

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title:</b>	Tendering of Early Help (Volunteer Support for Families with a child under 5 years old)
-------------------	---

<b>EIA author:</b>	Ross Pike, Project Officer. Children's Commissioning Team
--------------------	---

## 2. Approval

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date approved</b>
<b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b>	Ian Banner	12/06/2013

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>	3.0	<b>EIA completed</b>	12/06/2013
<b>Date saved</b>	12/06/2013	<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Sandy Thomas	Service Manager	SCC	Budget Holder
Jo Lee	Senior Commissioner	SCC	Commissioning
Alys Wood	Category Specialist	SCC	Procurement
Ross Pike	Project Officer	SCC	Commissioning

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<p><b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b></p>	<p>Early help (volunteer support for families with a child under the age of five) is being reviewed with a view to continuing to provide positive outcomes for families and value for money in Surrey but ensuring consistency and countywide coverage and streamlined contract management for SCC.</p> <p>The current provider's core function is to train and recruit volunteers who visit families in their own homes, once a week. They support families with everyday tasks such as hygiene, grocery shopping, healthy eating and accessing community services to more complex emotional support, parenting skills and child development. The support lasts for as long as the volunteer is needed or when the youngest child turns five.</p> <p>The only criterion for accessing the service is that the family have at least one child under the age of five and that they live within the geographic boundaries of the scheme. Referrals can come from a range of sources including health visitors and social workers or directly from the family.</p> <p>The service aims to provide the right support to prevent family problems escalating into crisis, necessitating intervention from statutory services and also to provide families with the resilience to cope independently using the universal services available in Surrey and realise positive outcomes for themselves and their children.</p>
<p><b>What proposals are you assessing?</b></p>	<p>The changes that are being considered are primarily contractual; moving from nine individual one year contracts with the provider to a one contract countywide model system that meets the needs of families and children across the county for a period of two years.</p> <p>There are no plans to alter the service significantly as it currently delivers high levels of support, value for money and positive outcomes for the families whom it serves. Therefore, the model for delivering support to families with a child under five will not be prescriptive. Performance measures and outcomes will be outlined and monitored. The motivation for the review is to ensure Countywide coverage, so there are no gaps in provision and consistency of the service and to streamline contracting and monitoring processes.</p> <p>The implications are a potential change in provider and possible subsequent loss of efficacy depending on the identity of the provider as they may have to start from scratch and receive cases from the existing provider.</p> <p>Greater penetration of the county should be achieved by aligning the contracts to a countywide area. Outcomes will be demonstrable for every case supported by the service using a consistent methodology that reflects the priorities of the County Council and its Children,</p>

	<p>Schools and Families Directorate.</p> <p>The expected aims and outcomes of the service will not substantively change.</p>
<p><b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b></p>	<p>Service users: the relationships with their current service and volunteer could be lost. This could negatively impact the family and their children if trusted support is lost or altered. If the provider changes and the workforce too; material, social and emotional outcomes could worsen, vulnerable families may not be reached and social care teams could experience increased referrals. However, the service could benefit from increased security from a two year financial award allowing greater scope for provider planning and outreach to families which do not access the service currently, development of workforce skill set and ability to impact on more challenging complex cases and further embedding of relationships with local community services.</p> <p>Council staff: the burden of contract and performance management will lighten increasing the capacity for scrutiny and relationship management and free up capacity for other functions. Social care staff will be able to continue to build networks in their area including the family support provider preventing crises and the need for intervention.</p> <p>Conversely, if a new provider is chosen this could increase the amount of work required on contract and performance management as the new provider gets to grips with SCC's expectations. A dip in performance could impact social care team referrals and caseloads in both children's and adult's teams and community services such as Children's Centres.</p> <p>External organisations: if funding is not awarded to the existing provider they could cease operating causing employees to lose their jobs. This has obvious negative economic and social implications for Surrey residents. Existing partnerships that providers have developed will not be able to continue perhaps reducing the effect other organisations can have on outcomes for children and families in the county and on the employment of other staff.</p>

## 6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out
<p>Engagement was carried out with each of the provider organisations directly to discuss the work they carry out with the community in their local area. Via interviews they provided self reported outcomes, case studies and case load information as well an insight into the gaps they have discovered in their referrals and the resulting potential for unmet needs. This was analysed alongside the quarterly monitoring information provided to Children’s Services.</p> <p>Drawing on the work carried out by other teams across the Directorate such as the Early Help Public Value Programme we have been able to supplement the information provided by the frontline staff with further service user feedback.</p>
Data used
<p>Graham Allen MP, <i>Early Intervention: The Next Steps. An Independent Report to Her Majesty’s Government</i>, (January 2011). Surreyi, JSNA chapters on Demography, Priority Places and Child Poverty. ONS, Census data on the age structure/demography of Surrey Districts and Boroughs (2011). Home Start, Outcomes, Caseloads, Staff and Volunteer numbers, 2011-12</p>

12

## 7. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function

## 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic <sup>2</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	This is an early help service so should positively effect children in the early years benefiting them as they age. Children over-5 are not the primary target of the service but if they have siblings over-5 they are still supported. As are the parents/carers who may be of any age.	None identified	The Allen Review highlights the need to put services in place to help child development early. The 0-5 yrs criteria contributes to that aim. Evaluation of the schemes show the positive effect the service has on their lives too.
<b>Disability</b>	Develop volunteer skill-base with increased focus on outcomes for children and parent's with disability	May not be able to secure volunteers with the right skills or motivation to work with the most complex cases. These families may be adversely affected or need the intervention of a social care team to help.	Evaluation report.
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	The provider works closely with parents experiencing difficulties coping with multiple births, many children under-5 and post natal depression. Contracting differently will allow the service to continue and expand this work countywide	None identified	Teenage parents have been identified as hard to reach but it is also recognised that this group are more responsive to 'friends' such as the voluntary sector rather than statutory services. JSNA.

Page 203

<sup>2</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

<b>Race</b>	Alternative providers may have other strategies for engaging reaching BME groups that have not be used in Surrey before which could bring marginalised groups into the orbit of a family support service.	Continuing with the current model of sending volunteers to support people in their homes does present problems in certain tight knit communities and family groups such as the GRT community which do not consider outside intervention from organisations to be welcome.	Evaluation report GRT Strategy
<b>Religion and belief</b>	Alternative providers may have other strategies for engaging reaching groups that have not be used in Surrey before which could bring marginalised groups into the orbit of an early help service.	Continuing with the current model of sending volunteers to support people in their homes does present problems in certain communities and family groups whose beliefs mean that outside help for struggling families is not appropriate.	Evaluation report
<b>Sex</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	Can tackle emotional stress and domestic abuse issues which can destabilise relationships and impact on parents and children and young people's well-being and attainment.	Capacity/experience of provider to deal with such situations may differ leading to divergent outcomes depending on the contract award.	Self reported outcomes/monitoring

## 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Disability</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Race</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Religion and belief</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Sex</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	None identified	None identified	
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	None identified	None identified	

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
N/A	N/A

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Transition	SCC will support the successful provider with implementation of the new countywide service and with the transfer of service users where appropriate.	1 <sup>st</sup> November 2013	Commissioning

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
N/A	

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	Monitoring data submitted to Surrey County Council by the provider. Self reported outcomes from the users of the services. Evaluation of the service by Children's Service officer.
<b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b>	Positive impacts include improved equity by ensuring countywide service provision and value for money for Surrey residents and potential new methods and strategies for helping 'hard to reach' residents. No negative impacts were identified.
<b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b>	N/A
<b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b>	Thorough review of current service provision and revision of outcomes expected by SCC from any provider of the service.



<b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b>	N/A
--	-----

This page is intentionally left blank