

	<p>CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND SAFEGUARDING COMMITTEE</p> <p>6 June 2018</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>Children, Young People and Family Hubs 0-19 Programme – Full Business Case</p>
<p>Report of</p>	<p>Chairman of the Committee – Councillor David Longstaff</p>
<p>Wards</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p>Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Key</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix 1 Full Business Case Appendix 2 Case Study Appendix 3 Public Consultation Report Appendix 4 Equality Impact Assessment (Residents and Service Users)</p>
<p>Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Chris Munday, Strategic Director, Children and Young People Chris.Munday@Barnet.gov.uk Tina McElligott, Operational Director – Early Help & Children in Need of Help and Protection Tina.McElligott@Barnet.gov.uk</p>

Summary

This report seeks approval to change the way we organise and deliver the council's Early Help services to children, young people and families. Implementation of the recommendations will facilitate a single coordinated Early Help Offer delivered as an integrated partnership with a range of key stakeholders.

The integrated model and a revised staffing structure along with full cost recovery of traded services and a review of contracted services and SLA's will be delivered within budgets agreed in the mid-term financial strategy 2015-2020.

The reorganisation will not impact on the current levels of service delivery across the Borough; though services may be redirected to meet changing need and demographics over time.

The reorganisation includes utilising Children's Centres and Youth Centres to deliver locally accessible services to the community across the 0-19 age range. Current service delivery will continue, however we would look to develop additional services for times when the buildings are not in use (such as evenings and weekends in Children's Centres). The reorganisation would also see the family support aspects of the Children's Centre offer being delivered through the 0-19 hubs whilst early engagement and outreach would be delivered through the school-led Children's Centres which are part of the wider hub service.

Officers Recommendations

That the Committee approves the reorganisation of the Council's Early Help Services. Specifically:

- 1. Formalise arrangements trialled in the pilot phase establishing multi-agency panels in each locality to review complex cases for Early Help and taking a partnership based approach to the delivery of a package of interventions**
- 2. Reconfiguration of Council staff into hub teams with no reduction in front line staffing**
- 3. Change use of Children's Centre and Youth Centre buildings to deliver an integrated 0-19 offer in local communities**
- 4. Commission school led Children's Centres to deliver universal and universal plus services to support continued early engagement antenatally/postnatally and the provision of structured outreach programmes of activity to ensure access to early education and health services. To deliver the Family Support element of Children's Centre services by the local Early Help Service teams to ensure a unified and consistent approach to delivery.**
- 5. Deliver traded non-statutory services at full cost recovery**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 Family Services vision is to ensure that all children and young people in Barnet, especially our most vulnerable children, achieve the best possible outcomes. To enable them to become successful adults, they should be supported by high quality, integrated and inclusive services that identify additional support needs early and are accessible, responsive and affordable for the individual child and their family.
- 1.2 One of our key areas of work to support this vision is to ensure a whole family approach to early intervention and prevention. This report proposes changes to the way we organise and deliver council Early Help Services to children, young people and their families and will help us to achieve our vision. It builds upon:
- a review of best practice from Family Services in other parts of the country
 - a pilot model developed in partnership with other organisations who also deliver early help and support services to Barnet families
 - outputs from a public consultation conducted 1 February to 27 March 2018
 - Recommendations from Ofsted Single Inspection, July 2017
 - The Outline Business Case approved by CELs approved at its meeting in January 2018.
- 1.3 The proposed approach which is primarily aimed at service improvement will also address budget efficiencies previously agreed in the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015-2020.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Challenge

- 2.1.1 There is a clear case for changes to the way in which we deliver Early Help Services. The challenge is that although Barnet has some good early help services in place, families and staff tell us that:
- Families often do not get the right help first time and can be referred to multiple agencies before they access the help they need. This leads to frustration and causes delays in families getting the support they need to prevent difficulties escalating.
 - As families' needs become more complex, or as they move around the system, the volume of professionals increases. This results in families having to tell their stories multiple times, and risks gaps in information, their story getting lost and a duplication of effort, with families having to attend multiple appointments at different times and venues.
 - Families often have children spread across pre-school, primary, secondary and post 16 age ranges. A singular focus on pre-birth, 0-5, 5-16 or post 16 services does not provide a whole family approach and unnecessarily involves too many layers of professionals with families that do not work effectively together.

- 2.1.2 This feedback is supported by observations from Ofsted within the July 2017 inspection report on services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers.

“There is a range of early help provision that is offering some good-quality support to children. However, the services operate independently and do not offer an integrated early help service that provides seamless support to families. This is recognised and work is underway to develop more integrated, locality-based services.”

[Barnet Ofsted, para 36, 7th July 2017]

“Strategically, there is further work to do to ensure that multi-agency service provision responds more appropriately to meet the needs of children. This includes the need to clarify pathways with all partners to strengthen and embed the early help offer across all services...”

[Barnet Ofsted, para 39, 7th July 2017]

2.2 The Pilot

- 2.2.1 The Children, Young People and Family hub programme has been piloting new ways of working in two of three localities in the borough: East Central launched September 2017 and West, launched Jan 2018. The South locality was recently launched in May 2018. See map on Page 5 of Appendix 1.

The pilot has focussed on supporting children and young people aged 0-19 and their families in need of Early Help. The pilot hubs have been doing this through:

- Informal co-location of staff from different organisations in the same location(s)
- Introduction of Multi Agency Panels in each locality to allocate a lead agency/professional and co-ordinate targeted support for individual families in need of Early Help. By end April 2018, c170 cases had been reviewed and allocated a package of support through a partnership based approach.
- Improving ways of working between organisations and different professional backgrounds through shared training and development activities.
- Reviewing our partnership offer in each locality, so it is delivered in the right places, to the right people, has the right impact and is communicated clearly to service users and practitioners.

2.3 The Benefits

- 2.3.1 The pilot has already had some positive effects:

- Schools have been central to developing the model, and have led the two pilots underway in East Central and West localities. Informally, school staff have reported that they are receiving a quicker and more comprehensive response to requests for support for families in need of a multi-agency response.
- Families have had a quicker and more comprehensive response within days of referral. This is due to swifter decision making, better information sharing

between professionals and a focus on putting the right lead professional and team in place around the family in an expedient way.

- Professionals from 8 organisations across health, education, early help, housing and employment have agreed to co-locate in two locations on either a full or part time basis. This will cut travel time for staff; foster a culture of more integrated working and make it simpler to access services because more of them will be based in the same place in local communities.
- School based pastoral/family support networks have been identified, and staff being supported across the locality to build knowledge and practice.
- Some gaps and duplications in service across the partnership are being identified via the needs discussed at the Early Help Multi Agency Panel and work of the Hub development groups.

2.3.2 Whilst it is still too early to look at longer term outcomes of the pilot upon the lives of children and families in need of Early Help services (owing to the fact most families are supported by early help services for an average of 9-12 months); there is anecdotal feedback on the 170 families that have been supported since the commencement of the pilot in September 2017. This is illustrated in the case study at Appendix 2. Feedback and perceptions of staff and partners has been largely positive; the new Early Help Panel approach is considered to be extremely effective in managing and wrapping around a broad range of needs because a coordinated package of support can be put in place from inception rather than different solutions being provided at staggered intervals over time.

2.4 Formalising the pilot to become “Business As Usual”

2.4.1 The pilot has demonstrated that reorganisation of services into a hub model supports integrated working across the partnership in order to provide the right service first time for children, young people and families. It is therefore proposed that we:

- Formalise arrangements trialled in the pilot by establishing multi-agency panels in each locality to review families who require multiple Early Help resources and taking a partnership based approach to the delivery of a package of solutions
- Reconfigure Council staff into hub teams with no reduction in front line staffing. This will result in reduction in posts (under 20) all of which will be management and support functions with no reduction in front line staff
- Change use of Children’s Centre and Youth Centre buildings to deliver an integrated 0-19 offer in local communities
- Commission school led Children’s Centres to deliver universal and universal plus services to support continued early engagement antenatally/postnatally and the provision of structured outreach programmes of activity to ensure access to early education and health services. To deliver the Family Support element of Children’s Centre services by the local Early Help Service teams to ensure a unified and consistent approach to delivery
- Deliver traded non-statutory services at full cost recovery. These services include:
 - Operation of the Finchley Youth Centre building
 - Operation of the Greentops Youth Centre building
 - The Duke of Edinburgh award facilitation service
 - Face to Face Counselling Service

- Alternative Education Service
- Child care Places at Newstead Children's Centre
- These improvements will also address budget efficiencies previously agreed in the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015-2020.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 Our recommendations are summarised below together with the alternative options and the reason why they are not recommended.

3.2 **Recommendation 1:** Formalise arrangements trialled in the pilot phase establishing multi-agency panels in each locality to review complex cases for Early Help and taking a partnership based approach to the delivery of a package of solutions.

3.3 **Alternative Option(s): No change.** This would be to revert to previous arrangements whereby referrals between agencies are via the MASH and then allocated to professionals via team managers. The professional then has to identify others that are working with the family to gather information and organise a team around the family meeting which can take between 4 and 6 weeks.

- Finding satisfactory solutions for families will take longer
- Problems are more likely to escalate requiring statutory interventions.
- Families will continue to repeat their stories and may experience being passed from agency to agency. This in turn could cause stress and consequently cause them to withdraw from seeking Early Help.
- Staff are less likely to improve their knowledge of other support available and it will be more difficult for them to forge effective partner relationships and identify the best team around the family and joined up approaches to problem solving.
- Families with special needs and more complex situations will not benefit from the full and comprehensive range of support available in early help
- Improved practices and outcomes for children will not be promoted or delivered.

3.4 **Recommendation 2:** Reconfigure Council staff into hub teams with no reduction in front line staffing.

3.5 **Alternative Option(s): No change:** We would retain staff in a main council building (currently North London Business Park) and keep Children's Centres and Youth centre buildings for sole use by children and young people of specific age groups.

- We would not achieve the desired integration of Council Early Help Services or integration with partner services
- We would not achieve our objective of making services more accessible and more locally delivered
- We would not achieve our objective of moving staff closer to the families they support

- Staff would not benefit from co location with partners which would build trusted relationships and improve knowledge of other services.
- Services would be at greater risk of cuts as savings will still need to be achieved.

3.6 Recommendation 3: Change use of Children's Centre and Youth Centre buildings to deliver an integrated 0-19 offer in local communities.

3.7 Alternative Option(s): Revert to previous model of operation before the pilot.

- This would not achieve the planned improvements
- Cost efficiencies would still need to be found.

3.8 Recommendation 4: Commission school led Children's Centres to deliver universal and universal plus services to support continued early engagement antenatally/postnatally and the provision of structured outreach programmes of activity to ensure access to early education and health services. To deliver the Family Support element of Children's Centre services by the local Early Help Service teams to ensure a unified and consistent approach to delivery.

3.9 Alternative Option(s): Continue with Children's Centre model where services are delivered through one of nine Children's Centre across twelve sites.

- Services remain siloed
- There is no whole family approach
- Families will need to access services and interventions for their children 0-19 from different settings
- No consistency in quality assurance/supervision in family and parenting support services
- Savings would be difficult to achieve.

3.10 Recommendation 5: Deliver traded non-statutory services at full cost recovery.

3.11 Alternative Option(s): Withdraw from delivery of these services and find alternative solutions. This would include:

- Explore alternative venues to Finchley and Greentops Youth Centres to deliver Youth Services and activities
- Source an alternative supplier to facilitate the Duke of Edinburgh Award service
- Use Kooth on line as an alternative to the school's face to face counselling service
- Source an alternative supplier to deliver the Alternative Education Service
- Source an alternative supplier to Newstead Children's centre to deliver Child care places.

- 3.12 Business plans to ensure the above services recover costs in 2018/19 are being developed. This will include increasing hire of venues and rooms to other organisations, improved housekeeping and introducing modest charges for some services. Thus, there is no financial driver for change. Furthermore, by withdrawing from these valued services we are less able to connect young people in need of support with other beneficial activities which could add value to their lives.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 A high level implementation plan has already been developed (See Full Business case at Appendix 1). Following approval of the recommendations in this report, further detail will be established and the plan implemented and a Project Implementation Document initiated.
- 4.2 The 0-19 CYPF Hubs Programme Board will continue to oversee implementation of the project.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The Children, Family and Young People 0-19 Hub Programme is part of the Family Friendly Barnet 2020 – ‘Children First’ Programme, which is improving services for children, young people and families in Barnet across a range of different areas.
- 5.1.2 This supports the following Council’s corporate priorities as expressed through the Corporate Plan for 2015-20 which sets out the vision and strategy for the next five years based on the core principles of fairness, responsibility and opportunity, to make sure Barnet is a place;
- Of opportunity, where people can further their quality of life
 - Where people are helped to help themselves, recognising that prevention is better than cure.

5.2 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

- 5.2.1 Efficiencies within the Early Years, Early Help and Youth Services are a key part of the medium term Financial Strategy for 2015-20. This project will further deliver savings of £1.483m of savings against its £1.471m target. Family Services have said they will meet their target savings of £0.944m in 2018/19 and £0.527m 2019/20.
- 5.2.2 Efficiency improvements will be achieved as follows:

Reduction in Children Centre Budget	£451,316
Break even traded services	£154,574
Management Savings	£434,367
Increased income through realignment of Early	£362,727

Years DSG	
Grant bid	£80,000
Total	£1,482,984

5.3 Social Value

- 5.3.1 The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2013 requires people who commission public services to think about how they can also secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits. Before commencing a procurement process, commissioners should think about whether the services they are going to buy, or the way they are going to buy them, could secure these benefits for their area or stakeholders.

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.4.1 Local authorities have a wide range of general and specific duties in relation to children and young people. The re-design of early help services will impact on a number of these duties. This section highlights the most relevant ones.
- 5.4.2 Under section 11 of the Children Act 2004, the Council and partner agencies must make arrangements for ensuring that their functions are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. This duty applies to all council functions and to all children in the local area, however it is particularly relevant in relation to services provided to families and children in need of support.
- 5.4.3 Under s.2B of the National Health Service Act 2006, the Council has a duty to take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area. Such steps include provision of services or facilities designed to promote healthy living and provision of information and advice. Having integrated and effective early help services for children and families support both of this overarching public health duty.
- 5.4.4 The Council has various duties in relation to pre-school and primary school aged children under the Childcare Act 2006.
- **Section 1** places a duty on the Council to improve the wellbeing of children aged 0-5 and to reduce inequalities between them.
 - **Section 3** requires the Council to ensure that early childhood services are provided in an integrated manner, in order to facilitate access to maximise the benefit to young children and their parents.
 - **Section 4** places a duty on relevant partner agencies to work with the local authority to improve wellbeing and secure integrated childhood services.
 - **Section 5A** requires the Council to secure, so far as reasonably practicable, sufficient children's centres in its area to meet local need.
 - **Section 5D** requires the Council to consult on any significant changes made to children's centre provision within the local area.

- 5.4.5 The proposal involves changes to the use and way services are delivered in Children's Centres, and it involves a different approach potentially moving to services being provided in a more holistic way to families regardless of the age of the child. When considering this proposal, the Council must bear in mind that it retains specific duties in relation to young children, including a sufficiency duty in relation to children's centres. The consultation included focused questions on the proposals for future use of children's centre buildings.
- 5.4.6 In addition to its general welfare duties, the Council has a specific duty under s.507B of the Education Act 1996 to secure, so far as reasonably practicable, sufficient educational leisure-time activities and recreational leisure-time activities and facilities for the improvement of well-being of young people aged 13-19 years (up to 24 years for those with a learning difficulty or disability). The Council has a power to charge for activities provided in accordance with this section. In exercising this function, the Council must take steps to ascertain the views of young people about the need for such activities and facilities and secure that these views are taken into account. The consultation will include focused questions on the proposals for future use of the youth centres and services for young people. The consultation also engaged with a focus group in this age bracket.
- 5.4.7 The Council has a general duty under S.27 of the Children and Families Act 2014 to keep under review the educational, training and social care provision made in its area for children and young people who have special educational needs or a disability and must consider the extent to which this provision is sufficient to meet the educational, training and social care needs of these children and young people. This duty includes a requirement to consult prescribed persons, including relevant children and young people and their parents, schools, colleges, children's centres, early years providers and youth offending teams. The planned consultation included a focus group of parents from this target group and we wrote out to all Early Help Service Users who had used services between September and February. This included parents and carers of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.
- 5.4.8 When making decisions to change the way services are delivered, the Council must consider its public law duties, including the need to make its decision in a fair and transparent way. The Council should take account of all relevant information when making its decision, including in particular the results of consultation and the equality implications of the decision, as well as the statutory framework.
- 5.4.9 The Council's Constitution, Article 7 (Committees, Forums, Working Groups and Partnerships) sets out the Committee's responsibilities as all matters relating to children, schools and education.

5.5 Risk Management

- 5.5.1 Key risks and mitigating factors are outlined in the Full Business Case at Appendix 1 - Section 6.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 The 2010 Equality Act outlines the provisions of the Public-Sector Equalities Duty which requires Public Bodies to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
- foster good relations between people from different groups

5.6.2 The broad purpose of this duty is to integrate considerations of equality into day business and keep them under review in decision making, the design of policies and the delivery of services.

5.6.3 We have completed an Equalities Impact Assessment. See Appendix 4 – Residents and Service Users and this was used in the analysis of the Public Consultation – See report at Appendix 3. It is our conclusion that this project will not disadvantage any residents or service users with protected characteristics. Groups more likely to be affected by this proposal include children and young people, parents of such children and children and young people with disabilities and SEN. Some families are likely to benefit from the services being provided in a more localised and holistic way. There were some concerns raised in the consultation that are addressed in the consultation section at the section on Consultation and Engagement – paragraph 8 of this report.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

5.7.1 In July 2016, the Government published their Care Leavers' strategy *Keep on Caring* which outlined that the "... [the government] will introduce a set of corporate parenting principles that will require *all departments* within a local authority to recognise their role as corporate parents, encouraging them to look at the services and support that they provide through the lens of what a reasonable parent would do to support their own children.'

5.7.2 The corporate parenting principles set out seven principles that local authorities must have regard to when exercising their functions in relation to looked after children and young people, as follows:

1. to act in the best interests, and promote the physical and mental health and well-being, of those children and young people;
2. to encourage those children and young people to express their views, wishes and feelings;
3. to take into account the views, wishes and feelings of those children and young people;
4. to help those children and young people gain access to, and make the best use of, services provided by the local authority and its relevant partners;
5. to promote high aspirations, and seek to secure the best outcomes, for those children and young people;
6. for those children and young people to be safe, and for stability in their home lives, relationships and education or work; and;
7. to prepare those children and young people for adulthood and independent living.

5.7.3 In developing the organisation and delivery of Early Help Services and to ensure that Barnet has due regard to the Principles and improves on the delivery of corporate parenting to children in care and care leavers in Barnet, we:

- held a Public Consultation in February / March 2018
- have included the needs and wishes of children in care to ensure the services are relevant, accessible and of a high standard.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.8.1 Please also see Appendix 3 Public Consultation report.

5.8.2 Following the Outline Business Case submitted to CELs in January 2018, a public consultation was launched 1 February and closed 27 March 2018. Despite writing out to 1,100 service users, extensive advertising including posters, press releases and on-line banner advertising, responses were very low with just 153 respondents to the on-line questionnaire; attendance at public meetings was in single figures.

5.8.3 We consulted on 3 Proposals:

5.8.4 Proposal 1: Co-locate services for children, and young people of all ages so that they are accessible and delivered from more locations closer to the families they serve.

- 61% agreed with the proposal
- 21% disagreed, with almost half of these respondents stating a concern about the impact of the proposal on the quality of services, also a worry that children and young people using the same buildings could have safety issues given the differences in ages.
- Participants in focus groups who were parents/carers of children and young people with special needs acknowledged that the proposals aim to improve the quality of services but were concerned that relocation of services might be confusing for families and any requirement to attend different centres could cause distress for both parents/carers and children. (Para 1.8.7)
- Some Focus group participants thought some Children's Centres did not have the space to house more services and that they were sometimes at capacity with some sessions and activities oversubscribed. Some participants worried that if Children's Centres also provided Youth Centre services, there would be a safety risk and the facilities on offer would not be suitable for all age groups. (Para 1.8.6)
- Participants in favour of the proposal were positive that the use of buildings would be maximised and that co-locating services would be beneficial – particularly for those who have special needs. (Para 1.8.7)
- Some participants felt that the proposals would only work if the council invested in the relocation and training of staff and ensure there were adequate resources to support families effectively. (Para 1.8.9)

5.8.5 Comment on Public Consultation responses to Proposal 1

- Our proposal is to make buildings available for access and delivery of services to children of all ages. During school hours, the majority of users will be families with children aged 0-5 years and outside of school hours services to families with school aged children will be available. Similarly, Youth Centres that are used less during school hours can be expanded to provide services for families with younger children, or to provide space for parenting groups or other activities. The model aims to promote choice and improve access for a wider range of service users.
- The local authority has a comprehensive workforce development programme that will continue to evolve to meet the needs of the children's workforce as services develop in line with national research and best practice guidance. Staff will be provided with opportunities to further develop their repertoire of skills and knowledge alongside partner agencies to ensure a rich mix of expertise across each of the locality areas.

5.8.6 Proposal 2: Refocus and restructure professional staff to work with children and young people of all ages thus focusing on the needs of the whole family.

- (45%) of respondents supported the proposal
- Participants who were in favour of the proposal thought it would deliver efficiency in terms of cost savings and provide more joined-up services for families and a single point of contact would be beneficial. (Para 1.8.12)
- Participants opposed to the proposal (34%) thought that reducing the number of managers could have an adverse effect on the co-ordination of services, which could lead to a deterioration in service quality. (Para 1.8.12)
- Some Participants expressed concerns over possible loss of expertise but considered that if adequate training were provided the proposal could work. (Para 1.8.13)

5.8.7 Comment on Public Consultation responses to Proposal 2

- The public consultation raised a concern that the reduction in management posts would have an adverse effect on the co-ordination of services. The proposed service delivery model is co-located and managed under SMARTer management arrangements that aim to ensure services are well coordinated and seamless for families.
- A senior level post has been developed to oversee partnerships and engagement across the three localities and ensure skills are shared, learning is coordinated and resources are effectively distributed and targeted. A comprehensive workforce development programme will be implemented to support these aims.
- In the proposed model, Early Help quality and performance will be overseen by a dedicated senior level post who will support the use of locality data, service user feedback and multi-agency audits to continually review and effectiveness and quality of services. Information will be used to drive service improvements, learning and development.

5.8.8 Proposal 3: Reduce costs and / or increase charges or find alternative means for delivering non-statutory traded services.

Through the public consultation we asked for views on two options for each service:

- Option 1 - To recover costs through improved cost efficiencies or
- Option 2 – To find alternative means for service delivery.

Responses to options were as follows:

5.8.9 Greentops Youth Centre

Just over half (53%) of questionnaire respondents agreed with the option to recover costs for through paid use by other organisations. One in five (19%) said they disagreed. In comparison to the first option, a smaller proportion of questionnaire respondents (46%) said they agreed with the option to explore the use of other buildings to host youth activities. Three in ten (30%) disagreed with this option.

5.8.10 Finchley Youth Centre

Almost six in ten (57%) questionnaire respondents agreed with the option to recover costs for through paid use by other organisations. One in five (20%) said they disagreed. Again, in comparison to the first option a smaller proportion of respondents (44%) agreed with the option to explore the use of other buildings to host Youth activities. A similar proportion (43%) disagreed with this option.

5.8.11 Focus group participants mostly agreed that the option to recover costs for the Youth Centres through paid use by other organisations would generate much needed income. Participants reflected that this would maximise use of the buildings outside of their usual operating hours and thought that space to rent was in high demand in the area. (Para 1.8.20) Some participants, however, highlighted that caution should be taken when hiring out space at the centres and safeguarding issues should be taken into account. Focus group participants were not on the whole in favour of exploring the use of other buildings to host Youth activities. (Para 1.8.21) They thought there were not many facilities for young people on offer in Barnet and closing the buildings would exacerbate the problem. This was corroborated by the questionnaire finding that 30% of those who disagreed with Proposal 3 were opposed to the closure of the Youth Centres or thought that the option of maximising the buildings' usage should be explored more.

5.8.12 Comment on Public Consultation responses on proposals for Greentops and Finchley Youth Centres The majority of respondents agreed with our preferred options for both Youth Centres. Those who raised concerns over possible safeguarding issues would be unaware that we have strong safeguarding policies and processes already in place and that it is not our intention to make space available to different groups at the same time – e.g. babies and toddlers during the day and activities for young people at evenings and weekends.

5.8.13 Duke of Edinburgh Award support and facilitation service

A third of questionnaire respondents (34%) said they agreed with the option to reduce costs and increase charges. However, three in ten (31%) disagreed. A larger proportion of questionnaire respondents (47%) said they agreed with the option to support schools to contract with other licensed providers who can also deliver a Duke of Edinburgh Award support and facilitation service. A quarter (26%) said they disagreed.

5.8.14 Focus group participants who were familiar with the Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme thought it is a valuable opportunity for young people to learn new skills and gain new experiences. Some participants felt the council should continue to fund the service, even if it was operating at a loss, given the importance of the scheme. They worried that if charges were increased, schools would either not provide the opportunity for pupils to take part in the scheme or look to pass the cost onto parents. (Para 1.8.23) Some focus group participants were in favour of the option to support schools to contract with other licensed providers to deliver the service. They thought that alternative providers might be able to keep costs down for schools, as they would be able to generate efficiency through providing services at a national or local level. (Para 1.8.24)

5.8.15 Comment on Public Consultation responses on proposals for Duke of Edinburgh Award support and facilitation service We believe this service adds value as part of our broader portfolio of services. We propose to break even on this service by increasing charges to schools and by improved housekeeping to keep

costs down. If we are unable to do this we will seek alternative providers if they are able to deliver the same quality and level of service for lower costs.

5.8.16 Alternative Education service

Almost four in ten (37%) disagreed with the option to reduce costs and increase charges. Almost three in ten (28%) said they agreed. By contrast, a larger proportion (37%) said they agreed with the option to find an alternative provider and 28% disagreed.

5.8.17 Focus group participants felt the service was vital to support young people who are unable to attend school and some felt that the council should continue to provide it, even if it was making a loss given its importance. A few of these participants thought that if charges for the service were increased for schools, these charges might be passed onto parents, which would be unfair. Some participants felt it would be a good idea to support schools to find an alternative provider, as contracting with a national or regional provider might keep costs down for schools. However, it would be important that schools commission a provider who has a good track record and provides a high-quality service. (Para 1.8.28)

5.8.18 Comment on Public Consultation responses on proposals for Alternative Education Service – The council is one of a number of providers delivering this service contracted to schools. If charges are increased, it would be to the schools and would not be passed on to parents. We propose to break even on this service by some increased charges to schools (which we would keep as low as possible) and improved housekeeping to keep costs down.

5.8.19 Face to Face Counselling Service

Almost six in ten (57%) questionnaire respondents agreed with the option to look for the early help mental health services to cover the cost of clinical supervision (at no charge) for the face to face counselling service for young people. Almost one in five (18%) disagreed. By contrast, a smaller proportion (34%) agreed with the option to promote the online counselling service for young people. Four in ten (40%) disagreed.

5.8.20 Focus group participants felt that counselling should be provided online and face to face for young people. Young people might seek counselling services anonymously online in the first place, but withdrawing face to face counselling completely could be detrimental for them. It was also felt that it is often important for counsellors to read body language and some of young people's mental health problems might stem from their online experience. (Para 1.8.26)

5.8.21 Comment on Public Consultation responses on proposals for the Face to Face Counselling Service – The majority of respondents agreed with our preferred option and the plans to cover the cost of clinical supervision has already been met through the transfer of the Children and Adolescent Mental Health services. Thus, we propose to continue with both the face to face counselling service and the on-line counselling service.

5.8.22 Newstead Children's Centre

Just over a third (36%) of questionnaire respondents agreed with the option of reducing costs in the delivery of childcare places at. Three in ten (30%) disagreed. A

similar proportion (34%) agreed with the option of seeking an alternative provider who can deliver the service more cost effectively and 31% disagreed.

5.8.23 Focus group participants suggested that the council could look to other providers to explore best practice for delivering a cost-effective service, but others felt it was likely that the council would have already done this and felt that it was simply a case of the council not being able to afford to run the service anymore. For these participants, there was no other option but to seek an alternative provider. However, those participants who were in favour of seeking an alternative provider, highlighted that it might ensure that the service is delivered cost effectively and is sustainable in the long term. (Para 1.8.30)

5.8.24 Comment on Public Consultation responses on proposals for Newstead Children's Centre – Slightly more respondents agreed with our proposed options rather than the alternatives. It is our proposal to improve house-keeping to reduce costs to ensure the service breaks even but if we are not able to do this we will seek alternative local providers who can deliver the same quality and level of service for lower costs.

5.9 Insight

- Barnet is the largest Borough in London by population and is continuing to grow. The highest rates of population growth are forecast to occur around the planned development works in the west of the Borough, with over 121% growth in Golders Green and 115% in Colindale between 2017 and 2032.
- The borough will become increasingly diverse, driven predominantly by growth within the existing population.
- There are approximately 93,590 children and young people under the age of 19 years living in Barnet representing 25% of the Borough's total population. Barnet's population is estimated to reach 98,914 by 2020- a growth of 6%.
- The proportion of children entitled to free school meals:
 - in primary schools is 16.7% (the national average is 14.5%)
 - in secondary schools is 13.1% (the national average is 13.2%)
- 19% of children under five (5,000 children) live in low income families.
- Of all children and young people aged under 19 years old in Barnet, 14% are aged 16 – 17 years old. Despite the small population, this cohort represents some of our highest demand. Barnet has a notably higher proportion of children in care aged 16+ compared to the national average (+91% as at November 2017), part of this
- increase is in line with averages across London due to number of newly arrived Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children.
- Barnet's diversity is amplified for children and young people compared to the country as a whole, with those from the minority ethnic groups accounting for 52% of all children living in the area versus 30% nationally.
- In the 0 – 9 age group There are more children from BAME groups, than there are white children. The largest minority ethnic groups of children and young people in the area are Indian and Black
- On 31st March 2018, 155 children and young people were the subject of a child protection plan. This is a decrease from 188 at 31st March 2017. 13 children lived in a private fostering arrangement. This is an increase from 10 at 31 March 2017.
- 336 children were being looked after on 31st March 2018 (a rate of 34.7 per 10,000 children), staying broadly similar to 342 (35.3 per 10,000 children) at 31 March 2017.
- Current number of live Early Help Assessments - 750

Insight data will continue to be regularly collected and used in monitoring the progress and impact of Barnet's Children's Services Improvement Action Plan and to shape ongoing improvement activity.

6 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1 Single Inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers and Review of the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board report, Ofsted, 7 July 2017

https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/local_authority_reports/bar-net/051_Single%20inspection%20of%20LA%20children%27s%20services%20as%20pdf.pdf