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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This document sets out a business case for investing in youth workers to deliver improved outcomes and in turn, cost avoidance within other budgets.

This document has been produced through discussions with other services to establish service requirements, outcomes and the scope to enable savings. During these discussions there was considerable enthusiasm for the role that youth workers could play in supporting young people and it is clear that there is an opportunity to use youth worker resource to address budget pressures, but more importantly to achieve better and more sustainable outcomes for young people.

In February 2016 Children, Family and Education Committee agreed to develop a business case for setting up a targeted youth support team.

The purpose of the team will be to work with specified young people who have been identified as at risk of school exclusion or entering care.

As such, the key criteria considered as to whether a youth worker intervention are as follows:

- Issue whereby a significant percentage of the cohort affected are within the 11-19 age range.
- Cases where statutory support is costly and suitable support may not be readily available (i.e. appropriate foster care)
- Cases where services are working with a whole family and it is felt that a young person within the family may benefit from additional support.
- Cohorts where issues arising in teenage years have clear roots in earlier behaviours / events in a young person’s life, such that early help can be evidenced to prevent later statutory interventions.

Financial projections have been developed to indicate the cost avoidance that could be achieved on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and LAC (Looked after Children) Placements budgets through this type of work.

A decision on whether to proceed with this approach will be taken by the council’s Children, Families and Education Committee on 16 June 2016.

2. **OBJECTIVES**

2.1. The Targeted Youth Support Team’s objectives would be as follows:

- To address and overcome barriers to education, health and life chances
- To reduce levels of social and/or educational exclusion
- To resolve family and adolescent issues as part of early help or at an early stage in statutory safeguarding support

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Youth and Adolescent Services Review
At the February 2016 CFE Committee a number of priority areas were set out as a potential focus for a future targeted delivery model. This included supporting the following vulnerable groups:

- **Prevention work with pupils at risk of exclusion** – both those pupils requiring additional support in the transition between primary and secondary school; and those older pupils identified as being at risk of exclusion
- **Supporting adolescents as part of a wider family intervention** – for instance a youth worker working with an adolescent in a family that is being supported by the council’s Families Matter (family support work) team/support to foster carers with responsibility for teenagers and adolescents with complex needs
- **Supporting young people known to social care** – for instance young people in foster placements requiring support/young people who may subsequently be at risk of family breakdown, becoming ‘missing’, or at risk of Child Sexual Exploitation
- **Prevention work with young people who may engage in risky behaviours** - for instance working to reduce the prevalence of young people with sexually transmitted infections

Whilst this paper will consider the viability of working with each target group separately to consider their needs and the required outcomes, data analysis shows that there is often an overlap between these vulnerable groups. For this reason there is an advantage in having a group of youth workers that specialise in supporting adolescents and are able to work with them on a range of issues, from supporting them in cases of family breakdown to discussions on risky behaviours.

The links between these vulnerable groups, and the objectives outlined in section 2 above can be seen in the below diagram:

**Key stakeholders**

- Schools
- Families Matter
- Social Care
- CCG
- Public Health

**Workstrands**

- **A** Prevention work with pupils at risk of exclusion
- **B** Supporting adolescents as part of a wider family intervention
- **C** Supporting young people known to social care
- **D** Prevention work with young people who may engage in risky behaviours

**Objectives**

1. Addressing and overcoming barriers to education, health and life chances
2. Reducing levels of social and / or educational exclusion
3. Resolving family and adolescent issues as part of early help or at an early stage in statutory safeguarding support

It is proposed that the needs set out above can be met through a single Targeted Youth Support Team. This team would work across all the groups / objectives identified (rather than allocating different staff to different areas of work). This provides flexibility to manage peaks and troughs of caseload.

Targeted Youth Support interventions can be considered in three categories:
- Planned early help interventions with identified groups to intervene early and prevent issues arising e.g. working with a year 6 pupil that has been identified as needing support to transition into year 7 at secondary school
- Prompt response work where youth workers are able to intervene and contain a situation (e.g. family breakdown related event one evening) to prevent escalation.
- Planned interventions at the point where a young person is about to meet the school exclusion / care threshold – providing support in addition to social care / school support to maintain them in school or the home setting.

The following sections set out the identified need within each target group and the potential role for a Targeted Youth Support team within this.

4. Overview of the requirement

4.1. Prevention work with pupils at risk of exclusion

The number of young people excluded from mainstream education in Sutton (either permanently or via a CARE place – meaning ‘Child At Risk of Exclusion’) is increasing. 11 month data to Feb 2016 shows 47 (18 permanent, 29 CARE place) exclusions, as a slight decrease however place take up remains high due to the previous year’s intake.

CARE places in particular are rising, The criteria to be considered for CARE at the Pupil Referral Unit is that they will have had a number of fixed exclusions and a range of strategies to support them prior to this happening.

From those attending the Pupil Referral Unit for respite (intended as a temporary measure), over half end up at the PRU on a long term basis. In 2012/13 26 young people from the previous year’s year 11 cohort at the Pupil Referral Unit were NEET. In 2014/15 this was 21.

![Figure 1: No. of young people sent to Pupil Referral Unit](image)

As shown in the below table, as a percentage of exclusions (both permanent and CARE places), only 8% returned to mainstream education in 2014/15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. perm exclusions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. CARE places to Limes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. moved back to mainstream from Limes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate – no. of those returned to mainstream that stay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate (returns)as a % of total exclusions</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last national comparison data shows Sutton to be in line with national averages – with 0.12% of the Secondary population permanently excluded in 2013/14 compared to 0.13% as the national average. For fixed term exclusions these figures were 5.02% and 6.02% respectively, however the trend since these dates has continued an upward trend with 16 CARE and permanent exclusions in January 2016 alone.

This presents a number of challenges for Sutton:

- Alternative provision (including funding Pupil Referral Unit places) is funded through the Dedicated Schools grant (DSG). The increase in exclusions is placing additional pressure on the DSG to fund provision. This has been managed to date through use of DSG balances, however should the trend continue the DSG will no longer represent a balanced budget. As such there is a financial driver to address exclusion rates. Should this not take place, the council may need to consider delegating responsibility for CARE places to schools and only directly fund permanent exclusions as per the statutory duty.

- Outcomes for young people that have been excluded are poorer than for those that remain in mainstream education – this includes educational attainment; work readiness and a range of other factors. Whilst the Pupil Referral Unit works with young people to seek to reintegrate them following respite, to truly address the issue in the long term there is also a need to invest resource at an earlier stage. This is on the basis that those at risk of exclusion can be identified in advance, through factors noted in tracking back current exclusion cases e.g. lack of engagement with services, family breakdown.

The recent government white paper ‘Educational Excellence Everywhere’ sets out the government’s intention for schools to play a greater role in the provision of alternative education.

Page 102 of the White Paper states that “Mainstream school headteachers will commission expert provision for pupils with needs and behaviour that have become unmanageable within a mainstream setting. ... local authorities will retain a role in ensuring sufficiency of AP in their area”
Furthermore “a pupil’s mainstream school will retain accountability for their educational outcomes and will take a lead role in commissioning their provision, including when they have permanently excluded the pupil but the pupil has not subsequently enrolled at a different mainstream school. Schools will be responsible for the budgets from which AP is funded. As they will also be responsible for commissioning and accountable for educational outcomes, they will have stronger incentives to take preventative approaches”.

By using youth workers to work with schools to identify and support young people at an early stage, prior to exclusion this fits in with the government policy focus on early intervention.

4.2. Assessing likely financial outcomes from a Youth Work offer to address school exclusion rates

Key features of any youth work model to reduce school exclusions include:

- Develop an effective identification mechanism in order to target support appropriately
- Linking in to a wider team around the child approach as appropriate.
- Flexibility of resource including availability outside school hours for after school work / coaching

The following sets out a case study for a current example relating to exclusion:

**Case Study: Child A**

Child A is 15 years old in Year 11. She has been displaying low level disruptive behaviour since year 9 but had been on course to achieve 5 A*-C GCSEs. In year 10 her anger and aggression was so bad that she was referred to CAMHS but closed after one session due to non-attendance. Recently her attendance and behaviour has deteriorated and the school has struggled to put in boundaries to control her in the classroom as she becomes increasingly volatile. It is thought that there is something going on at home but the parents are hard to engage with and haven’t attended meetings set by the school. Staff suspect drugs may also be involved due to her erratic behaviour, diminishing appearance and change of peer group.

This culminates in Child A attacking another pupil in the classroom and ends up permanently excluded in the first term of Year 11. With support from the PRU she achieved 2 GCSEs but sadly she became NEET (not in education, employment or training) post 16. It transpired that her parents were getting divorced and her Mother had moved a new partner into the home which Child A hadn’t coped well with.

Under the proposed model, Child A would be picked up as part of a panel process and identified as required further support.

**What would have happened in the proposed model**

At the point of child A showing signs of persistent disruptive behaviour in Year 9 she would have been referred to the Targeted Youth Support Team and assigned a worker. This worker would look to build a relationship with the Child inside and outside of school to focus on barriers and issues occurring. A main focus of this would be working with the family via home visits to see what was happening there and ensuring the parents were focusing on the Childs needs.

The worker would attempt to ensure attendance at CAMHS appointments looking at a TAC (Team around the child) approach involving all professionals with potential referrals to parenting if needed. Work could be done with the child in school to break down barriers to learning and equip her with coping mechanisms in difficult situations. Information could be shared with the school to put strategies in place to prevent her being permanently excluded incorporating drugs work and exploring the schools’ concerns further.
In funding considerations it should be noted that:

- Currently, the Pupil Referral Unit is oversubscribed; 31 of the commissioned 120 places are used for SEN type provision (with an £8k premium) and an additional lump sum payment was made in March 2016 to reflect the additional places provided. Provision exceeds physical capacity, with the use of commissioned providers to offer offsite / remote provision.
- When setting the DSG budget, the authority makes an assumption on the level of top up funding that will be paid (i.e. how many places are filled).
- Pressures on the SEN budget combined with the fact that all places at the PRU are currently being occupied mean that the DSG is under pressure and likely to use reserves to balance in 2015/16. This is not sustainable and will not be possible in future financial years as the three areas of DSG will be ringfenced, preventing one area from supplementing another.

Annex C shows the DSG funding structure.

From those that are identified as at risk of exclusion, there are two potential outcomes:

- a % will be able to be worked with and prevented from being excluded – this outcome would be effectively paying for the intervention resource
- a % will be worked with but still excluded – the funding to work with this group still needs to come from the reduction in top up fee, therefore the cost for working with these individuals needs to factor in those identified who would not have been excluded anyway. Therefore although worked with, an assumption needs to be made on this so schools do not pay for those that would not have incurred alternative provision costs anyway.

An example of this breakdown is below –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Identified as at risk of exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes without intervention</td>
<td>Would not have been excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes with intervention</td>
<td>Not excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**

- **A success rate of 10% for those worked with in preventing exclusions**
  Based on a preliminary file audit and data analysis, it can be assumed that at a conservative estimate 1 in 10 of those excluded could have been prevented from exclusion. This is backed up by the fact that 1 in 12 (8%) of those excluded successfully returned to mainstream education following work within the PRU suggesting that they are less complex cases that could have been prevented from entering care with intervention; and the youth service would expect a success rate slightly above this.
- **Interventions of approx. one term in length**
- **Caseloads of 15-20 per worker** (this may be lower dependent on the complexity of individual cases)
- **Exclusion peaks in years 7/8 (permanent exclusions, following issues in primary / secondary transition) and year 10 (typically CARE places)**
As shown by the analysis below.

- That pupils that are likely to struggle with the transition to secondary school can be identified by their primary school headteachers. This assumption is based on conversations with headteachers.
- That year 9 / 10s subject to CARE places can be identified in year 7 / 8 through a set of criteria (e.g. failure to engage with universal services) to indicate they are at risk of exclusion. Again, this assumption is based on conversations with headteachers.

Outcome projection

Based on these assumptions, the following income scenarios have been modelled:

This analysis gives a very wide range of potential outcomes from one worker, from £5820 – 441,360 depending on length of intervention, no. of cases worked with and time in the year the child is excluded. What it doesn’t show is:

- **The cost of the worker** – approx. £40k per worker with on costs needs to be paid from this cost avoidance.
- **Future years PRU savings for that child** – if excluded in year 7, that could be a further £29,424 in cost avoidance for that child. This is shown in the table below.
- **Place funding** – this is set at 120 places for the current PRU and would not be expected to reduce quickly –the aim of this proposal is to reduce exclusions to the point where the PRU can operate within its 120 places again. A longer term goal would be to reduce the number of places commissioned.
- **In practice, some pupils will move between the PRU and school environment.**

Taking these factors into account, a child excluded in early year 8 will avoid £29,424 costs, year 10 £14,712 so based on the peak exclusion years of years 7/8 and 10, this means a typical cost avoidance of £15-25k.
Commentary

With an average worker caseload of 15-20 cases, by resourcing workers within a Targeted Youth Support Team the DSG could see a considerable impact on alternative education costs within a 1-2 year timescale.

In reality, within a Targeted Youth Support team, there will be an overlap in the individuals identified under this workstream and those identified within the social care arena as at risk of family breakdown / entering care. Data is still being analysed on the current edge of care / at risk of exclusion cohort overlap, however it can reasonably be assumed that a percentage of the cases worked with will be meeting other outcomes as well as exclusion prevention.

Youth workers are also well equipped to handle a wide range of issues, from drug use (with cannabis use being cited as a key feature within exclusion data) to family breakdown. As such, this support would address a range of issues through one consistent worker.

It is suggested that in the first instance, a DSG investment of £110k is put into youth workers. This funds 2.5 FTE worth of resource although it is assumed that 3FTE worth of caseload will be delivered assuming an overlap in outcomes with the edge of care cohort and that some identified would not complete the intervention). These staff would not be dedicated to this work, to maintain flexibility across the team. The following assumptions have been made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASELOAD</th>
<th>INTERVENTIONS</th>
<th>AVERAGE SAVING</th>
<th>SUCCESS RATE</th>
<th>IN YEAR TOP UP FEE COST AVOIDANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5FTE - 60</td>
<td>PER YEAR - 2 (Max 6 months)</td>
<td>FOR PUPIL'S SCHOOL CAREER Low - £15 High - £25k</td>
<td>(prevent exclusion) 10%</td>
<td>Lower value – £180,000 Upper value – £300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 2016
Potential case load would be 60 at a time, so assuming a maximum 6 month intervention / turnaround time, with a ‘success’ rate of 10%, 12 young people would be prevented from CARE / Permanent exclusion. Using the £15 – 25k assumption above (based on a year 8/9 permanent exclusion) this would reduce alternative education costs by between £180k and £300k.

4.3. Reducing the rate of school exclusion - alternatives

Currently schools deliver behaviour support in house (opting out of buying back the previous secondary behaviour support service a few years ago). This work does support students with issues taking place outside the school environment to alleviate barriers to learning. It is however recognised in discussion that the capacity to deliver mentoring / coaching support is limited within the school setting. As such, it is not felt that the exclusion levels can be addressed within a reasonable timescale (relative to the budget pressures) through this alone.

Given the pressures on the DSG central budget there is a considerable risk of overspend in 2017/18. The council’s own budget position means that subsidising this is not possible. As such, without an approach to reduce the number of CARE places and exclusions, the council would need to prioritise funding for permanent exclusions (which it has a statutory duty to purchase) and could consider delegating the budgeting for CARE places to individual schools (primary and secondary). This would be done through the formula and may mean for some schools with previously higher rates of CARE places they are required to meet any cost over and above the delegation amount.

There are benefits to be had in a joined up arrangement for the provision of CARE and permanent exclusion places and as such the council would want to present schools with the potential to use youth workers in a cost avoidance model prior to progressing any plans to delegate CARE place budgets.

4.4. Supporting adolescents as part of a wider family intervention

Over the last year the council’s Families Matter service has noted an increase in cases featuring adolescents. These cases could be effectively supported with a youth worker working with the young person alongside the wider team around a family intervention.

As such, there is an appetite to pilot the Families matter service funding youth worker resource in order to meet Troubled Families outcomes, specifically an outcome relating to children at the edge of care (see Section 4.5). In working with these young people, the targeted Youth Support Team could access government Troubled Families funding for those families ‘worked with’ and ‘turned around’.

4.5. Supporting young people known to social care

In recent years the council has faced significant pressure on the placement budget, with varying degrees of overspend. This budget is regularly monitored and closely managed however the high cost nature of placements means that the budget can be heavily affected by a small number of individual cases. For example in 2015/16, having been on track during the majority of the financial year, 5 Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) cases towards the end of the year resulted in high cost placements and an overspend of £1.1m (1.9m total before income contributions). Supply and demand pressures on foster and residential placements also contribute to high costs in this area.
There is a financial need to address this and reduce the number of children entering care as well as a moral one also – with better outcomes reported where it is possible to maintain a child in the home in a managed and safe way.

A number of councils have looked at options for delivering interventions to an ‘edge of care’ cohort of children recognised to be at risk of going into care. A range of early interventions have been employed.

Sutton is no different and workstreams currently under way to address this include:

- Potential use of a social impact bond arrangement to access intensive family intervention therapies e.g. Multi Systemic Therapy (MST).
- Reviewing commissioning arrangements to reduce placement costs

One of the key characteristics of the looked after children cohort is that they are primarily in the 11-19 age group. Furthermore this age group is more likely to go missing if they do enter foster / residential care, therefore the costs and potential risk to the young person in residential are significant.

4.6. The Youth Work offer to reduce the burden on the placement budget

As part of discussions around reducing the number of looked after children, three key areas for consideration have emerged:

1. Identifying at an earlier stage those showing warning factors for entering care so that they can be worked with early and supported.
2. The need for a resource available to follow up crisis type events e.g. where family breakdown occurs in the evening. This is on the basis that by having workers available to meet with the young person / family and talk these events through this increases the likelihood of the situation being managed to prevent complete breakdown, with the risk of entering foster or residential care.
3. For those at risk of entering care, support from a youth worker as part of a planned intervention can both help to maintain the young person’s living situation, by keeping them at home (with appropriate safeguards) as well as providing support (through coaching and other techniques) to the young person. In some cases, the required intervention may be to provide diversionary activities for the young person to safeguard them from risky behaviours.

These are both areas that youth workers would be well equipped to support, as a supplement to other social care interventions.

An example case study can be found below:

1 A series of case studies relating to ‘Edge of Care’ interventions can be found in the Ofsted report: Edging away from care – how services successfully prevent young people entering care
Child B Case Study – what happened

Child B, aged 12, came from a large family and was one of five siblings. Historically the family had been known to multiple agencies including social care, Police and YOT. There was a history of dis-engaging from education with three of the siblings attending alternative education. The mother was receiving support, which included Disability Living Allowance from Children with Disabilities team. The father had left the family home and Mum’s partner was living with the family.

A lot of Mum’s time and attention was given to the youngest sibling who had profound and multiple disabilities. Child B became ‘lost’ within the family and many of his basic needs were not met which included shelter, food, emotional warmth and boundaries. Child B’s behaviour at school deteriorated resulting in multiple exclusions which in turn escalated in low levels of attendance. Child B started to become involved in low level offending and so was open to YOT. Child B spent long periods of time living away from the family home ‘sofa surfing’, presented as being at risk of CSE, started smoking and using cannabis. By the age of 13 child B had become a ‘Child in Need’. Child B’s youngest sibling died which had an impact on the family’s finances and placed additional strain on family relationships. At this point agencies involved were Social Care, YOT (Youth Offending Team), parenting, youth services, Police, education and health. Child B’s missing episodes become longer and more frequent yet he continued to voluntarily attend a youth centre where he was fed and given attention by youth workers.

Due to ever increasing engagement of risky behaviours Child B was removed from the family home and placed in residential care.

What would have happened in the proposed model:

Child B would have been referred in for youth work support. Child B would have met youth workers regularly on a voluntary basis. The relationship would have centred entirely on Child B having carried out a needs assessment to identify areas that Child B felt needed to improve. The work would have centred around the goal of Child B remaining in the family home. The youth worker would ensure there was a professional network around the child and family that was able to address all needs. The youth worker would build a relationship with Mum to ensure that she was on board and supporting child B’s targets.

4.7. Assessing likely financial outcomes from a Youth Work offer to address school exclusion rates

Assumptions

- A typical one year residential placement costs the council £182k on average (with weekly costs of approx. 3.5k).
- Residential placement costs have been used for analysis rather than a blended figure representing foster care and secure placement costs also. An examination of looked after child cases will show a variety of pathways, with some young people going in and out of foster care prior to a residential placement and others being recommended to a residential placement straight away for reasons of placement availability (e.g. a foster placement cannot be found in a suitable timescale) or required safeguarding need. The decision to use residential costs reflects the fact that securing foster placements for these complex adolescent cases is difficult, resulting in many of the cases going to residential. Secure placement costs have not been included to prevent skewing the likely saving however it would be hoped that secure placements would reduce with this intervention. For example, where a young person is meant to be in a residential placement but frequently goes missing
(often back to their own locality), prompting a safety concern that leads to their being put into a secure placement for a period of time. Working with the young person in their home setting would help to prevent this scenario and associated costs.

- **Caseloads of 15-20 (depending on complexity of the case)**
- Intervention length will be specific to an individual case
- Working with young people 10-17
- For cases where the aim is to support someone who would otherwise be in care, a success rate of 50% of identified cases being supported to 12 weeks would apply.

The 2015/16 Placements Budget reported a £1.1m overspend, equivalent to 15 cases. Whilst a Youth Work / team around a child intervention involving youth work may not be appropriate in all cases (for instance Child Protection cases) the Targeted Youth Support Team will be appropriately resourced to be able to work with those most at risk, following requests from social work to develop a programme to support an individual.

**Criteria for working with cases**

A number of considerations will be taken into account when identifying the edge of care cohort. These include:

- Information about the child’s situation e.g. evidence of offending, school exclusion, risk of Child Sexual Exploitation, self harm, substance misuse – these criteria are based on studies looking at the care cohort.
- Information about the family situation e.g. domestic violence, substance misuse, relationship between parent and child.
- The nature of the case – cases that will work with this approach are predominantly those cases where there is a breakdown in the family relationship. This approach will be less suitable where the primary concerns relate to the parent’s actions towards the child or where there are serious concerns for the child’s wellbeing that require specialist support e.g. serious mental health concerns.
- Whether there are reasons that the child would need to be in a placement outside Sutton, e.g. links with criminal activity in Sutton. In these cases, supporting the child within the community may not be appropriate
- Whether the child wishes to go into care will be a factor – where the child does not wish to enter care this can be a sign that they are likely to go missing from the provided placement.
- Whether the family are willing to support such an approach.

Identification of young people on the edge of care would be through a panel system to identify indicators at an early stage. Youth work support would sit alongside a menu of support options, selected as appropriate to the case.

An assessment of those from the Joint Adolescent Service accommodated from January 2015 to present shows at least 13 young people where practitioners believe this type of support could have been appropriate.

4.8. **Commentary**

Under this proposal, £240k from the placement budget would be invested in the employment of youth workers to form part of a wider Targeted Youth Work team. This provides suitable capacity to allow the service to provide cover 2-10pm on weekdays and 10am-10pm on weekends, in order to
respond to emerging family events. To ensure continuity of support and maintain a consistent approach, this would be resourced through full time workers, with sessionals used for ad hoc cover purposes.

Whilst event led responses will be required the bigger area of work in relation to social care will be in delivering planned programmes of support to young people known to social care. The invested funding would enable the resourcing of four youth workers plus a proportion of management time, with a case load of 15-20 each (depending on the level of intervention involved).

This funding assumes a minimal cost avoidance to the placement budget of £240k in order to meet its budget. As such, the youth service would need to deliver in excess of £240k in cost avoidance to provide a return on investment. It is recommended that some up front funding is provided to cover the initial resourcing cost, owing to the timelag in securing savings to the placement budget through sustained outcomes.

By setting a conservative estimate of the youth service needing to get 6 young people to maintain their home situation for 12 weeks each instead of entering care or alternatively to prevent the equivalent of two young people going into a residential placement for a year, this would pay for the service. Any outcomes achieved above £240k cost avoidance will represent cost avoidance to the social care budget.

Evidence for the ability to achieve this saving can be found in a recent case example where a youth worker has formed part of a team supporting a young person to remain at home with additional support to manage family, substance misuse and mental health issues. As a result the young person has stayed out of care for 8 weeks to date. This has given a direct example of where a young person would otherwise have gone into care, but instead has been offered a package of support, with the youth worker forming a key part of this work. For this reason, officers feel that the investment will deliver a wider saving to the placements budget.
5. OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE

5.1. Performance management

Performance and data management will be the responsibility of the Team Manager, supported by the Assistant Team Manager. As part of the model, identifying suitable cases and tracking outcomes will be important. This will be achieved by:

- Set up of spreadsheet to assess cases against care / school exclusion predictor criteria in order to identify cases.
- Facilitation of panels with schools and social workers to agree early intervention cases.
- Live tracker covering children worked with, length of intervention, caseload
- Link to placement tracker to identify where those in the identified cohort enter care
- Link to exclusion tracker to identify where those in the identified cohort are excluded from school
- Setting up mechanisms for outcome payments to be transferred to the Targeted Youth Support Team budget and projecting cashflow and future resource requirements.

5.2. Staffing

Statutory duties will be delivered by a team comprising a team manager, NEET tracker and 2 targeted youth workers (NEET focus) as well as three business support officers. Subject to committee agreement, an additional two workers, a teenage parenting worker and leaving care worker will form part of the team.

The targeted youth service team will build on this to include a further 6 targeted youth workers and an assistant team manager. Structures would be subject to staff consultation.

Line Management will be split between Team Manager and Assistant Team Manager.

5.3. Hours of operation / availability

Given the complex and volatile nature of need presented by vulnerable young people it is anticipated that an expectation of the role will be the worker’s availability for 5 days over 7 days, in and outside of business hours. The hours of working will be driven by the specific needs of the caseload. For example, workers working with young people having difficulties attending school might commence work at 7.30 am to support them and their parents and carers in getting ready and travelling to school. Workers working with young people in families where there are regular flashpoints in the home during the evening or at weekends might commence work later in the day and work into the evening or over the weekends during programmes of support.

5.4. Team capacity / caseload

Typical caseloads could be in the range of 15-20 young people. With a maximum intervention programme length of 12 weeks and assuming all cases run to a 12 week term, a worker could reasonably be expected to work with between 55 and 75 young people across a working year (assumed to be 46 weeks, after leave).

5.5. Team service offer

The precise programme of interventions will be specific to each young person and flow out of their assessed needs. The programme will be time bound (with the exception of particular cases
supporting people on an ongoing basis as an ‘alternative to care’) and intended to result in the change required, for example to improve participation in school, avoid care placement or prevent risky behaviour.

A targeted youth support intervention menu will typically cover; parent/young person and external stakeholder relationships; personal safety; self-management. Case work will progress and be monitored in line with an agreed intervention support plan. The way of working cases will be modelled on that of performance coach/coachee delivered at home, in schools and youth centres and delivered in collaboration with other agencies (using other resource as appropriate to the needs of the young people being worked with, for example, sports coaching courses, gym visits, school enrichment programmes).

It should be noted that service needs outlined in this paper are focussed on areas where the youth skillset can play a role, rather than on consideration of what the youth service currently delivers. It is assumed that for any new delivery model the service would seek to adapt structures and undertake training as required to fulfil the role.

An outline of the service offer can be found in Annexe B.

5.6. Learning and Development

Using a team that supports both young people at risk of educational exclusion and those at risk of entering care allows the team to be flexible to demand and allocate resource as required.

This form of working would represent a change for youth workers over current practice, with far more work taking place within the social care arena. Social work management supervision would be required and this would be resourced for evenings / weekends from current resource through offering an on call system rota. Professional supervision would be through the Targeted Youth Support Team Manager / Assistant Team Manager.

To ensure consistency the Targeted Youth Support team will all have training in a set of coaching techniques. The need for this consistent skillset and approach means that use of sessionals will be limited to ‘crisis’ type interventions where a worker is needed to respond to an issue at short notice and a member of the core team is not available. Planned interventions will be delivered by full time youth workers.

The Youth Service team are currently investigating a specific coaching approach, which could be used as part of each worker’s skill set. Training costs have been included in the budget.

The required youth worker qualities and competencies can be found in Annexe A.

6. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

The table below sets out projections for the costs to run the Targeted Youth Support Team and likely cost avoidance on the DSG and placements budgets.

The council will need to identify funding to cover the upfront staffing costs from September 2016 (where the time lag on outcomes means a £121k shortfall in 16/17 income to cover these costs).

This is in addition to funding the 16/17 savings shortfall of £383k. As such there is a total 16/17 funding gap of £504k.
It should be noted that whilst £240k cost avoidance is anticipated on placements this would in effect slow growth on this budget (which has risen for a number of years) rather than mean a reduction on the budget for placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16/17 over 15/16</th>
<th>17/18 over 16/17</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings target</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cease universal (CFE Feb 2016)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Decision made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cease other targeted non statutory services</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Proposed, assumes 3mths worth of saving in 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Teenage Parenting worker; Leaving Care worker</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings gap</td>
<td>-383</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Youth Support delivery cost</td>
<td>-191</td>
<td>-159</td>
<td>-350</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Youth Support cost avoidance</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>£110k DSG; £240k Placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net costs to deliver targeted youth support</strong></td>
<td><strong>-121</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of savings and investment - net effect</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **SWOT ANALYSIS**

The following is a summary of the key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the targeted Youth Support Team Model:

7.1. **Strengths:**

- Provides proactive response to placement and DSG budget challenges
- Delivers low cost, effective alternative to social work for specific types of intervention
- Scalable model that can adapt to trends.
- Already shown to be successful in live cases.
- Staff willing to adopt targeted approach and support more out of hours working – indeed in some cases staff are already having to do this therefore this would help to formalise the arrangement and ensure cover.
- The approach has multi-agency support, e.g. from the Early Help board.

7.2. **Weaknesses:**

- Considerable dependency on effective identification of cases and partners e.g. schools engaging with the identification and tracking process.
• Proving the effectiveness of early intervention is difficult, the council does not have a history of capturing outcomes in this way and under further rounds of funding cuts, this area may be at risk of cuts given that savings are generally cost avoidance over cashable savings.
• Lag time in demonstrating the results of early help means that it will take time to see the success of this approach and as such there is a delay in when the return on investment can be reviewed and adjusted if required.

7.3. Opportunities:
• Utilises skills and experience in current staff, repurposing them to address issues of school exclusion and care entry.
• Good fit with other initiatives e.g. the social impact bond for edge of care work – staff will be increasingly familiar with the outcomes based income type approach from this and work such as Troubled families.
• Other councils have shown success in using criteria to predict those young people that may require statutory support without early intervention. In the long term this approach will be key to reducing statutory demand.
• The proposal takes the opportunity to intervene at an early stage and improve life chances for young people, therefore making them less reliant on and costly to public services in the future.
• Provides an opportunity to respond to resident feedback from the public consultation on youth services.

7.4. Threats:
• Trend assumptions around the level of children at risk of care / exclusion may not be realised leading to a desirable reduction in DSG / placement costs, however with over investment / resourcing in the Targeted Youth Support Team for the actual level of need.
• Schools may wish to develop further initiatives to tackle behaviours that could lead to exclusion, reducing the need for youth team additionality (although pastoral support would likely be limited to the school day).
• High turnover of youth work staff due to long term uncertainty around the service could lead to a dilution of the trained coaching approach and effectiveness of interventions.
8. **RISK REGISTER**

Based on the SWOT analysis above, a risk register is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Risk Management/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that the team is unable to secure the projected income to cover both its costs and achieve cost avoidance / savings on the DSG / Placement budgets, resulting in the council paying the team costs.</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Executive Head, Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>This risk is mitigated by the use of conservative assumptions for cost avoidance and the use of the approach in a current case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT: SCHOOLS FORUM</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that the Schools Forum does not approve the proposed use of DSG money and therefore the schools element (and associated FTE) cannot proceed.</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Executive Head, Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>Proposal considered at Schools Forum on 18/05/2016 and received in principle agreement. Should there not be agreement on the proposal in its current form, the Targeted Youth Support Team staff compliment and work areas will be scaled down commensurate to the remaining funding available in relation to delivering outcomes for social care (reducing by approximately 2.5FTE). In this event, schools must commit to an alternative approach to manage the DSG budget to reduce spend on alternative provision which on its current trajectory will lead to the DSG being overspent in 2017 without reserves to cover the overspend. Moreover as exclusions (temporary and permanent) continue to increase, Sutton will need to work with schools to address this issue which is not comparable to neighbouring boroughs. This may mean delegating the budget for temporary exclusions to schools to manage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT – SCHOOLS</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that schools do not engage in the process of identifying and supporting vulnerable pupils, therefore reducing the effectiveness of the targeted approach and potentially reducing income.</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Executive Head, Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>Discussions have taken place to consider potential funding sources for 2016/17 funding requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>STAFF MORALE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Some of staff helping to set up may not be in new model. This may affect implementation and impact upon willingness to set up the new model.</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Regular staff briefings will take place and sensitivity will be given to those who do not form part of the new model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>DATA / TRACKING CAPACITY</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that the increased requirement for performance and outcome tracking leads to a reduction in the total caseload the team can work to and a reduction in outcomes accordingly.</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Tracking systems will be integrated into the model to prevent these from being onerous. Some administration support is available within the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that any wider changes in relation to Children’s Services over the next 3-5 years mean that option B is no longer aligned to ways of working.</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Executive Head, Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>Key to any new team will be the need to be flexible to changing service needs / practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION DELAY</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that implementation is delayed due to officer capacity or HR appeal / challenge resulting in a delay to the start of working with young people and an increased time lag in securing outcome payments which would affected the business model.</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Executive Head, Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>Ensure that the implementation phase is resourced appropriately. Seek HR advice early and allow suitable time for consultation to minimise risk of challenge / appeal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. CONCLUSION

The proposed model offers an opportunity for the council to implement a proactive response to current placement and DSG budget challenges. In line with recent national reports this is underpinned by the principle that reducing demand for statutory high cost services relies on an effective early help offer.

Whilst it is clear that schools will have a growing role in relation to commissioning alternative provision in the future, setting up a targeted youth support team provides a prompt response to the current trends around rising exclusion levels.

Similarly for the placements budget, given the scale of the challenge, a suite of interventions will be required to bring down costs, addressing both demand and the costs of the placements themselves. The Targeted Youth Support team offers one element of this approach and arguably staff are already starting to work in this fashion, with evening / weekend support in alternative to care arrangements. As such, formalising these arrangements will provide this on a sustainable, planned and more targeted basis.

As such the targeted Youth Support team has the potential to strengthen the way in which we identify and support our most vulnerable young people.
Annex A - Targeted Youth Support Worker - Competencies and Qualities

Targeted Youth Support Workers will need to be able to work with a young people in a wide range of situations. As such, they will need to fulfil the following competencies and qualities:

- Able to build professional rapport and develop relationships with young people and their families to improve outcomes
- Ability to design, deliver and evaluate group works and one to one interventions using a solution focused/coaching approach across all work delivered throughout the year and in holiday times.
- Knowledge and understanding of implementing safeguarding procedures working in a pressured environment.
- A flexible approach to supporting change in their allocated caseload, showing passion, enthusiasm and honesty throughout their work.
- Ability to assess, plan, implement and review action plans with a solution focused attitude to breaking down entrenched barriers for young people and their families.
- Ability/experience of working within a multi-agency environment with an understanding of social care and school values.
- Ability to engage other professionals at the right times, gaining information to progress cases and meet need.
- Workers will commit to 80% of their working time being face to face work with young people and their families, holding a caseload of 15-20 (TBC)
- Ability to risk assess volatile situations and make appropriate decisions for themself and the young person/family.
- Willingness to support the active involvement of young people at all times especially in any decisions made affecting them.
- Willingness to work across the week, including antisocial hours and weekends to meet support needs of vulnerable young people prone to crisis
- Ability to record all work onto a database and IT skills.
Annex B - Menu of Targeted Support Interventions

A targeted youth support intervention menu will typically cover; parent/young person and external stakeholder relationships; personal safety; self-management. Case work will progress and be monitored in line with an agreed intervention support plan. Example interventions include:

- Via scheduled one to one sessions, work to an agreed time bound, intervention support plan based on an assessment of need and by use of performance coaching techniques (e.g. goal setting, motivational interviewing, solution based conversation) to initiate changes that enable the young person to make progress required
- Deliver group work programmes in school or in the community focusing on a range of issues such as: CSE, Sexual Health, drugs, healthy relationships, domestic violence, self-esteem, post 16 career planning options etc. (supporting the school PSHE curriculum delivery)
- Undertake work to support family to ensure young person attends school (phone call or home visit) as required
- Escorting young people to school and/or to appointments when needed and creating plans to enable them to do this independently
- Acting as advocate for the young person, attend meetings at school regarding the young person (for example, behaviour management panels)
- Observing the young person in lessons focusing on behaviour and other challenges to keep engaged in school to assist young person to reflect and make change
- Looking at school based issues and contribute to personal education planning advising school colleagues on strategies that they can use to improve engagement
- Acting as a mediator between the family/parents and the school where relationships with school are fragile or have broken down completely
- Supporting young person to participate in positive activities outside of school and to participate in school enrichment programme
- Building appropriate relationships with young people and their family in the community
- Carry out direct work with the family to support behavioural change. This would be done in the home and/or via phone calls and in conjunction with family support workers as required.
- Responding to requests for crisis support and work with other professionals to plan structured response
- Leading/attending/initiating team around the child meetings to bring all professionals together and share information.
- Signposting, and refer when necessary to appropriate agencies for the child and the family
Annex C – DSG Funding Structure

An outline of the funding mechanism applicable to alternative education is shown below:

DSG Funding structure

Early Years providers receive entitlement from local authority.

Government applies own formula to calculate Sutton’s DSG requirement. Total allocation figure stated to the authority.

Local authority calculates academy entitlement and informs DfE who issue this directly and allocate funds according to set budget and local authority.

LBS allows for growth (additional places) according to budget and local authority.

Agenda Item 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit income</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place funding costs can be reduced if demand drops and infrastructure (buildings etc) are reduced accordingly but there is a time lag to do this.

| £7356 | Up to 120 | Minimum £0; Maximum £882,720 |

Top up costs can be avoided where fewer pupils are excluded and therefore fewer PRU places are used.

Funding for specified areas e.g. inclusion support.

TOTAL: Range: £1,200,000 up to £2,082,720