

Outline Business Case Template

Strand title	Surrey Family Support Programme
Sponsor(s)	Nick Wilson, Strategic Director for Children, Schools & Families
Lead	Sean Rafferty, Head of Family Services
Project team members	
Version number and date	Draft 5 – 10.01.14

1. Aims and objectives

At any one time there may be as many as 4,000 to 7,000 families or households with multiple and complex needs living in Surrey. These families and households will often be in receipt of targeted support and other interventions from across a wide range of Surrey public agencies and the services they commission.

These families and households typically suffer from a range of socially determined inequalities. These will include inequalities in early childhood development and education, employment and working conditions, housing and neighbourhood conditions, standards of living and more generally the ability to participate easily in the many benefits of living in such an advantageous place as Surrey. These families can also feature more than others in the local criminal justice system through being both the perpetrators of crime and or anti-social behaviour and or as the victims of crime and or anti-social behaviour.

Where Surrey public service providers offer targeted support to these families too late and or ineffectively these families can require long term expensive support and may find themselves in high cost acute services which might have been preventable.

Many individual vulnerable service users in Surrey receive good and better public services. However there is rarely a systematic response to families and households who present with multiple and or complex needs with the exception of some acute response services where statutory frameworks on offender management and adult and child protection come into place.

The aim of the Family Support Programme is to shift the balance of resources targeted at these families away from high cost acute services in favour of earlier action and fixing problems once. This will be achieved through changing the way Surrey Public Services work together with those families who present with a range of needs across a number of Surrey public sector agencies.

The proposal draws on evidence from the Surrey Family Support Programme and recommends that this existing multi-agency programme be adapted and expanded to support a much larger number of families and or households.

The objectives of this Transforming Public Services proposal is to:

- Positively turn around the lives of up to 7,000 families/households who present with complex and multiple needs through an integrated multi-agency approach to commissioning and delivering services
- achieve significant productivity savings across the participating Surrey agencies

- achieve cashable savings that will contribute to local public agency efficiency requirements

2. Case for change

Recent years have seen a significant rise in individuals and whole families who present with multiple and complex needs that require a response or proactive intervention from Surrey public agencies, for example the significant increase in families supported through statutory children's care services. The Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Analysis identifies a range of family issues for priority action such as:

- Families living in poverty and on the edge of poverty
- Families living with parental mental ill-health and or learning disabilities
- Families living with substance misuse
- Families living with domestic violence and abuse
- Families involved in crime and or anti-social behaviour
- Families with young carers
- Gypsy, Roma, Traveller families

The Surrey public services that work with families, households and individuals presenting complex and multiple issues will include:

- Police
- CCGs, GPs and their commissioned community health service providers
- Borough and District Council community safety and housing services
- Registered social landlords
- Schools and FE colleges
- Early years service providers
- Probation services
- HM Prisons service
- Courts
- Job Centre Plus and DWP commissioned employment support programmes
- Publicly funded voluntary, community and faith organisation services
- County Council Children's & Safeguarding Service
- County Council Schools & Learning Services
- County Council Youth Support Services
- County Council and CCG commissioned adults and children's mental health and learning disability services
- County Council commissioned substance misuse services
- County Council Public Health commissioned services

These numerous public sector structures and delivery arrangements are complex with organisational boundaries that do not always lend themselves to simple and or coterminous partnership working. This complexity, made more difficult through the frequent reorganisation of public service structures by central government, has led to some difficulties in developing and agreeing shared early intervention and targeted services across Surrey agencies. Existing responses to families and households who present with multiple and complex needs can result in:

- Poor outcomes for families and family members with high levels of failure demand where because family problems are not responded to effectively by agencies the first time around they become repeat problems that can sometimes escalate to acute services;
- High costs through duplicated referral arrangements with multiple and overlapping assessments, plans and interventions from different services and organisations, sometimes at the wrong time and wrong place;
- Complexity and confusion for families and staff with disjointed referral and support

pathways and service thresholds;

- Families falling through gaps where service thresholds act as a barrier to earlier intervention and problem solving for all family members;
- High cost reactive spend when problems become acute, as opposed to more cost effective earlier interventions;
- Poor tracking of systemic costs and outcomes because many agencies are involved with the same families, and;
- Little incentive for some agencies to invest in earlier interventions as the benefits are often realised by other agencies

The ever increasing social care demand crisis in Surrey is a sign not only of changing demographics but a sign that current services and partnerships are not giving an effective response to many individuals who present with complicated needs and even less so for families. This comes at a high cost for Surrey agencies at a time when public service budgets are rapidly shrinking and when priorities for spend will need to be changed.

The case for change may also be considered as part of the Prevention Priority being developed as part of the county's multi-agency Health and Wellbeing Strategy which seeks to develop a preventative approach to improve the following outcomes:

- Reduced gap in life expectancy between the poorest and wealthiest residents
- Less people smoking
- More people being physically active
- More people with a healthy weight
- Reducing hospital admissions due to drinking alcohol
- Reduced winter deaths

Those families and households who present Surrey public agencies with multiple and complex needs are most likely to be those families to present with poor health and range of poor health behaviours and who also have poor educational achievement, poor employment prospects and a low income and live in poor housing. Developing an integrated preventative approach that targets these families is a key part of the overall Prevention Strategy.

3. Proposed new delivery models

As part of the local response to the national Troubled Families Programme, Surrey public agencies have come together to develop the Surrey Family Support Programme. This multi-agency service model for working with families who present with multiple needs including adult unemployment, poor school attendance, crime and anti-social behaviour is made up of these key elements:

- Borough and District Councils are responsible for coordinating local agencies and their staff in working with families who meet the Troubled Families criteria;
- Each family joining the Programme has a single assessment and plan;
- Each family joining the programme is given a period of intensive practical support in the home by a dedicated Family Coordinator for a period of 12 weeks (average);
- All the agencies and practitioners working with a family agree to come together and work as a Team Around the Family for up to 12 months;
- One of the practitioners working with each family takes the role of Lead Professional to coordinate the multi-agency working with the family;
- Contact and communication arrangements across the practitioners working with each family are supported through a social media application, Patchwork;
- Clinical governance and quality assurance arrangements are provided by countywide agencies

This model of delivery has been in place in six boroughs and districts since March 2013 and countywide from October 2013 with resources in place to meet the local Troubled Families' target of turning around 1050 families by May 2015. The evidence to date is that this new way of multi-agency working is proving to be successful in responding more effectively to families who present with needs and problems requiring a response from a number of practitioners and or agencies.

Since April 2012 the programme has supported over 200 families with an intensive support package from their local Family Support Team supported by a multi-agency Team Around the Family (TAF). The DCLG's Director General for the national Troubled Families Programme has described Surrey's performance as 'tremendous.'

The new delivery model for this Transforming Public Services proposal is to take the Family Support Programme approach and scale it up to work with 4,000 to 7,000 families over the five years 2014 to 2020. This scaling up of families will extend the Family Support Programme to cover families that currently do not meet the Government's Troubled Families eligibility criteria. As part of developing the business case we will review which other families with multiple needs will be added to the Programme. The presenting issues that will be considered for the business case will include:

Presenting issues	Public Agency Stakeholders
Domestic violence and abuse	Police, Probation, MoJ, Home Office, Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, SCC Community Safety, SCC, Children's Social Care, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Public Health
Persistent anti-social behaviour and crime	Police, Probation, MoJ, Home Office, Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, RSLs, schools, SCC Community Safety, SCC Youth Services, SCC Adults Social Care
Offenders, ex-prisoners	Police, Probation, MoJ, Home Office, Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, RSLs, schools, SCC Community Safety, SCC Youth Services, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Public Health
Substance misuse	Police, Probation, MoJ, Home Office, Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, S&B Mental Health Trust, SCC Community Safety, SCC, Children's Social Care, SCC Adults Social Care
Families with pre-school children with complex , multiple needs	Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, Job Centre Plus, schools, SCC Community Safety, SCC Early Years, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Public Health
Children in alternative education	Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Job Centre Plus, schools, SCC Schools & Learning, SCC Public Health
Complex, multiple needs and low income and or high debt	All agencies
Mental Health and or learning disabilities	S&B Mental Health Trust, Police, Probation, MoJ, Home Office, Borough and District Councils, CCGs, Acute Trusts, Job Centre Plus, SCC Community Safety, SCC, Children's Social Care, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Youth Services, SCC Public Health
Where parents or children are in care	Borough and District Councils, CCGs, schools, SCC Early Years, SCC Children's Social Care, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Public Health
Multiple unemployment	Job Centre Plus, Borough and District Councils, FE Colleges,

	RSLs, SCC Youth Services, SCC Adults Social Care
Frequent A&E visitors	Acute Trusts, CCGs, SCC Public Health, SCC Children’s Social Care, SCC Adults Social Care
Homeless families	Borough and District Councils, RSLs, CCGs, Acute Trusts, Job Centre Plus, schools, SCC Early Years, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Public Health
Teenage Parents	Borough and District Councils, CCGs, schools, Job Centre Plus, SCC Early Years, SCC Public Health

Key to developing this business case is achieving a better understanding of how many families present with complex and multiple issues and the combination of needs these families present.

Scaling up the Family Support Programme to work with a much higher number of families and with greater importance placed on improving productivity across agencies will require changes to the model of delivery. These changes will be worked through in detail as part of developing the Cost Benefit Analysis for the Transforming Public Services proposal.

Following multi-agency meetings over the Summer and Autumn last year support was given to the following key service design principles of the new delivery model:

1. Multi-agency leadership

- The joint commissioning of the new delivery services by the participating commissioning agencies
- Aligning and or integrating current and new services alongside the new services
- Authoritative and systematic local leadership of multi-agency services

2. Integrated Systems and Practice

- Integrated multi-agency assessment arrangements
- Integrated Team Around the Family working arrangements at the local level
- A lead agency and lead professional for each family
- A single and sequenced multi-agency plan for each family
- Common, simpler and lower cost working practices
- Multi-agency IMT systems for identifying and tracking families and family outcomes
- Multi-agency IMT that connects practitioners and integrates case working
- Joint commissioning of local aligned and allied intervention services
- Multi-agency performance framework with clear families’ outcomes framework
- Overarching clinical governance and QA arrangements
- A workforce development programme

3. A Whole Family Approach

- All agencies working with the whole family
- Families involved in co-producing their assessment and solutions
- Each family given a period of practical home based support
- Interventions adapted to family complexity and need, i.e. intensive, medium and lite
- Work, training and or education (or other meaningful activities) a key outcome for every family

Beginning the redesign

An underpinning principle of any redesign of local services is that we are planning to create integrated and systematic networking arrangements and not structural integration. The reason for this being that the move towards integration through community budgets and systematic joint working can be more quickly and easily achieved than a structural change that could easily get

stymied by legal and financial complexities.

The service redesign is informed by the Cost Benefits Analysis and should seek to align services and staff around families with multiple and complex needs .It is proposed that local agencies begin the move towards an authoritative and systematic approach to integrated working with families and households who present with multiple and complex needs through the following three service design work streams:

Team Around the Family and Intensive Support

This design workstream will look at the current Family Support Programme Team Around the Family arrangements and look to see how the arrangements for governance, multi-agency working, aligned services, etc, can be made more efficient and effective. Insight and support can be drawn from the current multi-agency Team Around Family arrangements.

As part of the current Team Around the Family arrangements families are given a period of 12 weeks (on average) intensive support in the home. The nature and duration of this intensive support will be reviewed as part of this service design.

Very Complicated Families

There is a cohort of very complicated families that will grow as part of the scaling up. Typically these families have a combination of mental ill-health, substance misuse and domestic violence. Current multi-agency arrangements with these families are not sufficiently systematic to prevent a significant number of them falling into high cost acute services. A more specialist TAF arrangement could be more effective and efficient. This workstream will operate as a 'Discovery' project at this stage .

- Who are these families?
- How do the issues across individual family members create greater complexity?
- Are their needs known/hidden?
- What is their impact on communities?
- To what extent are problems inter-generational?
- What is their impact on agencies/resources?

Multi-agency Interventions

Scaling up the FSP to include more families with a wider range of problems creates a situation where we need to determine a new set of multi-agency interventions .There is potentially a long list of interventions that may be developed but the key ones for now will be:

- Reducing repeat incidences of Domestic Violence
- Homelessness prevention
- Reducing Mental Health in-patient and outpatient activity
- Work readiness and employment (turning high cost families into tax payers)
- Preventing children entering into formal interventions
- Reducing A&E admissions
- Substance misuse recovery
- Reducing exclusions and other high cost education interventions

These interventions also help describe the nature of the integrated arrangements necessary to effect better financial and family outcomes.

4. Changes required

The current Family Support Programme and its implementation provide a good insight into the changes that will be required to achieve greater productivity in a scaled up programme. All Surrey agencies will need to undergo significant change to develop and deliver on the new model of delivery. Changes will include:

Leadership Culture Change – A key success criteria for the new delivery model is integrated working

where the closer the integration is the better the family outcomes are and the greater the productivity benefits. Whilst there are many examples of good integrated working arrangements across Surrey, moving to this model of working will require a significant and closer degree of partnership working where agencies and services will cede some of their control over resources and services to a very different style of shared leadership and accountability.

Workforce change – those staff who work with families and especially those that will make up the Teams Around the Families will need to change their current working practices. Shared risk management with other practitioners and finding mutual and collaborative solutions with families will be a critical part of this. Developing a much more systematic approach to team working and working with families will be necessary too.

Organisational Change – the new model of working will require a considerable degree of change to organisations through new working arrangements and procedures and through some organisations stopping doing things to reduce duplication and some organisation performing functions on behalf of others.

Family and Community Change – Families upon leaving the Programme will need to be much less reliant on local public services and look to getting better support from within their communities – a change in community social capacity, including VCSF support, will be needed for some families to avoid re-entering the support systems. Greater self-reliance will also be needed of many families.

Financial change – Moving to a community budget approach where agencies budget and invest together will require a shift in current budgeting and planning arrangements and require that all agencies have a greater understanding of whole place budget and investment implications. The financial dependencies across Surrey public agencies will be clearer and closer. The development of the cost benefits analysis has illustrated the need for Surrey agencies to develop a more sophisticated understanding of business costs and activities.

Courage and Pace of change – It is often the case that partnership working in Surrey can be complex and slow. To realise the opportunities presented through Transforming Public Services in good time to improve community outcomes and public service costs requires a faster pace of change.

Government change – Government has a clear role to play in the development and delivery of a new scaled up Family Support Programme. Requests to Government to help this proposal to succeed will include:

- Support on integrating and simplifying current statutory assessment and planning arrangements
- Giving much greater control to Surrey agencies over the commissioning and oversight of local skills and employment programmes
- When the Troubled Families Programme is extended beyond 2015, Surrey should be able to claim any payment by results for families worked with in 2014-2015 who meet the new eligibility criteria
- Encourage and or incentivise RSL participation
- Pump prime the local development through invest to save
- NHS England to commission into the programme, e.g. specialist mental health services commissioning

5. Financial case

In preparing this outline business case it is possible to draw upon the published business cases from three of the government community budget areas who have also included a families with multiple

and complex needs project in their local programmes. These three areas are Essex, West Cheshire and Chester and Greater Manchester authorities. The businesses cases for these areas set out the following financial case summaries:

Essex

“ The total investment [required is] £17.9M resulting in a revised operating costs of£23.4M and net ..operational benefits of £34.6M. Long term steady state net cashable savings are estimated to be c.£7.8M per annum.”. The business case estimates £58M of cashable savings over a 7 year period.

West Cheshire and Chester

“...a whole system, cross sector, coordinated approach can significantly reduce demand on a range of public services. Overall the model has the potential to release a net fiscal benefit of £2.087M over five years [for 525 families] and that improved outcomes will provide reinvestment opportunities for public services.”

Greater Manchester Authorities

“Current estimates suggest that the costs of intervention of the New Delivery Model with the total cohort of families [8090] is £138M with benefits of £224M. It is estimated that £110M of the £224M represents cashable savings.”

The Surrey Cost Benefit Analysis

A preliminary Cost Benefit Analysis has been prepared using the Transforming Public Services Network methodology. This preliminary cost benefit analysis has considered the efficiencies that could be achieved through an integrated preventative approach. This preventative service cost benefit analysis may be summarised as follows:

Table 1: COST BENEFITS SUMMARY FOR 1,000 FAMILIES PER ANNUM

Headline Outcomes Measure	Benefits included and or excluded from the headline benefit	Range of fiscal benefit over 5 years (aggregated impact of benefits where known)	Average cashability (average across benefit measures included in the headline outcome measure)
Employment (inc NEETs)	Inc. JSA, ESA, Council Tax, NEETS (age 18-24) (excl. IB, JSA (LP), DLA, Work Programme NEETS 16-17)	£5.02M – £8.84M	98%
Health and Adults social care	Inc. Mental Health – inpatient and outpatient, CAMHS, anxiety/depression; Smoking, Type 2 diabetes, hypertension. (excl. A&E attendance)	£1.24M – £1.87M	50%
Crime and anti-social behaviour (inc Domestic Violence and Abuse)	Inc. Youth offending, Adult anti-social behaviour, Domestic Violence police call-outs (Excl. Repeat adult offenses, crime against individuals and households, domestic violence arrests, community sentences	£8.67M- £15.18M	60%

	and custodial sentences)		
Housing	Inc. Family homelessness, rent arrears and evictions, housing related anti-social behaviour, young people’s homelessness. (excl. Sustaining tenancies)	£4.08M – £6.53M	60%
Substance misuse	Inc. Young people and adults drugs and alcohol treatments	£3.45M – £5.75M	51%
Schools and pupil behaviour	Inc. Unauthorised absence, alternative support, exclusions and PRUs, adolescent behaviour (excl. Special Schools)	£14.35M – £21.43M	60%
Children’s social care	Inc. Children in Need, parenting programmes (excl. Looked after children)	£2.55M – £3.76M	60%
Total		£39.37M to £63.36mil	

Annual value of fiscal benefits at year 5: £15.37M to £24.73M

Comments on the Cost Benefits Analysis

For the purposes of this preliminary cost benefit analysis a wide range of assumptions were built into the costings such as an assumption to work with 1,000 families in each year, or 4,500 families over five years. estimates on likely engagement and success rates, a lag time for setting up the new service arrangements and developing the capacity to achieve full benefits, etc. Where local data was not available proxy data from national research and or data from other community budget pilots, e.g. Essex, was used.

It should be noted that all Surrey agencies struggled to provide a set of robust data against the preventative measures. In particular agencies struggled to provide unit costs against key transactional activities in the time given over to collecting and collating the data. This is not unique to Surrey since the Community Budget pilots each spent a long time in developing their analyses and had to rely on a wide range of national data sources as opposed to locally derived data. The summary cost-benefit analysis table above does not contain data for all outcome measures identified by partners. The final cost benefit analysis will seek to quantify the fiscal benefits for 43 outcomes. However, we currently only have enough data to provide fiscal benefits for 29 outcomes and therefore the total overall fiscal benefit is likely to increase as more data becomes available.

An optimism bias was applied to all data with -40% applied to all bottom of the range benefits . Top of the range benefits applied a range of assumptions based on the Transforming Public Services Network technical guidance and advice from the Network’s Finance Adviser.

Data from the current cohort of families in the Family Support Programme was used for most of the population assumptions that relied on Surrey data. It should be noted that an expanded programme would touch on a broader range of families and that for future iterations of the this cost benefits analysis data will need to be drawn from a wider set of family data sources where available.

A key issue for developing the cost benefits analysis is developing a clearer understanding of the impact of the fiscal benefits on current spending plans and projected demand on services. In this iteration of the analysis it is not known for all of the individual fiscal benefits as to whether the benefits are:

- a) Cashable, i.e. that the fiscal benefit may be used for an added financial saving against current financial plans and or reinvested in service to achieve other benefits and or contribute to planned budget reductions, or;
- b) Cost avoidance, i.e. that the derived benefit avoids future planned costs, e.g. absorbing a planned increase in service demand
- c) Realisable, i.e. for some measures the fiscal benefit may only be realised above a specific scale. E.g. if a new intervention reduces police call-outs, it can only be a realisable benefit if call-outs are reduced to a scale that permits the increased productivity to be diverted elsewhere or made cashable through reducing staff numbers..

For the purposes of this iteration of the cost benefits analysis cashability has been assumed at 100% or 0% where known and at 60% where unknown. This assumption is in line with the Essex CBA and agreed through the Transforming Public Services Network.

The cost benefit analysis has been shared with technical advisors from the Transforming Public Services Network who have commented that the analysis includes 'a lot of good content....backed up with evidence.' The challenges regarding making population assumptions and estimating cashable savings have been faced by all the community budget pilots.

Next steps to developing the cost benefit analysis

This preliminary cost benefits exercise, using a range of Surrey community data, has been able to demonstrate that there is great potential to realise improved community outcomes and significant fiscal benefits through an integrated preventative approach to working with those families and households. It also demonstrates that a sophisticated understanding of finances and financial management will be necessary to put in place the community budget arrangements to effectively realise the full benefits.

Next steps on developing the preventative service cost benefits analysis will include:

- Developing with partners a better set of population assumptions and local unit costs
- Using a multi-agency 'expert challenge' group to work through issues over understanding benefits cashability
- Developing fiscal benefits across all the relevant service outcomes
- Determining how shared fiscal benefits are distributed across partner agencies

A further stage of developing the overall cost benefits analysis will be to calculate the costs of delivering any new service arrangements and contrast these with current costs. For the time being it is assumed that the costs of delivering the new integrated arrangements may be managed within existing costs and or invest to save.

A key test analysis will be testing out the case as part of implementation and delivery. A key part of any delivery arrangement will require the careful capture and realisation of benefits.

The cost benefits analysis methodology devised by the Transforming Public Services Network, in addition to proving a method to calculate fiscal benefits, also provides a methodology to calculate the economic and social benefits of any preventative programme. The social and economic benefits that may be derived from this work will be developed at a later iteration of the analysis.

6. Implementation plan		
Step	Date	Risks
Agree scope of new service	By April 2014	We need to be able to scope the scale quickly in order to develop the business case
Develop Cost Benefit Analysis	February to June 2014	Agencies will struggle to provide the activity and financial data necessary for a detailed business case. Agencies may not give the production of this work priority to meet the timescales. The final the business case will need to be based on best available data.
Run Co-design workstream	February to July 2014	The timescales will be challenging to work through and agree across agencies the new service model. Significant agency participation is required.
Agree implementation plans	June 2014	The timescales will be challenging to work through and agree across agencies the new service model. Significant agency participation is required.
Begin implementation	From April 2014	Many cost benefits may only be realised once the new delivery model is in place . A complex and or slow implementation might delay benefits realisation. The new delivery model will require radical change to organisations, staff and families. Careful risk management will be necessary at implementation.

This page is intentionally left blank