Early Help Remodelling project is set out in Appendix A – Commissioned Services. For the purpose of clarity, the Troubled Families **grant** is not in scope of the Early Help Remodelling project, however, the **service** is in scope and proposals outlined in this report will impact on the way this service is delivered in the future.

Timeline and Process

4.12 The timeline for completing the aims of the EHR project is set out in table 1a; the project is currently on schedule.

Table 1a – Early Help Remodelling project stages and timeline

Project stages	Key dates
1. Project set up/information gathering	Jan to May 2016
2. Analysis and report writing	June 2016
3. Pre-consultation report	August 2016
4. Public consultation (12 weeks)	September to Dec 2016
6. Consultation analysis	December 2016 – January 2017
7. Post consultation decision report	March 2017
8. Phased Implementation – three strands: (1) Organisational review, (2) buildings and (3) contracts	April 2017 - March 2018
9. 34% savings achieved (£1.2m)	April 2017
10. 66% savings achieved (£2.3m)	April 2018

Links to corporate and partnership priorities and strategic plans

4.13 As part of this work, consideration has been given to the impact any reduction will have on interdependences across the council. The Early Help Targeted service has a crucial role in contributing to the following corporate and partnership strategies and plans listed below which may be impacted by the proposals.

- a) **JSNA and Public Health:** joint commissioning arrangements for a range of health prevention initiatives.
- b) **Child Poverty:** key actions within the Leicester Child Poverty Commission⁷ Recommendations (updated 2015) to address the reduction of children living in poverty and Breakfast clubs.
- c) **Leicester's 0 – 5 Strategy and Raising Achievement Service**⁸: key action to improve school readiness and oral health.
- d) **LCC Children, Young People and Families Plan**⁹/ **Early Help Strategy**¹⁰/LSCB/ LLESP 'Early Help' Strands: early help is a key priority with responsibilities and actions attached.
- e) **Leicester City Children's Improvement Plan (Ofsted)**¹¹: The Early Help Targeted service has 4 key recommendations to deliver against, including strategic partnership work to deliver early help services within our improvement notice.
- f) **Leicester's Healthy Child Programme:** this has been the most significant development where Early help services have been integral to the development of this programme developing a joint pathway from April 2017 to reduce duplication and overlap.

⁷ Available here: <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/schools-and-learning/school-and-colleges/performance-inspections-and-reports/leicester-child-poverty-commission>

⁸ Available from the Transformation and Commissioning team: 371124, earlyhelpremodelling@leicester.gov.uk

⁹ Available here: <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/media/113643/children-and-young-people-plan-2014-17.pdf>

¹⁰ Available from the Transformation and Commissioning team: 371124, earlyhelpremodelling@leicester.gov.uk

¹¹ Available here: <https://www.leicester.gov.uk/your-council/policies-plans-and-strategies/childrens-improvement-plan-for-leicester-city/>

Children Centre Statutory Requirements

- 4.14 Whilst the services delivered through the CYP&F Centres contribute to a number of statutory requirements, particularly within Children's Social Care, these services are generally discretionary with the exception of **early childhood services**. The delivery of early childhood services through the CYP&F Centres **is a direct statutory duty** which covers three areas:
- a) the statutory duty to provide sufficient children centres to meet local need;
 - b) the statutory duty to consult everyone who could be affected by any proposed changes; and
 - c) the number of activities to be provided on site for it to remain a designated children centre.
- 4.15 The Sure Start Guidance 2013¹² states that the duty on local authorities is to ensure there are **sufficient** children centres, so far as reasonably practicable, to meet local need. In summary, the council has a duty to provide sufficient early childhood services to meet the needs of young children and their families. The CYP&F Centres are subject to Ofsted inspection and report on a number of performance targets.
- 4.16 A children's centre is defined by the **Childcare Act 2006**¹³ as a place or group of places that provide **early childhood services** in an integrated way; that either provide services on site or provide advice and assistance on gaining access to those services elsewhere; and from which on-site services are provided for young children. Early childhood services are defined as follows:
- a) early years provision (childcare) and school readiness;
 - b) social services functions;
 - c) health services relating to children parents and prospective parents;
 - d) training and employment services to assist parents/prospective parents; and
 - e) information, advice and assistance (i.e. Family Information Directory of childcare services).

Refer to Appendix B - Statutory Requirements for additional details concerning statutory duties.

5 Information about the Early Help Targeted Service

Summary of current offer

- 5.1 The primary aim of Leicester's Early Help Targeted service is to provide a community response specifically for young children (0-4), in relation to their early years' development. The service also aims to support all children, young people and their families, to prevent issues from escalating to the point where statutory social care services are required. The Early Help Targeted service also supports families who are already subject to a statutory social care intervention, with the aim of supporting families to meet their own needs independently.

¹² Available here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sure-start-childrens-centres>

¹³ Available here: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/21/contents>

5.2 The Early Help Targeted Service’s budget is **£11.5 million** and is made up of the following components:

Budget Components	Amount	Comments
1) Council base budget which includes £1.24m of commissioned services)	£8,960,600	This is where the saving will be achieved, includes £121k for Childcare Sufficiency which is not in scope
2) Troubled Families Grant (national programme)	£1,207,000	Funded until March 2020
3) Dedicated Schools Grant for Children Centre Teachers service (£740k) and training for childcare providers £80k	£820,000	Funded until April 2018
4) Traded Services with schools for Family Support	£497,300	Dependent on traded services purchased annually by schools
5) Income	£12,500	Contribution charge for 2 settings based in CYPF Centres
Total Budget	£11,497,400	

5.3 The Early Help Targeted Service comprises 23 Children, Young People and Family (CYP&F) Centres, which are geographically located within six cluster areas across the City and designated as follows.

- Six designated CYP&F Centre’s open full time, offering 10 sessions of delivery per week
- Six satellite CYP&F Centres open to offer 7 sessions of delivery per week
- Eleven satellite CYP&F Centres open to offer 5 sessions of delivery per week
- Three CYP&F Centres have council preschool provision operating from them and two others have private preschool provision operating on a long term lease.
- Five CYP&F Centres are located on school sites; six are next to school sites

(Appendix C – Map of CYPF Centre Buildings, provides a map showing the location of the CYP&F Centres).

5.4 Table 2 on page 12 lists the three components of the current offer provided by the Early Help Targeted Service. The table refers to commissioned services and details of these, including funding amounts, can be found in Appendix A.

5.5 The service offer is split into **universal** (open to all levels of need) **and targeted provision** (open to those who meet a limiting set of criteria, focused on specific needs). Targeted provision is focused on children, young people and families who feature on a **Priority Children, Young People and Families List (PCL)**, refer to Appendix D – Priority CYPF List. The PCL is made up of children, young people and families who meet a range of criteria typically used to identify vulnerability, for example teenage parents, families living in areas of deprivation and children known to Children’s Social Care. The PCL is predominantly made up of children aged 0 – 5, however since the service has widened its remit to include whole family working, the PCL has included an increasing number of children and young people aged from 6 to 19/25 (approximately 20% of the PCL).

5.6 The early help service is delivered by 314 FTE posts, which equates to 400 members of staff. However, the number of posts in scope of the early help remodelling project is 300 FTE posts (equating to 383 members of staff) – the difference in number is the Children Centre Teachers who are funded externally and are not in scope of the EHR project. Of the 300 posts, 53 are either vacant or being filled on a temporary basis. In addition 59 members of staff requested voluntary redundancy as part of the corporate VR trawl. The majority of requests were postponed to be considered as part of the VR trawl for this service as part of an organisational review.

Table 2: The three key components of the current Early Help Targeted service

Early Childhood Services
Children Centre Teachers - Support pre-school learning, early year's development, school readiness and transitions. Direct delivery and support to settings/schools.
Local Authority Pre Schools - 10 pre-school settings, learning and transition to schools.
Funded Early Education Entitlement (FEEE) and Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) - Management oversight, audit and distribution of payments to providers and schools for FEEE and EYPP, completion of early year's census and FEEE applications from parents.
Child Learning and Development – Antenatal Programmes, targeted casework, group work, stay and play, focusing on parenting, attachment, stimulation, public health agenda and school readiness. Play Development Officer role supporting services with developing play initiatives.
Parent and Community Engagement - Supporting parents into education, employment and training, service user voice, co-production, adult learning and volunteering.
Commissioned Services - Bookstart (targeted reading initiatives and materials), Parenting programmes and Domestic Violence support programmes co delivered with partners.
Whole Family Support
Leicester must work with 3990 families where there are 2 or more of the following: Children not attending school, offending behaviour, unemployed adults and at risk of financial exclusion, health concerns, domestic violence and children in need of help and support.
Advice Point 6 x cluster based advice points through telephone and walk in providing low level advice, signposting and support (2 sessions) without it becoming a case.
Early Help Response Team - Screening and allocation of referrals for early help support, including joint work and step down of cases from Children's Social Care to early help services, advice point, return interviews for children and young people not known to social care, weekly surgeries for social care re: advice on early help support.
Family Support - Short term targeted casework, group work and traded services in schools working with children, young people and families, pre social care thresholds to prevent escalation of need.
Early Help Assessment - Long term (multiple issues) casework (multi agency) team around the family approach working with children and young people and families, pre social care thresholds to prevent escalation of need.
Commissioned Services - Grant arrangement for 10 Adventure Playgrounds, Multi-agency Workforce Development Training Programme and Newsletter, Parenting and Domestic Violence Programmes co delivered with partners, Welfare Rights drop in and appointments service.
Interface with Children's Social Care
Transfer/ Joint Work/ Step Down – Transfer of cases that come to SC but meet EH thresholds, Early Help practitioners joint working with any case open to social care, as part of a statutory plan, providing the services outlined above. Step down of cases open to social care to the services outlined above to support families to meet their needs independently and through universal services – these cases are no longer open to statutory services.

Evidencing the impact of early help provision

- 5.7. The Early Help Remodelling project undertook a range of tasks to identify and evidence the impact of early help services on children and family outcomes, which also included a focus on commissioned services. This work is presented in table 3 and 4 below.

Table 3: Key headlines for 2015-16: Council Early Help Services

There were 19,667 service users (children, young people and adults) who accessed the Early Help Targeted service (through face to face contact) at least once. This was an increase of 16% from 2014-15.

Of the 17,549 children and young people attending early help services, 51.8% were identified as a priority (PCL) and would benefit most from this provision.

There were 6,488 families who attended universal stay and play provision. This was an increase of 8% from 2014-15.

7,620 families attended targeted interventions (parenting groups, school readiness etc.). This was an increase of 10% from 2014-15.

There were 20,236 contacts made to the advice point (telephone, drop in, brief intervention of up to 2 sessions). Eighty-three percent of the contacts made were via telephone and 52% were by professionals with 48% from members of the public.

Of the 20,236 contacts, 50% received appropriate short term direct support and were closed successfully and not re-referred to the early help service, 16% resulted in no further action and 34% led to casework.

There were 1,344 families subject to casework in 2015-16, which equated to 4,614 children and adults. Of the 454 families (equating to 1,098 children and adults) whose case was closed in 2015-16, 75% of those stated their needs had been met.

Of all 2 year olds who were eligible for a funded early education place, 64.7% took up a place. This was a 19.7% increase on 2014-15.

Data analysis identified that in wards where there was greater engagement with the early help service, the Early Years Foundation Profile, EYFP) results were higher. This suggests that the early help service was instrumental in contributing towards supporting children to be ready for school.

During 2015/16, less than 2% of all early help cases were stepped up to social care and 12% (934 cases) of all social care cases were either co- worked with the early help service or stepped down from social care to the early help service. Tracking over a 12month period showed that almost 80% of cases stepped down to the early help service did not go back to social care.

As of Q3 2016-17, 33% of all children subject to a statutory social care plan (233) were co-worked with family support workers from this service.

N.B. Both individual and family data is provided as each social care case is counted as a child, whereas each early help case is counted as a family, due to its focus on whole family work.

There were 401 volunteer training activities provided across the City attended by 1,261 parents seeking to develop new skills and build confidence to assist with gaining full time employment.

Cost Calculator

Early Help Targeted randomly selected 20 families receiving support from the Family Support service, who were identified as Troubled Families. We identified the numbers of incidents for these families before and after the early help multi-agency intervention and a cost from a 'Cost Savings Calculator' was allocated to each incident type to identify the before-intervention-cost and post-intervention-cost to the public purse. In conclusion, the exercise found a reduction of issues and incidents with a non-cashable financial saving of at least **£470,000** for the council and its partners.

Table 3 continued: Key headlines for 2015-16: Council Early Help Services

Families meeting needs

The service has a Family Outcomes Plan (refer to Appendix E – Leicester City Family Outcome Plan) detailing all of the success criteria that is measured. To support this, practitioners use an outcomes tool (Richter Scale) to evidence impact and distance travelled. Analysis of Q3 for 2016-17 data showed that of the 198 Richter scale evaluations completed, there has been a 94% improvement in distance travelled for parenting and child development. Nine case studies were also presented to evidence the range of interventions and the impact they had on families.

Table 4: Key headlines for 2015-16: Commissioned or grant funded services

(N.B. Information taken from monitoring returns)

Adventure Playgrounds

Provision includes outdoor play equipment, youth club activities, projects, breakfast and lunch clubs, bespoke programmes such as mentoring, alternative education working with targeted groups e.g. disabled children, travellers, low income to access one to one and group work programmes. Most provision is free but some have small charges to cover costs for additional trips/food.

Across all 10 providers, 8,937 children and young people aged 5 – 15 (60% over the age of 8) are registered members, ranging from 102 in one provision to 2,041 in another, with an estimated 25% of children having additional needs.

Bookstart (Data covers 2014 – 2016)

Disseminates £200k worth of free reading resources (24,000 packs) from the Bookstart Trust to early years services to promote the sharing and reading of books.

There were 264 open access sessions attended by 580 families with evaluation showing that 50% of families improved their confidence in undertaking book reading activities within the home. In addition, there were 19 training sessions to support staff, parents and carers on 'storytelling' and 57 early years events promoting Bookstart.

Welfare Rights

Provides drop in advice sessions and appointments to support access to benefits, (e.g. Disability Living Allowance, Child Tax Credit), submitting appeals, eligibility checks for benefits and applications for equipment to support disabled children.

From March 15 to April 16, the service provided 1,587 appointments. Early help service data shows that 599 families who were registered with the early help service accessed the Welfare Rights service; 78 of these families were recorded as one parent households. Welfare Rights also supported residents of Leicester to access benefits totalling in the region of £5 million pounds.

Centre for Fun and Families (Data covers April 15 – March 16)

Commissioned service to deliver 9 x groupwork parenting programmes. Living with Teenagers is a specialist targeted group work programme that is designed for parents and carers who are experiencing behavioural and communication difficulties with teenagers. For 2015-16, 126 parents attended the courses with 66% of those completing the course in full. The programme evaluation identified that on average parents felt that there was a 30% reduction in difficult behaviours experienced with the frequency of these behaviours reducing by 41%. Across all groups, parents confidence levels in addressing issues increased on average by 33%.

Table 4 continued: Key headlines for 2015-16: Commissioned Services

(N.B. Information taken from monitoring returns)

Voluntary Action Leicestershire (Data covers April – Sept 16)

To support multi-agency early help workforce development, VAL are commissioned to coordinate a range of events, training and workshops. They also produce a monthly e-briefing and host a website providing a range of resources to improve practice with families.

Over the period of time stated, they coordinated 48 training sessions covering 5 topics which were attended by 358 professionals. Using a scaling of 1 – 5, (1 being the lowest) on average; professionals scored themselves at 2 – 2.5 with understanding and confidence before they completed the training, which increased to 3.5 – 4 after training. There were also 933 visits to the website over this period.

6. Consultation analysis

- 6.1. Below is a summary of our analysis of consultation feedback. For full details please refer to Appendix H– Consultation Analysis.
- 6.2. The public consultation presented 25 proposals for feedback from members of the public and stakeholders. (Refer to 1.16 – 1.17 for methodology)
- 6.3. In total, 1,224 people took part in the consultation, which is broken down as follows:
 - a) 374 (31%) individuals took part online
 - b) 210 (17%) individuals completed a paper booklet
 - c) 640 (52%) individuals took part in 62 focus groups.
- 6.4. Parents/carers were the largest group to take part in the consultation (452/1224, 37%), followed by referral agencies/organisations (375/1224, 31%) and children and young people aged 19 or under (138/1224, 11%). The remaining 21% were made up of other respondent types (e.g. a Leicester resident).
- 6.5. Ethnic monitoring of the responses to the consultation shows that 46% of respondents who took part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet were white British, followed by 15% who were Indian (Asian or Asian British). For the focus group consultation, 73% did not provide any ethnic monitoring data. Of the 27% that did provide data: 10% reported an ethnic category of White British, followed by 9% Indian. The majority of respondents were female (63% online/paper booklet). Eight percent of respondents who took part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet reported a disability, whereas 3% taking part in the focus groups reported a disability.
- 6.6. For 15 of the 25 proposals we asked respondents to tell us how the proposal would affect them and provided a tick box option for them to do this (e.g. it will affect us negatively/positively/not at all). A summary of majority answers is provided below in table 5.

Table 5: Consultation responses from the public and stakeholders concerning how the proposals would affect them

Consultation response	Proposals
For 5 proposals a majority of both the public and stakeholders were in agreement that the proposal would negatively affect me/us/my clients .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adventure Play • Children Centres • Bookstart • Stay and Play • Welfare Rights
For one proposal a majority of stakeholders were in agreement that the proposal would negatively affect me/my clients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Help Response – only stakeholders were presented with this proposal for comment (because it is a function that involves stakeholders to support front line delivery with service users.
For 8 of the proposals members of the public said the proposal ' would not affect me/us ' but stakeholders responded to say the proposal would negatively affect 'me/my clients'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster Advice Points • Early Years Learning and Development • Family Support Service • Home Learning Service • Parenting Groups and Crèche • School Holiday Events • Toy and Book Library • Volunteering, Employment, Education and Training •
For one proposal both the public and stakeholders said the proposal ' would not affect me/us/clients '.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly Parent Engagement.
For 11 proposals, respondents were not provided with a tick box response, because the proposals concerned no change, including 'any other comments'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult and family learning and crèche • Antenatal courses • Children centre teachers • Domestic violence groups and crèche • Family support service (traded with schools) • Health child programme • Parenting programmes • Targeted services • Interface with social care • Partnership and workforce development

- 6.7. We analysed the comments provided by respondents and grouped them into 'comments about the service/proposal' (1,428 comments), 'suggested potential impacts of the proposal' (1,516), 'suggestions concerning the service/proposals' (519) and questions (298). Our Consultation Analysis report (Appendix H) outlines the council's proposed responses in relation to the 25 proposals we submitted to consultation.
- 6.8. Of the 3,761 comments that we grouped together, we identified 70 comments that referred to the consultation process, which included not having sufficient information to make valid comments, too much information, too many consultation questions, not enough financial information and didn't know enough about the service to comment. A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. In addition, where appropriate, individual questions have been responded to and others will be answered in an FAQ document, to be distributed on Citizen Space and other mechanisms available to the public after a key decision has been made about the proposals, and will also inform our future communication strategy.
- 6.9. The council also received a petition that met the threshold for a debate at full council, i.e. greater 1,500 signatures. This was submitted by Playfair on 9 November 2016 where a debate took place at full council on the 24 November. The petition asked the council to withdraw the proposed cuts affecting 9 of the 10 adventure play providers represented by Playfair.
- 6.10. Consideration of consultation feedback, equality impact assessment and the petition has resulted in a recommendation to make changes to 12 of the 25 proposals that go to make up Model B.

7. Proposed revised service offer

Introduction

- 7.1. We took the initial service proposals - the '**Model B**' that was agreed by the Executive for consultation - and considered them in light of our analysis of consultation feedback and our equality impact assessment. This resulted in us developing a final set of proposals - a revised 'Model B' for consideration and endorsement by the Executive for implementation. The proposed changes aim to minimise impact and to take into consideration the alternative proposals submitted in the consultation that are viable, whilst still achieving the required level of savings.
- 7.2. Table 6 below provides the results of the work outlined above at 7.1. It sets out:
- a) the current service offer;
 - b) the initial service proposals that we consulted upon; and
 - c) revisions to the initial service proposals, leading to a final set of service proposals for approval and implementation.

How to read table 6:

- bold text in column two shows a change from the current service offer pending consultation
- red text underlined in column three (or underlined text if reading in black and white) shows the proposed revisions made to the initial service proposals, after considering consultation feedback and the equality impact assessment.

Please note that all activity is per week per cluster, unless otherwise stated. As a reminder the city contains 6 cluster areas.

- 7.3. A full description of the final set of proposals is given following table 6. This description is set out in line with the key sections of the table, starting with buildings and then follows with sections on early childhood services, family support and interface with children's social care. Table 6 is also provided as a separate A3 sheet – see Appendix G – Final Service Proposals.

Table 6 – The early help service offer - final service proposals

(Please note that all activity is per week per cluster, unless otherwise stated. *Children, young people and families who meet eligibility criteria only, refer to Appendix D)

	(4) Current service offer	(5) Initial service proposals (pre consultation)	(6) Final service proposals pending a decision (post consultation)
Posts	300 full time equivalent (FTE)	172.5 FTE (dependent on staff org review outcome)	<u>185 FTE (depending on outcome of staff org review)</u>
Buildings	23	12 – (transfer/close remaining 11)	12 (transfer/close remaining 11)
Base Budget	£8,960,600	£4,960,600	<u>£5,460,600</u>
Saving	N/A	£4 million saving	<u>£3.5 million</u>
Early Childhood Services For children aged 0 - 5	Antenatal programmes x 1 Telephone Advice Point in each cluster (6) & 23 centres Stay & Play x 5 Toy & Book Library from 23 buildings Weekly parent engagement activity Annual events and 2 x activities per wk of school hols 2 x Volunteer/ community dev sessions 4 x Targeted EY Education & Development sessions 2 x Parenting groups 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 x Crèches to support overall delivery Home learning service Children Centre Teacher service Welfare rights Service Bookstart service Early Help co-located with the Healthy Child Prog. Adult & Family Learning provided from centres	Antenatal programmes x 1 One telephone advice point for the city & access through the centres Stay & Play x 2 Toy & Book Library from 12 buildings Fortnightly parent engagement activity Annual events & 1 x week school hol for ages 0–8 1 x Volunteer and community dev session 3 x Targeted EY Educ. & Development sessions* 1 x Parenting groups* 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 x Crèches to support overall delivery Cease Home learning service Cease Children Centre Teacher Service Cease Welfare rights service Cease Bookstart service Early Help co-located with the Health Child Prog. Adult & Family Learning provided from centres	Antenatal programmes x 1 One telephone advice point & face to face access through the 12 centres Stay & Play x 2 <u>co delivered with HCP and flexibility to deliver 3 sessions</u> Toy & Book Library from 12 buildings <u>Parent engagement in decision making delivered as part of everyday practice</u> Annual events and 1 x activity per week of school hols for <u>ages 0 – 12</u> <u>Volunteering and community projects delivered by citywide team</u> 3 Targeted sessions* <u>with flexibility to deliver 3rd session as Stay and Play</u> 1 x Parenting group* 1 x Domestic Violence support group 3 crèches to support overall delivery Cease Home Learning service <u>Children Centre Teachers service funded until April 2018 initially</u> <u>Reduce funding to Welfare Rights Service by 40% *</u> <u>Bookstart service will continue - funded by alternative source</u> Early Help co-located with the Health Child Programme Adult & Family Learning provided from centres
Whole Family Working	Advice Point as above 14 x FTE Traded Family Support Family Support service Early Help Response Team £1.1 million grant - Adventure Playgrounds (AP) Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes focused on teenagers	Advice Point as above 14 x FTE Traded Family Support Family Support service * Early Help Response Team & one central telephone Advice Point 50% tapered reduction to AP's by 2020 & potential transfer of buildings Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes focused on teenagers	Advice Point as above <u>Citywide Traded Family Support (14 FTE) that is not restricted by criteria</u> Family Support service* Early Help Response Team & one central telephone Advice Point <u>Further analysis to be undertaken before decision on reductions taken.</u> Multi agency workforce development 9 x Parenting programmes <u>responding to need and demand</u>
Interface with Social Care	Step down of cases from social care to Early Help Joint casework incl. single assessments Short term response and crisis support Weekly surgeries for social workers	Reduced capacity: Step down of cases to EH Reduced capacity: joint casework Reduced capacity: Short term response and crisis support	<u>Step down of cases from social care to Early Help</u> <u>Development of EH Partnership Allocations Hub for Early Help Assessments</u> <u>Cease joint work on social care cases apart from joint work with single assessment team as part of step down process</u> <u>Edge of care response as part of overall delivery model above</u> <u>One telephone number and route to access EH and SC</u>

Buildings

- 7.4. Mapping work was undertaken to inform the proposals to assess which centres were the most utilised. Reviewing updated data, this has not changed. In addition, from the 441 respondents to this individual proposal, 30% solely walk to centres with other respondents using public transport or their own transport.
- 7.5. Consultation feedback highlighted the importance of retaining a local presence to ensure easy access for local communities. Where services no longer operate from buildings within a local area, opportunities will be explored to deliver services from other community buildings such as libraries and community centres.
- 7.6. The final proposal is to retain twelve centres and transfer the remaining 11 centres to alternative providers as outlined in the table 7 below.

Table 7: Children, Young People and Families centres – final proposals

Clusters	Retain as a designated children centre providing a full range of early childhood services	Retain as a satellite centre providing <u>some</u> early childhood services	Phase 1: Transfer to alternative providers of early childhood services Phase 2: Closure and disposal of centres if phase 1 is not successful
North	Belgrave and Rushey Mead	Woodbridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northfields & West Humberstone • St Saviours
North West	Beaumont Leys and Stocking Farm	Bewcastle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avebury meadows
West	Braunstone	New Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braunstone Frith • Rowley Fields • West End
South	Eyres Monsell and Gilmorton	Saffron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lansdowne
Central	Highfields	St Matthews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Evington • Mayfield
East	Thurnby Lodge	Netherhall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton • Rowlatts Hill

- 7.7. It is proposed that the six designated centres providing the full range of childhood services will be predominately occupied by council staff from the early help service, co-located with staff from the Healthy Child Programme (HCP), based on a ratio of 10 people to 8 desks (a standard hot desking ratio). The satellite centres, which will provide some early childhood services will be predominantly occupied by staff from the HCP Service, with limited numbers of council staff based there. Discussions will take place with the HCP provider to make the arrangements for location of staff bases.
- 7.8. A number of internal service areas and non-council external service providers, including schools, expressed an interest through the consultation in taking over the ownership of the eleven centres proposed for transfer. If the proposed revised service offer is approved, work will commence to

explore these opportunities. Transfer and disposal will be a separate piece of work under the council's Using Buildings Better (UBB) programme. In the event that the proposal to transfer the 11 CYP&F Centre buildings to alternative providers is not viable, closure and disposal of the buildings is the alternative option, which may result in the Department of Education (DfE) clawing back capital grant funding.

- 7.9. Children's Services will lead on the transition of staff into the twelve retained centres and continue to provide vacant building costs until a resolution has been reached. This may impact on the ability to achieve the full savings outlined if the buildings remain empty. However it is anticipated that the transfer/potential disposal process will be completed by April 2018, which is in line with the timescales approved by the Executive
- 7.10. Work is progressing with property services, finance and legal services to determine the risk of capital clawback in relation to the proposals to transfer some of Leicester's CYP&F Centre buildings to alternative providers of early childhood services as outlined in table 7. This work is ongoing and involves collating information on the grants the Council received in relation to all its current 23 children centre buildings. Financial information currently available suggests that the maximum value of capital clawback may be in the region of £5.5M in relation to the 11 buildings proposed for transfer to alternative providers and disposal. The figure of £5.5M is a provisional figure and requires verification with the DfE. Initial legal advice received is that there is a risk of revenue and capital clawback in relation to making proposals to change the use of a building funded by the Sure Start capital grants, but that there are a number of options open to the council to mitigate against and reduce the risk of clawback.

Childhood Services

- 7.11. The council will continue to fulfil its statutory requirement to ensure there is a **sufficient children centre offer** through the delivery of early childhood services from 12 centres, geographically located across the city. There will be a reduced universal offer as outlined in table 6 (page 18) for any child up to their 5th birthday, with some services provided for children aged 0 – 12. Additionally, the externally provided Healthy Child Programme (HCP covers school nursing and health visiting) and Adult Learning Service will deliver a universal offer.
- 7.12. The **HCP** will co-deliver stay and play provision with council staff to enable increased numbers of families to access provision, enabling a gateway for identifying children who could benefit from targeted interventions.
- 7.13. The proposal is that there will no longer be a **home learning service** where practitioners provide one to one support for families with young children to improve early years outcomes e.g. attachment, school readiness and behaviour. However, the HCP will continue to provide direct support to families with young children as part of the 4 universal levels of service they provide which covers similar themes to the current home learning service offered by the council.
- 7.14. The proposal is that **groupwork and one to one support** as outlined on table 6 will be for children from families identified on Early Help Targeted's 'Priority Children's List' (PCL), see [Appendix D](#). By focusing our services on families most in need, we would engage the right families to improve outcomes that also contribute to the council's corporate objectives and priorities. Crèches will continue to be provided to enable parents to engage in these courses.
- 7.15. The proposal is to provide one citywide **telephone advice point** where all families can access information, signposting and short term support (up to 2 interventions). Families would also access the Advice Point directly through any of the twelve centres to access support.
- 7.16. The **Children Centre Teachers (CCT)** service is funded until at least April 2018 from the Dedicated Schools Grant. It will become more aligned to the proposed new early help service offer to meet the service and corporate objectives. The CCT's will also continue to have a role in

supporting early year's education providers to improve outcomes for children as part of the council's 'Raising Achievement' service objectives.

- 7.17. The proposal is to continue **participation of children and parents in decision making** as part of everyday practice, through the various mechanisms used by staff to influence service improvement. Although bespoke resources will be reduced, there will continue to be a dedicated role for community development, volunteering and consultation.

Options are being explored separately to early help remodelling to merge the reduced number of participation roles within different children's services into one citywide participation team. This will reduce duplication and develop a stronger infrastructure for participation and engagement work. If this option is not viable, the reduced bespoke participation role will continue within the Early Help Targeted service.

Family Support

- 7.18. The council receives government funding to deliver a local **Troubled Families service** (TF). The primary objective is to work with 3,940 identified families by April 2020 using a 'payments by results' model to achieve progress as outlined within the council's 'Families Outcomes Plan' Practitioners will no longer provide support for families who are not identified as 'Troubled Families' (i.e. meet two out of six troubled family criteria) thereby focusing on families who are most in need of support, (Refer to Appendix E – Leicester City Families Outcomes Plan). This plan is in the process of being refreshed by the Early Help Strategic Partnership Board.
- 7.19. The proposal is that **groupwork and one to one support** as outlined on table 6 will be for children from families identified from the Troubled Families criteria only. By focusing our services for families most in need, we would engage the right families to improve outcomes that also contribute to the council's corporate objectives and priorities and the national requirements for the TF programme. Crèches will continue to be provided to enable parents to engage in groupwork.
- 7.20. The proposal is to provide one citywide **telephone advice point** where all families can access information, signposting and short term support (up to 2 interventions). Families would also access the Advice Point directly through any of the twelve centres to access support as outlined above.
- 7.21. There will be one front door response and telephone number for anyone requesting council early help or social care services. In addition, as part of a refreshed early help pathway, a partnership allocations hub is being developed to triage and allocate early help assessments (complex issues below the threshold for social care requiring multi-agency involvement) to the most appropriate service. Whilst the council will facilitate this hub, it will be an equal partner undertaking early help assessments that are within the remit of the new service and will no longer take a leading role in this work.
- 7.22. The proposal is that there will continue to be a **traded family support service** that schools can purchase for their students and their families only. Whilst the service will be managed by the council, schools will influence the type of work undertaken to meet the needs of their students. The traded service will not be restricted to work with families identified as 'TF' only.
- 7.23. The proposal is that there will continue to be an **Early Help Response team (EHRT)** as part of the one front door response. It will operate at a reduced capacity and will triage all requests for early help services and progress requests through to the allocations hub. The EHRT will develop its multi-agency response by co-locating with the police, mental health and early year's health professionals. They will also provide the interface between council early help services and children's social care (refer to Interface with children's social care below – 7.24 onwards for more details).

Interface with children's social care

- 7.24. In addition to 7.18 to 7.23 the Early Help Response team will continue to support the single assessment team with **joint work** as part of the assessment process and potential **step down of cases to early help services**.
- 7.25. The proposal is that due to reduced capacity, the council's early help service will no longer be able to jointly work on **child in need, child protection and looked after children** cases that are open to social care, but will only take cases that are 'stepped down' (i.e. families no longer require statutory social care intervention but still require support to prevent escalation). As one of the six criteria for troubled families are children subject to social care intervention, this falls within the new parameters of the service alongside the PCL. The Early Help Response team would no longer attend initial social care conferences but would attend where 'step down' of a family's case is being considered.
- 7.26. In addition, the early help service will strengthen their contribution to an 'edge of care response' to prevent children and young people coming into care in a number of ways as part of the overall service offer as follows:
- Locate and expand the family group conferencing (FGC) service within early help to provide specialist mediation and resilience planning for families with children identified as at risk of coming into care. Alongside this, specialist workers will upskill early help and social care staff to embed FGC principles within their work to create a sustainable support model.
 - The proposal is to expand the remit of the multi-agency support panel (MASP) to provide advice and resources for any case across early help and social care that is stuck, high cost and escalating with an interface with the resource and placement panel for children's social care.
 - The proposal is to explore utilising Troubled Families payments by results funding to spot purchase short term specialist resources for families within the early help threshold but identified as edge of care.

Commissioned Services

- 7.27. **Parenting Programmes** - the proposal is to continue to commission external specialist parenting programmes from an external non-council provider. However, the current contract is being reviewed to respond to other presenting needs from families e.g. lower level mental health issues.
- 7.28. **Workforce Development** – the proposal is to continue to commission multi-agency information sharing and joint training opportunities from an external non-council provider.
- 7.29. **Bookstart** – the proposal is to no longer annually commission the internal council provided Bookstart Service. Discussions have taken place with the provider of Bookstart and they have informed us that in advance of a decision being made, they have explored alternative options and secured funding from the Schools Forum (Dedicated Schools Grant utilising the Early Years block) until April 2018 when it will be reviewed alongside all funded provision. The Bookstart service will continue to operate from Children, Young People and Family (CYPF) Centres. In addition, children will be able to access resources through the toy and book library and be supported with school readiness through the universal and targeted provision (e.g.) stay and play and groupwork) that will still be in place. The current relationship with libraries will be strengthened to ensure families are aware of alternative initiatives with which they can engage.
- 7.30. **Welfare Rights** – the proposal is to continue to provide a welfare rights service through the CYP&F centres, but at a reduced level to only support families who meet the criteria to access the council's early help services. The Welfare Rights service has submitted a proposal to reduce their services providing appointments from 6 – 8 centres rather than the current 11 centres. It is recommended that this is considered as part of the commissioning of future welfare rights support.

7.31. **Adventure Playgrounds (AP's)** – after reviewing consultation feedback and discussions with providers of adventure play concerning the impact of the initial proposal, the final recommended proposal is as follows:

- a) The council's Service Analysis Team will conduct a full analysis of the services that the AP's provide under the conditions of their current grant agreements. The Council's Service Analysis Team will work with the AP's to undertake an assessment of impact which will enable the council to make a more informed decision about the future funding of the Adventure Playgrounds. This work will start in March 17 concluding in September 17. The outcome of this may influence future funding from April 2018.
- b) One of the ten adventure play providers (Belgrave Playhouse) has submitted a proposal requesting the council commits the same amount of funding until September 2018, when it has elected to end service delivery. The circumstances of this proposal are not related to the early help remodelling project or the proposal to reduce grant funding. The intention is to use the sale of the assets to fund staffing costs and transfer any remaining capital and revenue resources to alternative local providers of community services.

Key risks, impact and mitigation

7.32. Table 8 below presents the key risks, impact and mitigation concerning the implementation of the final proposals outlined above– these go to make up a revised '**Model B**'. Table 8 should be read in conjunction with the findings of the consultation (refer to [Appendix H](#)) and the equality impact assessment (refer to [Appendix I – Equality Impact Assessment](#)).

Table 8: 'Revised Model B' - key risks, impact and mitigation

	Proposal	Risks and Impact	Mitigation
1	Troubled Families funding is likely to cease from April 2020	<p>1. This will result in a loss of income of £1.6 million annually which may lead to another organisational review and the termination of the Family Support service.</p> <p>2. Not being able to meet national Troubled Families requirements or secure payments by results.</p>	<p>1. Work has begun to determine cost benefit analysis for the council and partners developing a business case to secure continuation funding to fund this area of work from 2020.</p> <p>2. Profiling work based on current level of intervention, TF work alone would require 88 FTE posts with a caseload of 36 at any one time for a period of 9 months. Current mechanisms have been reviewed with services reconfigured to maximise impact.</p> <p>3. Development of partnership allocations hub to implement a partnership response to leading Early Help Assessment casework.</p> <p>4. There will be a dedicated focus on securing payments by results, evidencing the impact of TF work, innovation and partnership work which will be monitored through the Early Help Strategic Partnership Board and Children's Trust.</p>
2	Healthy Child Programme contract term is until April 2020.	<p>1. If HCP does not continue to be co-located in CYPF Centres from April 2020, this will result in the potential closure of 6 out of 12 buildings..</p> <p>2. There will be a further reduction of admin and premises staff due to the reduction of buildings</p>	<p>1. The current contract term is 3 years with an option to extend for a further year.</p> <p>2. The Head of Service is a member of the HCP board and will ensure this arrangement is closely monitored.</p> <p>3. Work will be undertaken to explore opportunities for co-location of other services to generate income</p>
3	Cease Home Learning service	<p>1. Ceasing of service may lead to a reduction of the right families being targeted to access services that will prevent escalation of issues and impact on school readiness and child development.</p>	<p>1. Development of one pathway with the Healthy Child Programme (HCP) will ensure reduction of duplication, improved info sharing and joint working to target the right families for support.</p> <p>2. Agreed that HCP will undertake home learning as phase one and this service will deliver phase 2 with a pathway to access targeted groups if required.</p>
4	Reduce funding for the Welfare Rights service	<p>1. Members of the public who are not eligible to access the early help service will not be able to access debt and welfare rights support via CYPF' Centres, which may lead to escalation of issues.</p>	<p>1. Use of communication and promotional materials to publicise alternative provision.</p> <p>2. Embed principles of channel shift and Family Information Directory to ensure signposting information is accessible and publicised.</p>

Table 8 continued

	Proposal	Risks and Impact	Mitigation
5	Funding for the Bookstart Service may cease from April 2018.	1. Children may not be able to access free resources and targeted interventions to improve school readiness from the centres and have to travel elsewhere.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Schools Forum has approved full funding using the Early Years Block until April 2018 where it will be reviewed. In the interim, Bookstart and Early Help services will work closely together to develop robust evidence to secure future funding. 2. Children will still be able to access resources and interventions to support targeted reading and school readiness. 3. Use of communication and promotional materials to publicise alternative provision accessed through library services. 4. Embed principles of channel shift and Family Information Directory to ensure signposting information is accessible and publicised.
6	Further analysis may lead to a recurring grant reduction for Adventure Playgrounds.	1. Adventure Playgrounds may not be able to continue in their current format with reduced revenue funding from the council.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council's Service Analysis Team will undertake a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the use of the grant, which may inform future funding. 2. Development of strategic Play Commission will invest in embedding good principles for play across all services operating throughout the city. 3. Play Development Officer role will continue to provide dedicated support for AP's to develop a sustainable business model with income generation and good quality practice. 4. Explore opportunities to develop Community Asset Transfer and long term lease arrangements for land and buildings occupied by the AP's.
7	Reduction of frontline practitioner role.	1. Reduction of universal services, ceasing joint work with social care and only working with families who meet specific may lead to issues escalating for families and increased referrals to social care.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Six monthly review of Equality Impact Assessment. 2. Review and refine eligibility criteria to ensure the right families are supported. 3. Review capacity on a regular basis to inform trends and future planning and service delivery. 4. Co delivery of stay and play provision with providers of the Healthy Child Programme to maximise reach of families and access to early years health professionals. 5. Development of partnership allocations hub to implement a partnership response to leading Early Help Assessment casework. 6. Reconfigure services to maximise reach and impact. 7. Embed principles of channel shift and Family Information Directory to ensure signposting information is accessible and publicised 8. Investment in early help and social care workforce development to upskill workers with evidenced based tools to improve direct work with children and families.

Table 8 continued

	Proposal	Risks and Impact	Mitigation
9.	Reduction of opportunities for parents to engage with volunteering and other activities.	1. Some parents are unable to access opportunities that will increase employability.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Options are being explored to merge the reduced number of participation roles within different children's services into one citywide participation team. This will reduce duplication and develop a stronger infrastructure for participation and engagement work. Embed principles of channel shift and Family Information Directory to ensure signposting information is accessible and publicised. The service will seek to connect existing local volunteers who are unable to travel to other centres with other organisations in the local area. Closer integration with partners Inc. the Early Help Locality Partnerships to explore opportunities for joint community projects.
10.	Services no longer operate from buildings within local communities.	1. Some families are unable to access services due to not operating from buildings within their communities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities are being explored to deliver some activities from other buildings within localities such as community centres, schools and libraries. Opportunities will be explored to transfer buildings that we do not operate services from to other providers who deliver <u>some</u> similar services to benefit young children and their families.
11.	Reduction of a 'Children Centre' offer	1. The offer may not be compliant with statutory requirements to deliver a sufficient children centre offer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive work has been undertaken to benchmark Leicester's offer with other similar authorities, which have informed the proposal. Children Centre services have been prioritised with a lesser reduction compared to other directly delivered council services. There will be a full children centre offer operating from 6 centres, (1 per cluster) with some services delivered from 6 centres equating to 2 centres per cluster. Health Visitors will be collocated in each of the centres with opportunities explored to co locate with other services. Services benefitting families will still continue to operate across these centres such as Bookstart, Welfare Rights and community groups.

7.33. We believe that with the substantial mitigation presented in table 8 above, the final proposals that go to make up the revised Model B provide a sufficient council early help offer (which incorporates children centre delivery) to ensure Leicester's most vulnerable children, young people and families are able to access support from the council, when required, to prevent issues from escalating. This service will require a key focus on integrated working with our internal service areas and external partners. This service will enable the council to meet its statutory requirements for the delivery of early childhood services through the CYP&F Centres, achieve the national outputs for the Troubled Families programme and contribute towards the Ofsted improvement plan for Children's Social Care and the reduction of children requiring high cost statutory social care interventions.

Implementation

- 7.34. The early help targeted service proposes to continue to provide a timely and flexible response to local need, subject to the proposed budget and staffing reductions highlighted in this report. To support the implementation of a new service, a group of managers from this service area has been working through the initial service proposals (i.e. Model B) presented in the consultation to design a draft delivery model. This is considered good practice to support implementation and enable a smooth transition. The draft delivery model and implementation plan will be presented in the business case and subject to a staff consultation as part of the staff organisational review expected to start in April 2017.
- 7.35. Table 9 below outlines the draft implementation timetable based on Executive's consideration of this report and subject to endorsement of the revised Model B during early March 2017

Table 9 – Draft implementation timetable

Proposed stage	Time line
Staff organisational review (consultation starts)	April 2017
Staff organisational review (consultation ends)	June 2017
Phased implementation of the new service	September 2017 to March 2018
Transfer/disposal of children centre buildings	April 2017 to March 2018

8. Key financial risk and sustainability

- 8.1. The key risk associated with the revised Model B is the short term funding of the Healthy Child Programme (HCP) (£800k) and the Troubled Families Grant (£1.6m), which **total £2.4 million annually until April 2020**.
- 8.2. Additionally, income received from Public Health's budget in relation to the funds allocated to accommodating the HCP is only for the lifetime of the contract with the successful tenderer of this service. The maximum contract term is 3 years plus provision for an additional 1 year extension, **which covers the period from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2021**.
- 8.3. Whilst the future of the Troubled Families Grant is unknown at this stage, there is a greater emphasis from the Department for Communities and Local Government **on developing a sustainable model** through embedding the Troubled Families programme within existing early help delivery models.
- 8.4. **To ensure that the remodelled Early Help Targeted service is sustainable**, a separate piece of work will be undertaken to develop a business case, expanding the cost calculator model. This will be used to provide the Council's partners with evidence of the impact of early help services on improving outcomes for families and reducing the need for the more intensive high cost services that partners provide. It is envisaged that this evidence could result in partners committing financial investment to early help services. This will also apply to council services where the impact of early help has led to families achieving improved outcomes and/or a reduction of families requiring interventions, e.g. Children's Social Care.
- 8.5. As part of the Council's transformation work, joint commissioning and pooled budgets/resources will become a key focus in developing a more integrated multi agency children's workforce. This will also include continuing with the current practice of sourcing alternative funding through innovation work and grant funded programmes.
- 8.6. If the resilience and sustainability work outlined above is not successful there is a risk that further reductions of council early help services is required post 2020, therefore it is essential that the commitment to developing an **early partnership response** through the Children's Trust, and the

commitment to upskill the whole children's workforce, both remain a high priority.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1. As outlined within this report, the current delivery model needs to change to ensure that the council can provide services for those families most in need. The budgetary pressures together with the need to focus our resources on children subject to a statutory social care intervention means that the current offer of discretionary support and help based on universal provision is no longer tenable. Leicester is not in isolation in facing this type of challenge; most other local authorities have already or are in the process of reshaping their early help services.
- 9.2. It is clear from the 2013 statutory guidance that '*Children Centres are as much about making appropriate and integrated services available as it is about providing premises in geographical areas*'.¹⁴ With this in mind, there is a need to consider both the retention of some buildings but to develop the model to deliver support beyond buildings to reach the families in most need.
- 9.3. The key risk of remodelling is that the Education and Children's Service will not be able to provide a sufficient early help offer, including the provision of statutory early childhood services, to ensure Leicester's most vulnerable children, young people and families are able to access support when required to prevent issues from escalating. We initially developed three models of service delivery (i.e. Model A, Model B and Model C), where the risk was lowest for Model A and highest for Model C.
- 9.4. Following on from this work we have consulted on a preferred option, 'Model B' and undertaken work to assess the risks associated with this model. As a result of consultation feedback and our assessment of impact on our public sector equality duties, a revised and sufficient model including mitigation against associated risks has been produced for consideration and approval.
- 9.5. The reshaping of Leicester's children centre provision is taking place at a time when the future priorities for children centres are under review. Our most recent information is that the Government's commitment to its Life Chances Strategy, which was to feature a consultation on children centres, has now been dropped. The DfE has reported that it is considering the future direction for children centres and will provide further details in due course. The DfE has confirmed that the children's centre consultation is still going ahead and is likely to be launched early in 2017.¹⁵ Given this development there is a risk that the 'revised Model B' proposed for implementation in this report may not be wholly fit for purpose to be able to deliver the government's strategy for children centres. It is difficult to assess the level of risk at this stage given the lack of information currently available concerning the government's proposals for children centres.

10. Details of Scrutiny

10.1 Report was received on 6 Mar 17. Scrutiny members supported proposals and commented that they were well considered and reflective of the consultation responses. Whilst there are concerns about the level of budget reduction and the impact this will have, it was noted that there is a comprehensive equality impact assessment in place with mitigation against key risk, however some risks are unknown. As part of the monitoring process, Scrutiny members have asked for an update to be provided six months after implementation (approx. April 2018)

¹⁴ DfE Short Guide for Local Authorities 2016 (available from the Early Help Targeted Service)

¹⁵ Puffett, N. 'DfE commits to children's centres consultation', in Children and Young People Now, 03 January 2017. Available here: <http://www.cypnow.co.uk/cyp/news/2002933/dfe-commits-to-childrens-centres-consultation>

11. Financial, legal and other implications

Financial implications

Financial implications

The budgets for the current and proposed service are detailed in Appendix F. Of the £5m spending review target for Education and Children's Services, £4m was earmarked for the Early Help and Children's centre review. The proposals outlined in the report will only save £3.5m leaving a shortfall of £0.5m to be found elsewhere in the department. A review of Adventure Playgrounds is now being undertaken separately.

As outlined in section 8 above, the new arrangements rely on income totalling £2.4m from two separate funding streams. The first stream is £800k from the HCP provider who will be paying for co location space in the children's centres from July 2017. The second stream is the phase 2 Troubled Families grant income of £1.6m which pays for programme infrastructure costs plus 21 of the proposed 66 Family Support workers. The £1.6m assumes payments by results of £0.4m at a success rate of 50% which is significantly higher than recent figures.

As a result there are financial risks associated with the proposals which will need to be closely monitored.

The separate funding for the children's centre teachers, training and Bookstart service comes from the Early Year's block of the DSG. This funding has to be approved on an annual basis by Schools Forum and has been agreed for 2017/18.

Sure Start capital grants totalling £5.5m were used to fund the build/refurbishment of those children's centres which are to be transferred to alternative providers under all of the proposed options. Clawback of funding is triggered where the buildings are either disposed of or no longer used to meet the aims and objectives consistent with the original grant. The clawback is based on the market value obtained from the disposal of the building, proportionate to the level of the DfE's grant contribution to the original cost of the building. The detail of how this would work where a building has been refurbished to create the centre rather than a new build is not clear. The extent of any clawback remains uncertain and will depend on the ultimate use of the centres disposed of.

Martin Judson, Head of Finance

Legal implications

Contracts and General

The Council has endeavoured to undertake a meaningful consultation process and any risk of challenge arising from the process followed has been assessed as low by legal services.

It is noted that the Council proposes to amend its original proposals to reflect the results of the consultation process. The Council will not need to re-consult on the amended proposals so long as the factors leading to the change in stance were discussed during the consultation.

Whilst legal services feel that the consultation process accords with the requirements of the Best Value Statutory Guidance, the Council must ensure that affected providers and stakeholders are provided with at least three months' notice of any contract termination or funding reduction. Legal services can advise in relation to this.

Legal services have previously provided advice in relation to risk of revenue and capital claw back that could arise as a result of the proposals contained within this report.

The Council is reminded of the following:

(i) the obligation to consult the Secretary of State in relation to any proposals to dispose of, change

use of, or transfer ownership of funded assets. The Secretary of State should be consulted at least three months prior to the proposed date of transfer. A failure to consult could be deemed a breach of the funding consultations and could result in clawback.

(ii) the risk of claw back arising from the sale, transfer, change of use or disposal of a funded asset. To mitigate the risk of claw back, the Council would need to convince the Secretary of State that the funded assets at risk of disposal or change of use, will continue to be used for similar purposes.

As outlined in paragraph 7.10 of this report, further and on-going legal advice should be taken to determine the precise risk of funding clawback and measures to mitigate such risk.

Subject to the Council approving the recommendations contained within this report, further and ongoing legal advice should be taken as appropriate including in relation to the proposed termination of contract and/or reduction of funding (including variations to funding terms).

Nilesh Tanna, Solicitor (Commercial, Property and Planning) Extension 371434

Employment Legal Implications

The revised proposed Model B outlines substantial changes to the current staffing establishment in terms of indicative job roles and staff numbers. The Council's Organisational Review Policy should be followed. There is the potential that the organisational review may include redundancies and again the Council's policy should be complied with.

The collective consultation obligations under Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consultation) Act 1992 (TULCRA) are likely to apply and the consultation and notification obligations would need to be complied with. Further HR and legal advice should be sought as matters progress.

Consideration will need to be given to the application of TUPE. There are a number of services included in the scope of the report and it is not clear whether any of these services are currently provided by an external supplier or if any external procurement will be required. Each service will be fact sensitive and it may be possible for the TUPE Regulations to apply.

It is recommended that further advice is sought in order that the Council complies with its legal employment obligations.

Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

The revised proposals in Model B, to consolidate CYPF centres from 23 to 12, will have implications for addressing climate change. The transfer/disposal of 11 CYPF centres will result in a reduction in the Council's operational carbon footprint. The level of reduction will depend on the number of buildings transferred to outside organisations, and whether any are transferred to other services within the Council. If all 11 are transferred outside the Council, the estimated reduction to the Council's carbon footprint will be 147 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year. This equates to 0.5% of the current emissions from the LCC property portfolio. It should be noted that there will be no impact on the city-wide carbon footprint for Leicester from the transfers/disposals, assuming that the buildings transferred or disposed of continue to be actively used.

Finally, the proposed reduction in the number of remaining CYPF centres may have an impact on travel by the public to access services. Any increase in car travel would add slightly to city-wide carbon emissions.

Duncan Bell

Senior Environmental Consultant
Environment Team, Leicester City Council

Equalities Implications

Our Public Sector Equality Duty requires decision makers to be clear as to the impact of proposals under consideration on those affected by them, and where there are likely to be negative impacts, to present mitigating actions that reduce or remove those impacts. The report and the accompanying EIA set out the proposed changes to early years' service delivery and how these changes will affect current service users. The major change has been the reduction of universal services available across the city and the service focus on targeted priority families and children in keeping with statutory requirements and the council's strategic priorities.

The EIA identifies age, gender, and ethnicity and in some cases disability as the main relevant protected characteristics and how service users with these protected characteristics could be negatively affected. Mitigating actions have been identified that aim to remove or reduce any negative impacts and these are identified in the report. These mitigating actions need to include future monitoring/analysis of the relevant protected characteristics of the groups affected which some centres are already and that others need to undertake.

The organisational review which is to start in April of this year needs to ensure that an EIA is completed on this as part of the appendix R process, any issues highlighted and mitigating actions identified.

Sukhi Biring
Equalities Officer
Corporate Equalities Team

12. Background information and other papers:

Key council reports

- a) Leicester's 0-5 Strategy 2016-19
- b) Executive Briefing: Health Child Programme, March 2016
- c) The Future of Local Authority Maintained Pre-Schools in Leicester – An Options Report, 7th April 2016, report 667
- d) Colocation Charges in Children's Services Buildings, 26th May 16

Key reports

- a) Early Intervention: the next steps, 2011. Available here:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/284086/early-intervention-next-steps2.pdf

Legislation and statutory guidance

- a) Working Together to Safeguard Children, 2015. Available here:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-safeguard-children--2>
- b) Sure Start Statutory Guidance 2013. Available here:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sure-start-childrens-centres>
- c) Childcare Act 2006. Available here:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/21/contents>

13. Summary of appendices:

Appendix reference	Appendix title
A	Commissioned Services
B	Statutory Requirements
C	Map of CYPF Centre buildings
D	Priority Children, Young People and Families List
E	Leicester City Families Outcomes Plan
F	Summary of Early Help Budget Proposals
G	Final Service Proposals
H	Consultation Analysis v.12 100117
I	Draft Equality impact assessment v.17
I1	Draft EIA Data – Age
I2	Draft EIA Data – Ethnicity

Is this a private report (If so, please indicated the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

Is this a “key decision”?

Yes

If a key decision please explain reason

If the proposals are approved, this will result in a key decision which will be of substantial public interest and result in the council making of savings which are significant having regard to the council’s budget for the targeted early help service.

The impact of this decision will be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in two or more wards in the City who currently use or would benefit from the Children Young People and Family Centre’s provision and the Adventure Playgrounds.

The savings achieved are in excess of £0.5m and will be a recurring saving of £3.5m from the council’s revenue budget.