

CHILD PLACEMENTS AND RESIDENTIAL CARE

ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY – POTENTIAL OPTIONS

1	<p>Option 1 – To continue to spot purchase residential care as required.</p>		<p>Potential Saving of? <i>None unless the demand for places is reduced. This is unlikely given current trend.</i></p> <p>How long before any cost benefit is realised? <i>N/A</i></p> <p>What resources will be required to implement the option</p> <p><i>Significant continued Finance</i></p> <p><i>Continued support services</i></p> <p><i>Continued monitoring by Resource Manager and Children’s Rights Officer</i></p> <p><i>Reviewing Officer/Social Work time will continue to be required out of area</i></p>
	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to buy bespoke tailor made packages for young people including education. • Placements often out of area and in some cases this is positive to remove young person from negative environment • Supply and demand – no empty beds. • No staffing responsibilities. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost. • Lack of appropriate education packages locally, often leads to placements being a considerable distance from Stockton. • Distance places pressure on social work time. • Contact with family and friends more difficult. • Loss of links with local area placing strain on young person’s identity and networks. • Access to CAMHS may be limited. • Often further cost for therapeutic input. 	
	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop closer links with Private Sector regionally. 	<p>Threats/Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited influence on homes/placement culture and ethos. • No control over admissions or notice to discharge young people in placement. • Blocking of crisis beds in Stockton may continue, due to high cost of this option. • No control of in terms of inspection process and outcomes for young people. 	

Option 2 – To develop Local Authority Residential provision.		Potential Saving of?
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced current cost of placements. • Existing provision is high quality and outstanding. • Recognised good outcomes for young people in own local authority provision. • More young people placed locally in line with Care Matter agenda. • Strong links with Multi Agency partners. • Good staff retention. • Strong management expertise... • Strong partnerships in relation to local move on accommodation post 16, 17 and 18 years. • Young people maintain contact with families and friends. • Promotion of local culture and identity. • Continuity of school placement and health care. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited places. • Matching can be difficult. • Vacancies not available as required and waiting lists may be in place. • Education not available for those where their educational needs cannot be met locally within existing provision... 	<p><i>There are a number of models and savings range from £11.000 to £443.000 per year.</i></p> <p>How long before any cost benefit is realised?</p> <p><i>If housing stock is available then savings will be made within the first year. However if capital is required to develop provision then setting up costs will be higher and timescales for savings can only be established following estimated funds needed. (This is work in progress).</i></p>
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return young people back to their local area. • Prevent young people leaving local area. • Develop partnership with CAMHS further to deliver more therapeutic services. • Develop local education provision and bespoke packages. • Opportunity to redesignate short term unit to allow respite and planned intervention to support families in crisis. • Opportunity to develop further and sell to other local authorities. particularly if education packages were available. 	<p>Threats/Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blocking short-term crisis beds. • Staffing responsibilities e.g. conduct sickness etc. can increase costs to local authority. • Education provision may not be available thereby jeopardising placements 	<p>What resources will be required to implement the option?</p> <p><i>Setting up costs of £21.000 Staff Recruitment and training. Premises/Property Commitment from partners in education and health Possibly some capital funds – amount to be determined</i></p>

Option 3 – To commission a private/voluntary sector provider to establish a local children’s home.		Potential Saving of?
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More young people placed locally. • Access to multi agency partners. • Young people able to maintain contact with family and friends. • Continuity of school placement and health care. • No staffing responsibilities. • More young people placed locally in line with Care Matter agenda. • Promotion of local culture and identity. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost. • Limited choice re Admission Criteria (ability to say no) and give notice to end placements. • Cost of void beds. • Education provision limited locally for more challenging children. • Less control about mix of group. 	<p><i>Travelling and social work time. Costs for contact for families would reduce.</i></p> <p>How long before any cost benefit is realised? <i>Immediately</i></p>
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to develop partnership with provider and extend provision. • Develop local education provision and bespoke packages. • Work in partnership with other unitary authorities to develop more specialist provision. 	<p>Threats/Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No management control. • No control over admission or discharges. • Potential for poor OFSTED inspections and poor outcomes for young people. 	<p>What resources will be required to implement the option? <i>Costs would be redistributed from current out of area placements 1</i></p>