



## Report to Scrutiny

Item Number:

Contains Confidential or Exempt Information

No

<b>Subject of Report:</b>	Outcome Reviews
<b>Meeting:</b>	Review Panel 4 – 2018/2019: Future Ealing 28 February 2019
<b>Service Report Author:</b>	Gary Pyke, Assistant Director – Transformation Email: <a href="mailto:PykeG@ealing.gov.uk">PykeG@ealing.gov.uk</a> Tel: 020-8825 6064
<b>Scrutiny Officer:</b>	Harjeet Bains, Scrutiny Review Officer Email: <a href="mailto:bainsh@ealing.gov.uk">bainsh@ealing.gov.uk</a> Tel: 020-8825 7120
<b>Cabinet Responsibility:</b>	<i>Cllr Julian Bell (Leader plus Regeneration and Transport) and Cllr Peter Mason (Housing, Planning and Transformation)</i>
<b>Director Responsibility:</b>	Kieran Read Director Strategy & Engagement Email: <a href="mailto:readk@ealing.gov.uk">readk@ealing.gov.uk</a> Tel: 020-8825 6395
<b>Brief:</b>	To consider the outcomes of the reviews that have been undertaken as part of the outcome review programme and make recommendations accordingly
<b>Recommendations:</b>	The Panel is asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- consider and comment on the information provided about the outcome reviews; and</li><li>- make suggestions for further improvements as appropriate.</li></ul>

## 1. Outcome Reviews – approach

### *Context*

- 1.1. Through its Future Ealing transformation programme Ealing Council is seeking to deliver positive outcomes for communities in line with the administration's priorities whilst managing significant reductions in funding and rising cost pressures.
- 1.2. The outcome review programme is at the heart of Future Ealing and the strategy to deliver savings of £57m over the period 19/20 to 21/22.
- 1.3. The objectives of the outcome review programme were to
  - Link and review activity against outcomes
  - Identify evidence based implementable options for MTFS delivery to agreed savings targets
  - Set service strategy to inform future activity e.g. BPR
  - Provide expertise and capacity to challenge and innovate across Future Ealing agenda
  - Promote collaboration and tap into internal skills
- 1.4. The programme of outcome reviews was conducted over the summer of 2018. Proposals arising from the outcome reviews have been adopted into the MTFS from 2019/20 through the budget process and delivery will be overseen through the Future Ealing governance.

### *Approach*

- 1.5. The approach taken was as follows:
  - To focus the reviews on delivery against key measures in the Future Ealing performance framework rather than by service
  - To clearly define budgets that were in and out of scope for each review to manage dependencies between them and with existing transformation activity eg Better Lives
  - To require clear evidence based propositions for change with associated performance and financial trajectories and an implementation plan as key deliverables from the project
  - To ensure that each outcome review had a Director level lead to ensure ownership, delivery and internal challenge.
  - To procure external support to add capacity, expertise and challenge. A consortia of IMPOWER and Grant Thornton was appointed after a procurement process

- 1.5 The review options to be developed would reflect the ways of working to which the council is committed through Future Ealing:
- Focuses on delivering outcomes and review all activity against these.
  - Tackles underlying problems through prevention.
  - Empowers people and communities to take action themselves.
  - Makes effective use of data and customer insight.
  - Effectively commissions, market and contract manages.
  - Collaborates so residents see one council and one public service.
  - Grows our income and the local economy.
  - Improves the efficiency with which we operate on an ongoing basis.
  - Delivers a balanced budget and value for money delivery.
- 1.6 A detailed set of ‘challenge questions’ was developed as part of the specification to support and enable a creative and constructive challenge in line with the goals of the programme. This is included at Appendix 1.
- 1.7 The scale of financial pressure facing the council meant that in addition to transforming delivery models through innovation the council is likely to have to reduce the range of services it offers. Options to stop or reduce service provision were to be considered via the Outcome Reviews alongside options to reform services.
- 1.8 It was noted that the approach should not result in a service-based review approach. What was needed was an outcome approach, one which ignored service boundaries and instead focused on citizen/resident outcomes. To adopt an outcome focus the reviews were structured as follows:
- All Age Disability – this would build on work already completed within the Council through Better Lives, SEN Transport and Supporting People.
  - Safe and Achieving Young People – becoming a successor to Brighter Futures.
  - Independent and Healthy –taking forward health and care integration and the areas not impacted by Better Lives.
  - Housing and Homelessness.
  - Neighbourhoods – covering environment and active citizen work.
  - Skills and Employment – integrating with Safe and Achieving Young People and Independent and Healthy.

## **2. Outcomes Reviews – Proposals**

- 2.1 The key proposals generated and the anticipated impact on outcomes is summarised below.

## **All Age Disability**

- All age disability model – strengths based whole life planning approach
- LD package savings (skills and employment)
- SEND model, driven by the Ealing Learning Partnership (ELP) that looks to earlier intervention, opening up a network approach to support with schools and embedding an independence focus through strengths based assessment and greater emphasis on direct work that meets need and reviewing progress.
- A commissioning approach which will underpin how the Council works with partners, providers and young people to shape, commission and deliver independence centred support to this priority cohort
- Community equipment – promoting self support and independence

## **Safe and Achieving Young People**

- Regionalised fostering approach
- Changing LAC placement mix to improve outcomes and reduce placement costs
- Reducing LAC numbers and embedding Brighter Futures

## **Independent and Healthy**

- Sexual health – online channel shift

## **Housing and Homelessness.**

- Improve prevention
- Increase supply
- Increase throughput

## **Neighbourhoods**

- Transport strategy – promoting reduced carbon emissions
- Libraries strategy
- Children's centre strategy

## **Skills and Employment (impact primarily felt in other outcome areas eg homeless prevention/employment of care leavers)**

- Clear pathways and a centralised team
- Targeted employment support
- Social value
- West London approach

### **3. Savings**

- 3.1 In the context of the council's budget position ambitious targets were set. These were designed to stimulate radical thinking and to enable choices regarding implementation.
- 3.2 In total a net General Fund revenue budget of £98.45m was in scope of the reviews. From this the following targets were set in the context of the MTFS requirement. The detailed allocation of the savings is set out in Appendix 2.
- 3.3 The savings associated with the outcome reviews adopted into the budget were agreed in the December budget report with anticipated savings from the implementation of the neighbourhoods review workstreams on libraries and children's centres presented to January Cabinet.
- 3.4 General Fund Savings presented and agreed from the outcome reviews to January Cabinet were £10.283m, with further non General Fund efficiencies of £2.371m – as set out in Appendix 1.
- 3.5 The January Cabinet identified a further £1.458m General Fund savings and £0.492m non General Fund Savings

### **4. External support**

- 4.1 As part of the process Directors and staff within services were part of the selection process. This created transparency with services and suppliers and created a higher level of engagement with the Outcome Review process. This is identified as a 'best practise' procedure and should be used when appointing major providers and consultants across the council
- 4.2 Whilst working closely with the lead for each review the provider was also commissioned by the Programme Management Office which created the independence of the reviews from the Services themselves. At completion this was seen as advantageous as it kept the supplier independent of the services and allowed a higher degree of challenge and assisted with programme co-ordination.
- 4.3 Following provider presentations, the council awarded the Outcome Review work to a partnership formed by iMPower and Grant Thornton. The value of the contract was a fixed fee of £420K. Arrangements were agreed to ensure value for the council if it decided to work with the consortia in the delivery phase. This fee also covered a related review of the capital programme aligned to the outcomes.

### **5. Future Implementation and Engagement**

- 5.1 The outcome review programme sets an ambitious programme of activity. This will be managed within the agreed Future Ealing governance. Priority programmes will have a lead Director for implementation and will report monthly to the Future Ealing Delivery Board and onwards to the Programme Board and members.
- 5.2 One off transformation Investment to deliver the outcome reviews has been assessed and was agreed in the December budget report. In total the council will invest £2.484m. This investment will be managed through the PMO.

- 5.3 Delivery plans are being developed but the council plans to maximise efficiency and support the organisational development strategy by prioritising recruitment to LBE contracts and/or backfilling existing posts to deliver the outcome reviews, drawing on external capacity where there is a clear business case to add value.

## **6. Legal Implications**

Various parts of the Outcome Review outcomes will have specific legal implications. Where this is the case these will be outlined in detail in specific decisions

## **7. Financial Implications**

The financial implications of both investment in and savings derived from the outcome reviews are set out in the report. There are no new financial implications arising from this report,

## **8. Background Papers**

[Appendix 1 – Savings Proposals](#)

## Consultation

<b>Name of Consultee</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date Sent to Consultee</b>	<b>Date Response Received from Consultee</b>	<b>Comments Appear in Report Para:</b>
<b>Internal</b>				
Kieran Read	Director Strategy & Engagement		18/2/19	Throughout
<b>External</b>				

## Report History

<b>Decision Type:</b>		<b>Urgency item?</b>	
Non-key Decision		No	
<b>Authorised by Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Date Report Drafted:</b>	<b>Report Deadline:</b>	<b>Date Report Sent:</b>
N/A	21.01.19	19.02.19	18.02.19
<b>Report No.:</b>	<b>Report Author and Contact for Queries:</b>		
	Gary Pyke Assistant Director of Transformation Email: <a href="mailto:PykeG@ealing.gov.uk">PykeG@ealing.gov.uk</a> Tel: 020-8825 6064		

# Appendix 1: Outcome Review Challenge Questions

## Understanding

- What outcome/transformation target(s) does the activity contribute to? What is the evidence for this?
- What is the current delivery model?
- Is our current provision effective? What is the evidence?
- Is this something we could stop providing or reduce the level we provide?
- What are the current costs?
  - Staffing
  - Contracts
  - Unit cost
  - Benchmarks
- What drives cost – and what is the evidence?
  - Demand (from which cohorts/where in the system/how much could be prevented)?
  - Service provision levels? (Can these be reduced?)
  - Council policy?
  - Service failure (where?)

## Delivering Differently

- If the system was working well to deliver the outcome?
  - What would LBE do differently?
  - What would partners do differently?
  - What would residents/communities do differently?
  - What elements would be digital or enabled by technology?
- What level of demand/cost could we realistically target?
- Can service levels be varied – what would be the impact?
- Could we get better value from providers?
- Would an alternative delivery model open up opportunities/reduce costs?
- How could this service be integrated with others at neighbourhood level?
- What are the opportunities to be more commercial?
  - Trading?
  - Charging (what is the policy and why)?

## Implementation

- How long will it take to drive change and deliver savings?
- What is the savings profile?
- What are the key risks associated with change - how will these be mitigated?
- What would be the resourcing needed to make change happen?