

A Review of Third Sector Children's Services

David Cameron

Lindsay Macgregor

October 2019

Acknowledgements

Our thanks to the six members of the Steering Group - Chris Campbell, Fiona McKay, Kathy Henwood, Kenny Murphy, Laura Crombie, and Lynn Gillies - who arranged workshops and commented on interim drafts. Thanks also to all the interviewees and workshop participants from the Third Sector organisations under review. We appreciate the time and thoughtfulness given to the review in the face of uncertainty. Our thanks also to the interviewees from Fife Council, NHS Fife and the wider voluntary sector, all of whom gave helpful perspectives.

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Background	10
Key Findings	17
Options: Medium to Longer Term	24
Options: Short Term	36
Outstanding Issues and Possible Next Steps	41
Appendices	45
Bibliography	53

Executive Summary

This is the report of a review of that was conducted of funding for Third Sector organisations supporting children and families in Fife.

The review was asked to look at the impact of proposed savings from that budget and also at the longer-term relationship between Fife Council and these organisations.

Clearly the review was time-limited and was not able to explore fully all relevant issues, but it has been reasonably comprehensive, involving interviews with almost all of the Third Sector organisations involved, two well-attended workshops with Third Sector representatives, interviews with key Council officers and elected members as well as relevant representatives of other services and organisations. These approaches were supported by desk-based research and relevant reading.

It is important to note that the views expressed in the interviews and in the workshops are just that - they are views and perceptions. They may not always reflect the reality of situations and there may be other views and perceptions which contradict these. They have been included in the report because these perceptions are strongly held and really influence behaviours. On that basis we need to be aware of them and deal with them.

The main conclusions of the review reflect conclusions reached by other reviews and previously reported to the Council.

The Council is facing considerable budget pressures as a result of increasing demands for services and a real terms reduction in funding. It does have to consider options for savings which may run counter to its ambitions. A reduction in Third Sector funding would be one such saving.

If the full saving, currently proposed, of £410,000 is taken there will be a reduction in the services currently offered by the Third Sector and there will be reductions in staffing. While there are efficiencies that can be made in the Sector, the savings are relatively small and are likely to take time to be realised. There will be an increase in demand for Council services.

The report sets out options which the Council may consider with regard to this short-term saving, but it recognises that there will be an impact elsewhere if other savings are taken.

The report strongly recommends that whatever decision the Council takes with regard to the saving, it should not be applied on the same basis to all the Third sector organisations involved. It argues strongly that the Council and the Third Sector should fundamentally reform their relationship and that no organisation, currently involved, should be unable to participate in that reform as a result of the impact of savings taken this year. Options to achieve this are offered in this report.

The report also offers options for the Council to consider in the medium and longer term. These are all premised on closer joint working between the Statutory and Third Sector and offer the Third Sector greater influence in service planning and commissioning. The report hopes that the possibility of closer cooperation will break the cycle of proposed savings by the Council which are then opposed through campaigning and lobbying and, often, subsequently reduced or reversed. This cycle is damaging to coherent planning and needs to be ended.

The report also suggests approaches which the Council and the Third Sector could pursue jointly which may generate savings and increase efficiency.

Some of the options offered by the report are listed below for convenience. The issues are more fully explored in the relevant sections of the report.

Recommendations to improve joint working

1. Jointly revisit prevention and early intervention to determine whether it can still be a priority and, if it is, how it may best be implemented and resourced;
2. Jointly clarify criteria and needs assessment processes for accessing universal, early intervention, additional and intensive support services;
3. Revisit referral pathways and determine whether more formal processes are required;
4. Universal service providers should consider how they can most effectively identify and appropriately refer families and individuals in need of support;
5. Wherever possible, share relevant training programmes and opportunities across all sectors and organisations;
6. All sectors should jointly re-assess levels of current and future need across Fife to identify priority areas, outcomes, and demographic groups;
7. Fife Council and Community Planning partnerships should consider, where it is within their agency, how funding priorities and programmes can complement rather than duplicate or overlap;

8. Further consideration should be given to the number, remit and operation of strategic and planning groups and how members can most effectively be facilitated to participate in decision-making;
9. All providers should consider adopting shared approaches to needs and impact assessment and Fife Council should consider how consistency of monitoring and evaluation can most satisfactorily be strengthened.

Options for the proposed saving

The report offers, and further develops, a range of options for dealing with the short-term funding issues. These options are summarised below.

Option 1:

Make the saving from another area of Council provision to safeguard prevention and early intervention work and on-going work with some of the most vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife delivered by Third Sector Children's Services.

Pro: this would fully safeguard Third Sector provision and retain trusting relationships to the benefit of the proposed re-commissioning process;

Con: the saving would have to be found elsewhere or postponed, contrary to the decision already taken by the Education and Children's Services Committee.

Option 2: Make a partial saving rather than the full £410,000 to limit the negative impact on services and communities and/or phase the reduction over a longer period

Pro: the smaller the saving, the more limited the negative impact on services and beneficiaries;

Con: this approach could further lengthen and intensify the period of uncertainty for the Third Sector organisations affected.

Option 3: Make an 11.2% cut across the board, securing the stipulated £410,000.

Pro: all affected organisations share the same level of reduction;

Con: not all organisations would necessarily feel the same level of impact with small-, to medium-sized organisations potentially being tipped into losing key staff and services, and, in some instances, becoming unsustainable.

Option 4: Make the saving by reducing funding proportionately – taking nothing from organisations in receipt of less than £10k; 8% from those in

receipt of 10k – 99k; 10% from those in receipt of £100k-£299k; 12% from those in receipt of £300- £499k; and 14% from those in receipt of over £500k.

Pro: a more nuanced reduction, with smaller organisations slightly more protected;

Con: the reductions for large organisations which have already lost 1% in the process will impact even more significantly on staffing levels and service provision.

Option 5: Merge organisations with similar services across Fife or with complementary services within a locality or neighbourhood.

Pro: potential savings in management and office costs;

Con: mergers could not be completed successfully to deliver savings within the required timeframe and experience of previous mergers in Fife, and elsewhere, indicates that increased travel costs, needs for larger office space etc result in little or no saving.

Option 6: Make back-office efficiencies.

Pro: this would have the least negative consequences for services, staff and beneficiaries;

Con: no organisations interviewed were able to identify any obvious efficiencies which could be made within the timescale required. Every organisation identified that savings could only be made by cutting staff hours and/or eating into diminishing reserves.

Medium- and Longer-term options

There are a range of options for medium-, and longer-term change set out in the report. These are summarised here. We have given these priority in ordering the report as we believe these are critical in terms of establishing trust in the Third Sector. Positive proposals for change are likely to have a strong influence on the discussion of short-term savings.

Option1: The Council could move to a complete recommissioning of services. This could be based on a joint assessment of need between the Statutory and Third Sectors. It could also be based on a model where the Council identified the available budget and Third Sector organisations identified what they could do within that parameter.

Pro: This would allow a more radical approach to service delivery. It would break patterns which may have been too long established and create greater scope for innovative approaches.

Any steps to offer greater involvement to the Third Sector would enhance trust and good will and may assist in the acceptance of any decisions that the Council may take in relation to immediate funding to the Sector.

Con: There would inevitably be organisations what would be more and less successful in any recommissioning exercise and there would need to be a willingness within the Third Sector to agree to the process and accept the outcomes. There would need to be an increased commitment from the Third Sector to support collaborative structures such as the Third Sector Children's Services Forum and ensure that Fife Voluntary Action was able to function effectively

Option 2: The Council and the Third Sector could agree to establish stronger joint working arrangements. This might involve the establishment of geographical Hubs which would involve both Statutory and Third Sectors taking a more localised approach to the assessment of need and the provision of services.

Pro: This would allow for a more community-based approach to service delivery. It would assist in the building of relationships between service providers and between them and those in receipt of services. It could also allow appropriate Third Sector organisations to take on a lead role within particular areas and to take a lead in service coordination. There are examples of strong relationships and examples of good practice to build on.

Con: While there are examples of good practice, there have also been instances where this sort of working has not proven successful. Success would require Third Sector organisations to be prepared to collaborate, something which can be made more difficult when organisations are in competition for commissions and funding. There would be a need to build trust both between the Statutory and Third Sectors and within the Third Sector.

Option 3: The Council could continue with its current pattern of commissioning but give the Third Sector a primary role in the identification of need before joint discussion with the Council on how that need should be met.

Pro: This would allow greater consistency and continuity and would involve the least amount of change while offering an enhanced role to the Third Sector.

This would help to build trust and may ensure a constructive approach to current funding decisions

Con: This would be a moderate change and would not meet the ambitions that have been expressed both by Third Sector representatives in interviews and workshops and by Council officers for a more fundamental shift in relationships and practice.

Background

The Review

As part of Fife Council's financial strategy 2017-2020, a budget saving of £900,000 was identified, divided equally between Fife Council family support services and Third Sector organisations. This was approved by the Education and Children's Services Committee in February 2018. Following this, the May 2018 Education & Children's Services agreed a recommendation of a 1% reduction in funding for the last 9 months of 2018/19 for Third Sector organisations receiving total awards of over £100,000. A further savings total of £200,000 for Third Sector organisations was set for 2019/20 with agreement that there would be engagement with organisations to assist them in identifying how this would be achieved. Fife Council Revenue Budget 2019-20 was approved in February 2019 and the budget saving of £410,000 attributed to the Third Sector confirmed. This saving took into account the previous saving target for 2018/19 which was not fully achieved.

Against this background, Fife Voluntary Action (FVA), in partnership with Fife Council (FC) and representation from Fife's Voluntary Sector Children's Services Forum, commissioned a review of Third Sector children's services funded by the Education and Children's Services Committee. The purpose of the review was, firstly, to identify options for securing the £410,000 outstanding saving to the budget which had already been agreed in principle by the Committee, as detailed above, and, secondly, to develop proposals with the potential to change fundamentally how Third Sector services are commissioned and how organisations work with each other to deliver seamless and effective services.

The review has been overseen by a steering group with representation from both the Third Sector and Fife Council (Appendix 1). Key elements include:

- mapping existing resources
- an examination of trend data and outcomes
- extensive engagement with Third Sector organisations and key Fife Council staff
- consideration of delivery models
- production of an options paper with recommendations

Methodology

The review has involved a range of approaches and methods. The dominant element was a range of individual and group interviews (Appendix 2) with key Statutory and Third Sector staff interviews. Twenty-four of the 25 organisations in receipt of over £5000 from the Education and Children's Services Committee budget were interviewed, as were key staff from Fife Council Education and Children's Services and Communities and Neighbourhoods Services, Fife Health and Social Care Partnership, NHS Fife, and Fife Voluntary Action (Appendix 3).

In addition, two half-day workshops were held for Third Sector participants (Appendix 4). These were well-attended and were extremely constructive. The outcomes of these workshops were recorded and shared with the Third Sector organisations. Steering Group meetings were hosted by FVA and the consultants also provided an interim update at a meeting of the Fife Voluntary Sector Children's Services Forum.

The consultants also conducted literature reviews and data analysis, in particular, looking at approaches taken elsewhere. Interviewees and workshop participants from both the Third and Statutory Sectors were guaranteed anonymity in order to maximise openness and frankness. Sample comments from interviews are included where a particular view was made by several interviewees from different organisations/sectors. These are necessarily perceptions but on issues of partnership working and funding arrangements, perceptions matter and must be addressed.

Finally, the review was only able to take an overview of expenditure by individual organisations, for example, management and training costs, because different organisations submit their accounts using different budget headings. This made any comparison across the Sector for the purposes of this review impossible.

The Fife Context

Fife has the seventh highest rate of registration for free school meals in both primary and secondary sectors of Scotland's 32 local authorities and the ninth highest rate of child poverty, based on the 2016 HMRC's children in low-income families local measure¹. High levels of poverty tend to be associated

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/personal-tax-credits-children-in-low-income-families-local-measure-2016-snapshot-as-at-31-august-2016>

with other pressures on families which can include family breakdown, substance and alcohol abuse, poor health, and involvement with the criminal justice system. These other factors intensify the effects of poverty, leading to potentially poorer life outcomes for children and young people affected.

Some areas of Fife, particularly where generations have faced the ravages of unemployment and low waged work, suffer an intensity of poverty and disadvantage. Across the Levenmouth area, for instance, 19% of the population is in poverty compared to 12.4% of Fife's total population². On the whole, communities within Levenmouth, Kirkcaldy, Glenrothes, Cowdenbeath and Lochgelly are hardest hit by this intensity of poverty—the ten most deprived data zones in the 2016 SIMD for Fife are Buckhaven South, Methil Memorial Park, Gallatown West, Methil Savoy, Sinclairtown Central, Aberhill, Linktown East, Methil Kirkland, Lower Methil and Ballingry West; while the ten most education deprived data zones are Methil Memorial Park, Buckhaven South, Methil Savoy, Aberhill, Methil Kirkland, Ballingry East, Gallatown West, Methilmill, Kennoway East and Beath Woodend³. Six data zones appear in both lists.

However, in areas where poverty and deprivation are masked in the statistics by relative affluence, the experience of disadvantage can be just as damaging. In East Fife, for example, there is a strong sense of isolation among young people, with poor access to facilities and activities, particularly in the rural towns and villages. Many families in poverty in East Fife also struggle to access health and child care services⁴.

This significant poverty, exacerbated by other factors such as lack of positive parenting and attachment, living with the effects of others' alcohol and drug misuse, domestic abuse, and relationship breakdown, is particularly damaging. Rates of alcohol-related admissions to hospital in 2016/17, for example, among residents living in the most deprived areas in Fife, were 5.7 times higher than those living in the least deprived areas⁵.

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), including abuse and neglect, household substance misuse, domestic abuse, parental imprisonment, household mental

² <https://know.fife.scot/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/12/LSA-2018-Levenmouth-FINAL.pdf>

³ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_SIMD2016AnalysisFife.pdf

⁴ <https://know.fife.scot/knowfife/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/01/North-East-Fife-Strategic-Assessment.pdf>

⁵ <https://know.fife.scot/knowfife/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/05/The-Provision-and-Impact-of-Alcohol-in-Fife-Full-Report.pdf> May 2018h, p. 11

illness and loss of a parent, have been recognised as having a long-term impact on children. If cumulative adverse experiences occur, these can be associated with significant lasting effects on adult risk behaviours, life circumstances, physical and mental health and premature mortality. Adults who reported four or more ACEs were shown to be three times more likely to smoke, have lower mental wellbeing, have poorer educational outcomes, and have greater risk of chronic health conditions and of developing illnesses at a younger age, than those with no or fewer ACEs. An English study showed 50% of people reported at least one ACE and over 8% reported four or more ACEs. Extrapolating these rates to Fife, there may be around 153,539 adults in Fife with at least one ACE and 24,566 with four or more ACEs⁶.

The Policy Context – nationally and locally

There is a range of national and local strategies, guidance and policies to support effective delivery of positive outcomes for children and young people, including Getting It Right For Every Child, the national approach towards improving outcomes and supporting the wellbeing of children and young people; the National Parenting Strategy which focuses on valuing, equipping and supporting positive parenting to give children the best start in life and the support they need to succeed; the Child Poverty Strategy for Scotland; the Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 which set out responsibilities towards young carers; and the Framework for Maternity Care in Scotland 2011 which outlines how the Scottish Government is committed to ensuring that all children in Scotland get the best possible start in life, even before they are born.

Fife's Children's Services Partnership recognises the need to ensure that services are built around children, young people, families and their local communities; to improve the effectiveness and impact of partnership working to achieve outcomes; to ensure a decisive shift to prevention, and by so doing reduce inequality and promote equality; and to improve the performance and value of children's services across Fife⁷.

The sixteen priorities in the Fife Children's Services Plan are derived from GIRFEC's SHANARRI indicators⁸. The priorities are: Child Protection; Domestic Abuse; Universal Health Visiting Pathway; Infant Nutrition; Healthy Growth &

⁶<https://know.fife.scot/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2019/01/ACEs-in-Fife-Exposure-and-Outcomes-Profile-Oct-2018.pdf>

⁷ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_D.1.AreaLeadershipMeeting-ChildrensServicesPlan2017.pdf

⁸ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_D.1.AreaLeadershipMeeting-ChildrensServicesPlan2017.pdf

Development; Broad General Education Attainment Gap; School Leaver Destinations; Emotional Wellbeing; Support for the Most Vulnerable; Permanence Planning; Places to Play; Exclusion; Substance Use; Participation of Children & Young People; Attendance at Secondary School; and Child Poverty.

Current Nationally-Funded Initiatives

There are a number of programmes in place nationally and locally in support of these policy directions. 95% of schools in Scotland have been allocated Pupil Equity Funding (PEF) for pupils in P1-S3 known to be eligible for free school meals. PEF funds interventions at the discretion of the head-teacher working in partnership with other schools and with their local authority. In 2019/20, Fife Council schools received a total of £10,048,680 PEF to support closing the poverty-related attainment gap⁹.

Fife's work on Our Minds Matter, funded until April 2020, to support young people's emotional well-being, including specialist therapeutic services across Fife, is recognised nationally. The Scottish Government has committed to investing £60 million in additional school counselling services, including 350 school counsellors and 250 school nurses to support the wellbeing of pupils.¹⁰

Finally, the Scottish Government plans to increase Early Learning and Childcare (ELC) entitlement for all eligible children to 1140 hours per annum by the end of this parliamentary term. This equates to 30 hours per week based on school terms or just over 23 hours of free provision if split over 49 weeks of the year¹¹.

Progress in Fife

Identification of issues and areas of intense deprivation is not new and Fife, through Community Planning and associated partnerships, has been responding in ways which have brought some significant improvements, particularly across educational outcomes. Areas identified for continued improvement include parenting skills; closing the attainment gap; improving physical health and development; supporting the emotional wellbeing of all

⁹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pupil-equity-funding-school-allocations-2019-to-2020/>

¹⁰ https://www.samh.org.uk/documents/SAMH_View_Counselling_in_Schools_Updated_October_2018.pdf

¹¹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/business-regulatory-impact-assessment-expansion-early-learning-childcare-2-year-old-eligibility/>

children and young people; and improving the employability skills and life chances of young people¹².

Specialist services from both Statutory and Third Sectors provide support to deliver GIRFEC's (Getting It Right For Every Child) eight nationally-adopted SHANARRI wellbeing outcomes to ensure children and young people are safe, healthy, achieving, nurtured, active, respected, responsible and included. These services support freedom from abuse and the effects of abuse; positive mental and physical health; school readiness, positive learning experiences and attainment; smooth transitions to and from nursery, primary, secondary and further education and into work; positive parenting; opportunities for play and outdoor activities; self- or independent advocacy if and when required; awareness of rights and responsibilities and agency to participate in age and stage appropriate ways.

This requires not only specialist services for children and young people but also for parents and care-givers and also services which take a holistic, whole-family approach. Parents who might face particular additional challenges are highlighted in the National Parenting Strategy¹³ and include:

- teenage parents
- fathers, particularly those living apart from their families
- lone parents
- parents of teenagers
- mothers with poor mental health
- families affected by poverty
- families affected by disability
- families affected by imprisonment
- families affected by domestic abuse
- families affected by drug and alcohol abuse
- families impacted by attachment difficulties
- all parents and carers of looked after children

Across the three dimensions of intense localised need; scattered, often rural, need; and individual issues of need across Fife, there is a range of interventions to prevent actualisation of risks; to identify and offer early and additional support to prevent issues from escalating; and intensive and on-going support to children, young people, parents and families already facing the most

¹² http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_Plan_for_Fife_2017_2027_June192.pdf and http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_ECSDPlan2017-20-forupload.pdf

¹³ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_Plan_for_Fife_2017_2027_June192.pdf

challenging circumstances. On the whole, Statutory services work at the higher threshold of need, though some Third Sector organisations are contracted to deliver services at this intensive level and most organisations interviewed reported delivering some level of intervention across all four thresholds, from prevention to intensive support.

Fife's Children and Young People's Improvement Collaborative supports Children's Services staff across the Community Planning Partnership to improve the quality and effectiveness of services, empowering staff at all levels to test and lead change, improving measurement, feedback and knowledge management systems and supporting collaboration across sectors. It integrates Quality Improvement programmes encompassing key aspects of children's and young people's lives from conception to 18 years: the Maternity & Children's Quality Improvement Collaborative; the Early Years Collaborative; Raising Attainment for All, PACE (Permanence And Care Excellence) and the One to One Project (Post 16 +) into one single programme, informed by the Scottish Government's 3-step Improvement Framework for Public Services. Fife's Family Nurture approach, promoting collaborative work, service transformation and closer integration, is supported by seven Family Nurture Centres across Fife¹⁴. The Child Wellbeing Pathway brings a coordinated approach to the assessment of, and planning for, every child and young person's wellbeing at universal, additional and intensive levels. Fife is already very well positioned, therefore, to take forward a collaborative, integrated, transformative approach to improving outcomes for children, young people and families across Fife, with the building blocks in place.

¹⁴ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_D.1.AreaLeadershipMeeting-ChildrensServicesPlan2017.pdf

Key Findings

Challenges

For both Statutory and Third Sector providers, the multiplicity and intensity of difficulties which individual families, children and young people face, coupled with dwindling resources with which to respond, means that it is very difficult to sustain the prevention and early intervention agendas when so many people face crisis.

There have been additional pressures on the Council budgets because of the increasing costs of Continuing Care and out-of-Authority placements for young people. This is a significant cost despite the efforts made by Fife to reduce such placements. Placements within Fife reduce this pressure, but the costs of both community and out-of-authority placements for Fife Council are higher than the Scottish average¹⁵. These budget pressures have also been increased through the need to use supply staff in schools¹⁶. Any further efforts which could be made on addressing these pressures would significantly ease the need for the current savings.

The impact of increased demand and reduced funding is clear. More than two-thirds of Third Sector interviewees stated that thresholds of need of those families and individual children and young people they work with have increased significantly over the past ten years. Several interviewees raised the question of prevention and early intervention which is still a central plank of Fife's strategic approaches but which is often compromised by funding and resourcing decisions within individual organisations faced by increasing numbers of families at high levels of need.

There is no clear strategy and little specific funding targeting prevention though it features as a key plank of most strategies alongside early intervention. To some extent, all organisations are working towards prevention by supporting individuals with interventions to avoid a reoccurrence or worsening of negative experiences. However, limited thought seems to be given to what prevention might look like – prevention of poverty, of poor mental health, of poor attainment, and so on. It is recommended that the Third Sector and Statutory Sector together with community participants develop a prevention strategy for Fife and that activities for prevention are commissioned as part of the wider commissioning process – that is, all

¹⁵ <http://scotland.mylocalcouncil.info/Data.aspx?id=S12000015&cat=14193&data=12491&lang=en-GB#data>

¹⁶ http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_ECSCAgendaPack2019-08-271.pdf

organisations should be commissioned to identify, action, track and evaluate their own prevention strategy whether individually or as part of a partnership, alliance or consortium. A Prevention Strategy could include:

- An investigation into the potential advantages and disadvantages of IT, social media, web-based information and interactive pages in their contribution to the prevention agenda;
- A cross-sectoral training/knowledge-sharing programme themed around prevention;
- Development of specialist, topic-based prevention toolkits for workers, parents, grandparents and other care-givers;
- Helpline/email/webchat for parents and caregivers .

we need to look at how to improve access and to move from traditional models to using social media more. The Voluntary Sector don't really lead the way on social media usage. There's been no change in delivery since 20 years ago – it's outdated.

This intensity and multiplicity of significant concerns and stresses also means that families can be in receipt of services for many months, even years, where their situation is intractable, or that they go in and out of support repeatedly and move between Statutory and Third Sector services. For Third Sector organisations, particularly those which have volunteering at their heart, the escalation of complexity brings additional demands on training, support and supervision, and management. Organisations at the initial review workshop identified that they would welcome an opportunity to clarify, with Social Work colleagues, criteria and thresholds at which different services can be accessed.

This issue of thresholds has been around for many years but it has worsened recently. Some people with fewer problems, Social Work pick up and others they don't. There's no consistency in Social Work or CAMHS. They need to clarify their thresholds and their referrals reasoning. It leads to bigger problems in the long run.

Several organisations suggested that they would benefit from accessing Statutory Sector training programmes, as an efficiency measure but also to ensure shared knowledge and approaches and to enable Third Sector staff to access high quality specialist training provision locally.

Both Statutory and Third Sector interviewees identified that delegation of budgets for some early intervention and prevention provision, for example to schools, has led to some fragmentation and potential duplication. Similarly,

where pots of money for similar aims are within the orbit of different strategic partnerships, there can be a mismatch between the different strategies and processes adopted— for example, between the prevention work of the Alcohol and Drugs Partnership (ADP) and Fife Children’s Services Partnership.

Integrated funding streams would help. In Fife, there’s a gap between the funding pots.

Alongside fragmentation of funding streams, there is a fragmentation of service provision. Children’s services have developed over many decades in response to varying local and national needs and funding initiatives. Some Third Sector services are only available in certain geographical areas or only to certain age groups or only to young people with certain disabilities, for example (Appendix 5). Whilst this apparently scattergun approach may serve Fife just as well as a more considered approach, there is an opportunity for all partners to jointly review the landscape of need and provision.

With this fragmentary landscape of provision, there are inevitably some gaps. Some interviewees perceived gaps in provision for children under 2 and over 5, or particular areas of Fife where services are lacking, for example.

There’s lots missing for 0-2 year-olds. There are lots of missing families.

People move on once their child is 5. There’s no group for over 5s, though.

There’s a gap in Dunfermline – no one’s working on parenting skills after [children reach age 5].

Services during holiday periods were also identified as under extreme pressure:

In the summer, referrals go through the roof. Families are coping but just and no more. Health Visitors come to us looking for respite for families over the summer holidays – we have to turn them down. We could spend all our money on it.

Schools have Family Workers but not for 52 weeks a year. Seven and a half weeks in the summer is a long time for families.

There were also suggestions for improvements to referrals. Several organisations questioned the usefulness of the category “universal” and felt

the definition is difficult to apply. Five organisations, unprompted, suggested that referral and working relationships with midwives and other health sector staff could be strengthened. The Kirkcaldy network was cited as a particular example of good practice, bringing all relevant providers together locally. Several organisations felt they had strong relationships and referral processes locally and found the Wellbeing Pathway helpful yet still perceived there to be gaps between provision in practice.

There are good links between organisations in localities – they know who to refer to, who does what, there’s good knowledge and awareness of other services and agencies but service delivery is not necessarily more joined up.

We should be involved pre-birth by midwives ...

The Wellbeing Pathway isn’t all that well used. There’s a discussion. Then they fling everything at the family to fix things but it doesn’t work.

Third Sector managers also had concerns about the number of strategic groups which have developed around children’s services. Many Third Sector managers also carry a significant amount of direct service delivery so their time is very constrained. Yet, if they cannot make time to attend strategic meetings, they cannot influence developments or feel truly part of a partnership of equals. There was a strong view that ongoing work to co-ordinate agendas and re-align strategic groups should continue to be prioritised.

...there are too many strategic groups. It’s not apathy but prioritising – what are the likely returns?

Both Social Work and Third Sector interviewees identified the measurement of need and of impact as problematic. Different organisations use different assessment tools with families and individual service users and impact assessment, on the whole, is dependent on measuring outputs and gauging change using the assessment tools.

It’s not a linear path [for families]– it’s up and down. Some can get worse – they identify as a 4 [on the needs assessment scale] when they first come to us because they don’t want to identify as lower or don’t realise. Later, they might self-evaluate as 2, once they really realise. So, it can look like they’ve got worse since they came to us...

*[Impact] can't be measured over two years – you need 7 or 17 years.
But Fife Council must devise measures with us.*

This can make it very difficult to share assessment information across different organisations and sectors and makes it difficult to compare outcomes for accountability purposes.

It's not a good way of doing it. If you've got an SLA, you should all collate the same data. What does it tell them if everyone is sending in different data? It's not consistent.

We need Fife Council to let us know what feedback they want from us so we can invest in a system that's responsive to their data requests.

The real outcomes are the relationships we build.

We can't contribute to Fife Council monitoring systems. There's no consistency even within the Council – there are three different departmental systems. There would be more equity if we could feed in as equal partners to shared systems, developed and agreed by all of us. As it is, it's tokenistic. If we all did monitoring and evaluation the same way and using data to show the difference we make against the Children's Services Plan, we'd be more equal round the table.

It also requires organisations to assume their own singular responsibility for bringing about change within a family which may be facing acute multiple problems and receiving services from several providers simultaneously. Unravelling responsibilities for outcomes and change under these circumstances is impossible.

The way it's reported isn't what happens – it's not down to one organisation – we all play a part in each outcome for a family.

The current approach to monitoring and evaluation for purposes of accountability works well in some cases but not in others.

Monitoring and evaluation requirements for Fife Council are straightforward and easy.

The Children's Services Link Officer doesn't link us to anything...comes to meetings but doesn't contribute.

It's a difficult position for them – they need basic audit competence. The notion's good but the implementation is not good.

Fife Council Link Officers provide advice to the Third Sector organisations they are allocated, attend most Board meetings, can be involved in recruitment and other HR processes, and can provide an important link to the Council, particularly valued by some of the smaller voluntary organisations.

We're a wee organisation so our Link Officer explains about funding, policies – she's valuable. She can challenge things for us, gets us appointments with [Chief Social Work Officer], provides us with a quick answer because she knows exactly who to ask.

The ... Link Officer is fantastic, attending Board meetings and providing crucial information and support to the Manager and Board, for example on Total Mobile and networking...

However, Link Officers also have a scrutiny role, collecting monitoring information, identifying any early warning signs and writing annual evaluation reports. These Link Officers have several organisations within their remit which can range from care homes for the elderly to childcare services so their specific operational knowledge of the area within which their organisations work is necessarily limited. Every three years, a full review of each organisation is undertaken by a separate Link Officer.

There was also a strong view that monitoring and evaluation could take greater account of the multiple benefits of the Third Sector, including community empowerment through the development of volunteers. There was considerable evidence that active engagement with organisations had a very positive effect on social capital within vulnerable communities.

There was also a concern that not all of the efforts, made and demanded, translated into meaningful change. Considerable amounts of information were gathered but there was a lack of clarity about how that was then used. Some interviewees were not convinced that the best use was made of feedback from service users or suggestions that were made.

Most Third Sector interviewees also spoke about a relatively high turnover of staff in the Statutory Sector which means a higher investment of time and energy is required for building what can turn out to be fairly short-term professional working relationships and networks.

there's no continuity so it's difficult for Social Work to have the level of sustained relationships required

Recommendations

1. Jointly revisit prevention and early intervention to determine whether it can still be a priority and, if it is, how it may best be implemented and resourced;
2. Jointly clarify criteria and needs assessment processes for accessing universal, early intervention, additional and intensive support services;
3. Revisit referral pathways and determine whether more formal processes are required;
4. Universal service providers should consider how they can most effectively identify and appropriately refer families and individuals in need of support;
5. Wherever possible, share relevant training programmes and opportunities across all sectors and organisations;
6. All sectors should jointly re-assess levels of current and future need across Fife to identify priority areas, outcomes, and demographic groups;
7. Fife Council and Community Planning partnerships should consider, where it is within their agency, how funding priorities and programmes can complement rather than duplicate or overlap;
8. Further consideration should be given to the number, remit and operation of strategic and planning groups and how members can most effectively be facilitated to participate in decision-making;
9. All providers should consider adopting shared approaches to needs and impact assessment and Fife Council should consider how consistency of monitoring and evaluation can most satisfactorily be strengthened.

Options: Medium to Long Term

The options that the Council may wish to consider for the short, medium and longer term are set out below.

Unusually, the medium and long term options are set out first. This is because we believe that these are more fundamental and significant. We also believe that, whatever short-term option the council chooses to adopt, it is more likely to be accepted by the Third Sector if it can be seen as part of a more fundamental reform.

The interviews with Statutory and Third Sector staff have identified shared pressures, priorities and some potential solutions. There is an opportunity to effect many of these suggested solutions in delivering shared priorities while alleviating some of the pressures through a re-commissioning process. Recommissioning, however, takes an investment of time and energy from everyone involved to ensure the fundamentals of relationships, communication, and processes are identified, agreed and implemented from the outset.

There is a balance to be found between commissioning as something that is about securing savings and efficiencies, and commissioning as a description of something more collaborative, trust-based and about participative planning for social outcomes.

This review has found much enthusiasm amongst Third Sector staff for continued participation in shaping future service provision within the sector as well as with other public sector partners. To consider the review recommendations and to implement the depth of changes required, a full-scale recommissioning of services will be needed. It is important that all who provide children's services, across the system, have a shared vision of commissioning. This can be encapsulated in a framework that includes commissioning principles, the links between commissioning and other strategic plans, and commissioning processes.

It is recommended that the recommissioning process has a set of parameters:

- that relevant Third Sector organisations are identified and included as equal partners in determining the principles and outcomes of recommissioning and in shaping the processes suggested below;
- that a timetable is established outlining the processes;
- shared principles and aims;
- agreed priority needs;

- jointly-developed approaches and service delivery models;
- a range of required operational intra- and cross-sectoral structures to implement the approaches and to meet identified needs;
- agreed process improvements to increase effectiveness;
- identified governance implications, including accountability, monitoring and evaluation.

This is already a period of uncertainty for the Third Sector, augmented by the decision to reduce funding by £410,000 in 2019/20. Clearly, a full-scale re-commissioning process will introduce further uncertainty and, for some organisations, it may well prove unsuccessful. It is suggested, therefore, that some certainties are worked towards to give the Third Sector some stability for the future, at least. A level of continuity supports good quality provision for families, children and young people and allows for quality relationships –at the heart of positive outcomes—to be developed. As the award of one year contracts promotes an environment of instability, it is proposed that a return to three-year commissioning cycles is resumed.

The on-going funding discussions and decisions at Education and Children’s Services Committee have added to feelings of uncertainty in the Third Sector. An environment of suspicion, mistrust and uncertainty does not contribute positively to the potential for effective partnership working which will be required if the improvements outlined are to be delivered. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that competitive tendering is not considered as an option. The process would be destabilising and would be most likely to jeopardise the prize of more joined-up efficient and effective services. To respond effectively to complexity requires a move away from competition between providers and grantees towards more effective collaboration. Funders and providers, both, need to look beyond their own organisation’s immediate interests and goals.

Rather, the re-commissioning process should support the strengthening of relationships, encouraging organisations and services to focus on shared outcomes, identifying more efficient ways of working across sectors and with a willingness to think beyond conventional organisational boundaries. Re-commissioning can provide the opportunity to review needs and how best to address those needs, reflecting on structures, resource requirements, balance between prevention, early intervention, additional support and intensive support, needs and impact assessments and accountability. It is advisable to consider the landscape across all sectors and services delivering children’s services, including Health and Social Care, NHS Fife, Fife Council, Police Scotland, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, colleges, benefits and Jobcentre

services, as well as relevant Third Sector adult services such as Citizens Advice and Rights Fife, when planning responsive services. This also allows for taking into account other funding pots.

By taking a whole-systems approach to commissioning and by co-designing service delivery across organisations and sectors, transaction costs, overheads, and back-office costs can be reduced across the piece and more efficiency savings can potentially be shared, rather than divisively and less cost-effectively slicing funding from all services and dealing with sectors separately, no matter the effect on service users. Effective service delivery in the face of austerity budgets will require strong local networks with good relationships between key players, and a cohesive and effective children and young people's partnership board that brings together all stakeholders.

There are existing successful commissioning models in Fife to build on. The Opportunities Fife Partnership assesses proposals for commissioning to improve employability across the local authority. Its commissioning strategy is intended to guide investment from all sources of funding available to the partners, and payment for service delivery is made on the basis of the provider delivering on agreed targets related to job outcomes. Payment of a core amount is paid quarterly in advance with any additional payments made on the basis of the agreed targets for job outcomes, positive outcomes and referrals, depending on the pathway stage. In the case of employability, this commissioning model has seen funding transfer from the Statutory Sector to the Third Sector.

We should build referrals into commissioning to ensure referrals are coming from the right places and being accepted

The lessons from the Opportunities Fife Partnership which are particularly worth consideration by a joint Children's Services Partnership are the development of a joint strategy to guide all investment and the use of commissioning to drive improvements in referrals. Measurable job outcomes, on the other hand, are not easily transferable to the context of children's services so it is recommended that payment according to reaching pre-ordained targets, outputs and outcomes is not appropriate. In the complex environment of children's services, outcomes are brought about by the interplay of the service user and the "system" as a whole, a joint endeavour. Commissioned organisations and those they work closely with can be given the flexibility to define outcomes through engagement with those they serve and to redefine them in response to changing aspirations and contexts.

While there is an ideal opportunity, following this review, for all children's services providers across the Statutory and Third Sectors to come together to agree future priorities, the review provided a few pointers for discussion. In particular, three areas of shared concern emerged from most interviews, in addition to issues of poverty and disadvantage:

- school readiness and all the ways in which it can be nurtured by a supportive home environment and by parental engagement with play, learning, routines, relationships and behaviour;
- the identification and protection of children and young people affected by parental substance misuse or at risk of substance misuse themselves.
- children and young people living with high levels of anxiety and other mental health issues. One or two organisations, in relation to anxiety, raised transitions as an area which can fall through the gap of provision where services are provided up to primary school age or up to secondary school age, the very stages when continuity of support might be most desirable.

In almost all the interviews, the importance of relationship recurred – relationship with other providers, relationship between sectors, and, of course, relationship with service users and wider communities. For so often, the quality of relationship is at the heart of transformation and positive outcomes. So if quality of relationship can be reflected in a co-produced outcome framework, that is likely to be one of the most accurate measures of success.

This also marks an opportunity for genuine co-production in which commissioners, delivery organisations and those with lived experience, work together to create commissions.

Once needs and priorities have been identified, approaches can be developed to deliver the most appropriate services. Some may be delivered by a single specialist organisation focused on a key area; some organisations may be commissioned to deliver some services individually; and others in tandem with other commissioned organisations. Budgets may be pooled, bringing together different budget streams into one pot; or consortia may be commissioned to deliver some services. Again, Fife has experience of consortia on which to draw.

Structures

Recommissioning provides an opportunity to ensure that delivery structures are still appropriate and robust. One of the key issues raised by all the interviewees is the increasing complexity, intensity and multiplicity of issues children, young people and families arrive at their doors with – mental health issues, drug and alcohol issues, poverty, caring responsibilities, debt, physical health issues, behavioural and relationship issues to name only a few. No one agency or programme can support individuals facing a barrage of major difficulties. More than one service is inevitably required to work alongside families holistically—often, working not just with the children or just with the parents but looking at the needs of the whole family and each family member.

Key to successful outcomes will be:

- Easy access and availability of at least one organisation for a child, young person, parent or carer to feel able to get in touch with by self-referral early on
- Robust triage and referral mechanisms between all sectors and agencies to ensure appropriate referrals are made and received
- A “lead advocate” approach whereby one person takes responsibility for supporting the family or individual to reach the services they need, to make the kind of progress and get the changes they want
- Effective pathways, from prevention through early intervention to additional and intensive support.

How services are structured will vary according to geography and specialism. Some work will best be carried out by a single autonomous organisation. Informal partnerships can work well where there are good relationships and networks – for example, where workers can pick up the telephone to each other, keep in touch through regular meetings etc. These informal partnerships are supported by single autonomous organisations which choose to work more closely together to deliver their own outcomes. Partnerships can be nurtured by co-location— for example, at schools and nurseries, community centres, Third Sector hubs, or health facilities, and regular partnership meetings, referral protocols, joint initiatives and shared funding applications can all serve to further support partnership working.

Fife has extensive experience of partnerships and partnership working¹⁷. The Fife Advice Partnership, for example, includes statutory housing and

¹⁷ <https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/WorkingTogetherR2.pdf>

homelessness services, an alliance of housing associations, as well as Third Sector advice agencies. In the case of Fife Advice Partnership,

Partnership working isn't easy. There were a number of challenges to overcome in order to meet funder requirements and ensure the services continue to be relevant. Improvements around joint caseworking and communication, case recording and monitoring, building working relationships and referral processes were made. Joint development meetings were organised to assist with this and to involve practitioners in informing the ways in which working could also be improved.

There can be drawbacks to partnership working. In the early days of the Alcohol and Drugs Partnership (ADP), for example, smaller organisations felt they faced unfair competition for resources from much bigger national organisations. There is also scope for duplication across different partnerships – the ADP strategy prioritises responses for children and young people affected by parental substance misuse, a theme which is also within the remit of Children's Services (delivered by Barnardo's, DAPL and Clued-Up).

However, the partnership approach within the ADP, ten years on, ensures a focus on shared priorities, goals and outcomes and supports collaborative service delivery and better commissioning¹⁸. It commissions services using funding from Fife Council, the Fife Health and Social Care Partnership and Scottish Government and additional monies are sought from partners and from other external sources. The ADP identifies exactly what percentage of its total funding is spent on prevention, treatment and recovery.

Another benefit of the ADP Partnership approach was identified by two interviewees – the operation of a “closed” commissioning process whereby the partnership organisations negotiate and shape the commissioned services in tandem with the commissioners is seen to lend itself to much more collaborative, joined-up, and sustainable delivery models.

Similarly, Edinburgh Together brings together statutory services and Third Sector organisations, including Canonate Youth, Barnardo's and Children 1st, to ensure that children and young people with emotional and behavioural problems can remain in their own schools and families wherever safe and

¹⁸ <https://wordpress.fifedirect.org.uk/fadp/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/05/FifeADPDeliveryPlan2015-2018FINALDRAFT.pdf>

appropriate¹⁹. Edinburgh Together provides multi-disciplinary assessments of children and their families, and services to meet assessed needs, promoting whole class and whole school approaches and working collaboratively with other agencies. They can provide a range of services from within the partnership, including family and relationship therapy, parenting skills, play therapy, playground support and peer relationship work, as well as assistance to parents and carers of children with behavioural difficulties, and out of school and holiday play schemes.

Aberdeen City has a city-wide Family Support partnership which includes statutory health and social care services as well as Third Sector organisations such as Home-Start and the Scottish Childminding Association.

In April 2019, Opportunities Fife identified different priorities for employability and services were recommissioned for which internal services had to apply too.

We moved to 60% voluntary sector; 43% internal, recognising that the voluntary sector is closer to our target market. Voluntary organisations should be part of the commissioning process. They need to be nimble and innovative.

A set of Commissioning Principles were developed, bringing a focus to the most deprived 20% SIMD areas of Fife and funding fewer, more strategic initiatives. It was expected that funded projects should be larger to achieve economies of scale, and where Third Sector provision was not configured to achieve this scale of outcome, partnership with other providers was supported to produce this required scale of intervention.

A longer term aim of the Partnership is to increase the capacity of the Third Sector to allow it to take the strategic lead in delivering employability services through all stages of the pathway via a consortium. The Partnership sees advantages in a consortium which could deliver an Opportunities Fife branded service with a mix of paid staff and volunteers to deliver services at the local level with volunteering as a route to employability and with an ability to attract external funding, allowing the consortium to deliver in other areas of Fife.

¹⁹ <https://canogateyouth.org.uk/edinburgh-together/>

Consortia

Consortia add a further level of formality to the structure. They can bring smaller Third Sector organisations together to deliver larger contracts, benefitting from capacity building support, potentially improving communities' experiences of support, and creating cost savings for providers and commissioners. However, they can be challenging to set up and to sustain and can succeed or fail on the strength or weakness of relationships, communications and resources. Commissioners need to provide support to put in place the foundations, processes and mechanisms which will underpin the consortia. A level of investment is also likely to be required at the outset to get the consortium off the ground.

This (consortium) model costs more at the beginning – getting the infrastructure and structure tight – issues of compliance, management, oversight. There needs to be a cost/benefits analysis.

Consortia can be fairly “loose” arrangements, where one member acts as the primary contractor, for example, managing the relationship with the commissioner and sub-contracting to the other members of the consortium. In Fife, Clued-Up, Fife Gingerbread, Fife Council Supported Employment Service and CARF formed a consortium, with Fife Gingerbread as the lead accountable body, to deliver a range of money and employability advice, support and skills, family support, parenting skills, and youth services in Lochgelly/Cowdenbeath and Kirkcaldy areas as a Making It Work for Families package.

Often, however, a consortium will be created as a legal entity in its own right, jointly owned and controlled by the partners. It may have a central or virtual business hub, responsible for recruiting members, managing contracts and developing strategic business relationships. Or a member organisation may be sub-contracted to take on this role. The consortium hub may also manage oversight and quality control, reducing the burden on the commissioning body, and may provide back-office functions for the members, potentially providing efficiency savings.

Consortia can cover whole geographic areas or deliver all the services on a specific issue or theme. The benefits for smaller organisations working at a very local level is that they can extend into wider areas if they choose. Consortia can provide all the services required to respond to particular needs, bringing together different specialist services.

At the heart of successful consortia are good relationships and trust. Some organisations may need information about what is involved and may have concerns that a consortium could lead to loss of autonomy or even mergers by the back door. Clear communication is also key – who will receive which referrals; how far can data sharing go; what branding will be used; how will risks be shared and quality standards monitored and maintained. All of these, and many more, questions need to be explored and answered and developed into an agreed framework, protocols and memorandums of understanding. And the commissioners themselves have a key role in the success or otherwise of the consortium. Regular meetings will be required so consortia themselves can contribute to improved commissioning and bring their specialist intelligence, skills and knowledge to shape contracts, supporting service design and impact measurement. There can be a breadth and richness of experience to consortia where very local neighbourhood organisations work together with medium-sized providers and large, national organisations and all of them may find that they deliver more and better together than individually. This requires a highly supportive commissioning environment with commissioners, legal advisers and procurement teams with appropriate expertise and experience who can build relationships and support capacity building and service improvement. Payment by results contracts pose barriers for smaller voluntary organisations – it is better for them if they know in advance they will receive a specific number of referrals, for example, giving them more certainty in regard to required staffing numbers and sustainability. Social value can also be built into contracts – the value of supporting volunteering, community/service user participation and engagement, attracting additional funding, for example, all of which smaller organisations are often best placed to deliver.

In Aberdeen, Reaching Aberdeen Families Together (RAFT) is a consortium of five Third Sector partners – Barnardo’s Scotland, Aberdeen Foyer, Alcohol and Drugs Action, Home-Start Aberdeen and Apex Scotland. The consortium is commissioned by Aberdeen City Council and receives referrals from the council’s children’s social work teams.

The consortium approach is by no means plain sailing, however. The Family Nurture Approach in Fife was undertaken in partnership and involved a transformational change programme focusing on early intervention and prevention to break the cycle of disadvantage. The Public Social Partnership’s services in South West Fife, as part of a Family Nurture Hub, proved unworkable for a number of reasons – partners felt it was not a partnership of equals; that there was little opportunity for co-design; a lack of clarity regarding the structure, leadership, management and governance roles; and

internal communication was poor. One Third Sector organisation was perceived as having more power and more say in the delivery model which led to friction and staff felt unsupported. The concept of a “virtual hub” was not well communicated and some disliked the use of corporate branding which rendered their organisation invisible²⁰.

Mergers

Mergers are a reasonable structural response, for example, geographically where two or more organisations are offering very complementary or overlapping services; or thematically, where two or more organisations are offering very similar services but in different geographical areas. Mergers are not undertaken for purely financial reasons – to work well, they may actually require some investment. The merger of East Fife, Kirkcaldy and Dunfermline Women’s Aid into Fife Women’s Aid, for example, secured little financial saving in either the short or long term.

While there may, on the surface, be savings to be made by reducing the number of manager posts, for example, or closing offices, there are other costs, for example, in increased travel expenses or securing premises with space for a merged workforce. Effective mergers also take time to complete supportively.

Hubs

There were also suggestions from interviewees of the creation of hubs – buildings from which a range of Third Sector, and, potentially Statutory Sector family services would be provided as one-stop shops and shared facilities. Most Third Sector interviewees, however, noted that relationships of trust are quickly built with service users because their premises are not associated with statutory functions such as nursery, school or Social Work provision. While this association could be altered to become more positive, this would take time.

FVA has a number of buildings across Fife within which it rents rooms and provides shared functions such as photocopying and telecommunications. However, this model of a focused family-oriented provision would require considerable investment of time and money to identify and re-fit appropriate

²⁰ Funding Ideas Ltd, *South West Fife Family Nurture Hub: an external evaluation of the Public Social Partnership*

buildings, whether community centres, schools, or existing voluntary sector premises.

Why do Fife Council pay us £10k to give to a private landlord? ...we're upstairs and not accessible for people who can't manage stairs. It's also not self-contained – we share with another organisation. Could we not use an empty Fife Council building?

We found sharing photocopiers and broadband with other organisations variously difficult and a disaster!

It's difficult to find venues – collaborations would help. We could share hubs.

Given the range of potential structures and delivery models outlined above, Fife Council has a number of options regarding securing and financing Third Sector services.

Option 1: The Council moves to a complete recommissioning of services. Ideally, this would be based on a joint assessment of need between the Statutory and Third sectors with the Council identifying the available budget and Third Sector organisations outlining what they could do within that parameter. There are other models discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report, but the core principle would be an enhanced role for the Third Sector in the process of planning.

This would allow a more radical approach to service delivery, breaking patterns which may have been too long established and creating greater scope for innovative approaches. Any steps to offer greater involvement to the Third Sector could enhance trust and goodwill in the face of difficult short-term funding decisions that the Council may take in relation to immediate funding to the sector.

However, there would inevitably be organisations that would be more and less successful in any recommissioning exercise and there would need to be a willingness within the Third Sector to agree to the process and accept the outcomes. In addition, there would be a need to build on the trust that has been established through this review and the examples of existing good practice and relationships, to ensure that the culture across services supported such close joint planning. Increased commitment from the Third Sector is

crucial to support collaborative structures such as the Third Sector Children's Services Forum and to ensure that FVA is able to function effectively

Option 2: Fife Council and the Third Sector agree to establish stronger joint working partnership arrangements. This might involve the establishment of geographically-defined virtual or physical hubs which would involve both Statutory and Third Sectors taking a more localised approach to the assessment of need and the provision of services

This would allow for a more community-based approach to service delivery and would assist in the building of relationships between service providers and between them and those in receipt of services. It would also allow appropriate Third Sector organisations to take a lead role within particular areas and in service coordination.

While there are examples of good practice to build on, there have also been instances where this sort of working has not proven successful. Success would require Third Sector organisations to be prepared to collaborate, something which can be made more difficult when organisations are in competition for commissions and funding. There would be a need to build trust both between the Statutory and Third Sectors and within the Third Sector.

Option 3: Fife Council continues with its current pattern of commissioning but gives the Third Sector a primary role in the identification of need before joint discussion with the Council on how that need should be met.

This would allow greater consistency and continuity and would involve the least amount of change while offering an enhanced role to the Third Sector. This would help to build trust and may ensure a constructive approach to current funding decisions

However, this would represent a moderate change and would not meet the ambitions that have been expressed both by Third Sector representatives in interviews and workshops and by Council officers for a more fundamental shift in relationships and practice.

These options are not mutually exclusive but all of them rely on strong professional relationships, clear communications, a shared vision and a commitment to collaboration across all sectors involved in commissioning, strategy and service provision. This bigger, longer-term picture must be borne in mind in considering the options for the shorter-term, specifically how to secure savings of £410,000 from the Third Sector as agreed by the Education and Children's Services Committee.

Options: Short Term

2019/2020 Budget Saving

A budget saving of £900,000 across Education, Social Work and the Third Sector was agreed as part of the 2017-2020 financial strategy with £450,000 attributed to the Third Sector. Organisations in receipt of over £100,000 received a 1% reduction in funding for the last nine months of this financial year, leaving a £410,000 saving outstanding.

In the short-term, there is a funding gap to be met but the majority of interviewees felt it is important to keep in sight the medium to long-term need to sustain the range and geographic spread of services for children and young people in the face of intensifying financial constraints on individual households as well as services.

Short-term Options

The consultants identified, in discussion with the interviewees, a number of options regarding securing the £410,000 saving:

Option 1: Make the saving from another area of Council provision to safeguard prevention and early intervention work and on-going work with some of the most vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife delivered by Third Sector Children's Services.

This would fully safeguard Third Sector provision and retain trusting relationships to the benefit of the proposed re-commissioning process and was the clear preference of all the Third Sector interviewees. Eight interviewees felt there are less swingeing ways in which Fife Council might seek to make the saving, from reducing the number of young people cared for outwith the Authority area and reducing levels of teacher absences to reductions in numbers and salaries of managers.

The number of children placed out of Fife is the biggest drain on resources. It takes a massive budget.

Fourteen interviewees felt there were efficiencies to be found in the Monitoring and Evaluation processes on the Council's side by revising the role and reducing the number of Link Officers.

At the first workshop, participants stated that they would rather not see any savings made from Education and Children's Services at all, Statutory or Third

Sector, to protect the prevention and early intervention agendas and to safeguard services to many of the most vulnerable children and families in Fife.

More than half of the Third Sector interviewees felt that making the saving in this way is unjust – that a £450,000 cut to Social Work services does not impact so severely on service delivery, staffing, salary and pension levels, service users, back office functions or sustainability as the same level of cut when applied to the Third Sector.

*They're comparing apples and pears to cut £400k from the voluntary sector. When they make that level of cut from Social Work, they reduce or end salaries but they don't lose anything from their back office functions – their legal support, finance, HR, IT, premises – in the way the voluntary sector do. They **can** cut £400k but they **ought** not to. It would be detrimental. The voluntary organisations are superefficient and value for money. They should look elsewhere to disinvest.*

However, if the £410,000 cut were not made from the Third Sector Children's Services budget, the saving would have to be found elsewhere or postponed, contrary to the decision already taken by the Education and Children's Services Committee.

Option 2: Make a partial saving rather than the full £410,000 to limit the negative impact on services and communities and/or phase the reduction over a longer period. This is a compromise position which would see smaller percentage reductions across Third Sector services—from 2% to 6%—and/or phasing a smaller reduction over three years. Certainly, the smaller the saving, the more limited the negative impact on services and beneficiaries. On the other hand, a longer timescale would only lengthen and intensify the period of uncertainty for the Third Sector organisations affected.

Two interviewees suggested that a longer timescale could allow the release of efficiencies which could be made across Fife Council and Third Sector Children's Services together rather than treating them as entirely separate entities. There is certainly more likelihood of efficiency savings to be made in the medium to longer term, especially if a more collaborative model of working across the sectors is adopted. However, the kind of efficiency savings which might be realised involve shared premises; shared HR, financial and legal services; reduced IT costs, all of which require a considerable investment of time to consider, agree and implement.

Option 3: Make an 11.2% cut across the board, securing the stipulated £410,000.

While this would ensure all affected organisations share a similar level of reduction, the Third Sector sought this review in the first place because they felt a top-slicing of this sort was blunt and unsustainable for small-to-medium organisations. And as the larger organisations have already taken a 1% reduction, already a differential has been introduced.

Option 4: Make the saving by reducing funding proportionately – for example, by taking nothing from organisations in receipt of less than £10k; 8% from those in receipt of 10k – 99k; 10% from those in receipt of £100k-£299k; 12% from those in receipt of £300- £499k; and 14% from those in receipt of over £500k.

This approach would share the burden of the saving proportionately, protecting those organisations which receive less than £5,000 (of which there are four). However, the reductions for larger organisations which have already lost 1% in this process will impact even more significantly on their staffing levels and service provision. While several organisations in receipt of high levels of funding are nationals with multi-million pound budgets, nonetheless they are staffed in Fife by local people and the reductions these agencies might experience could well jeopardise jobs and expertise and, as a consequence, services.

Option 5: Merge organisations with similar services across Fife or with complementary services within a locality or neighbourhood.

On the surface, this looks like a simple and cost-effective solution. There are a number of different ways of merging organisations – those which provide similar functions across different geographical areas; those which provide complementary functions across similar geographical areas; and those which provide similar functions across similar geographical areas. In each of those categories, mergers are possible in Fife, potentially releasing efficiency savings in management and back-office costs.

However, successful mergers take a significant investment of time and money. It is not considered that any mergers could be completed successfully to deliver savings within the required timeframe and experience of previous mergers in Fife (for example, the merger which resulted in Fife Women's Aid),

and elsewhere, indicates that increased travel costs, needs for larger office space et cetera result in little or no saving.

Option 6: Make back-office efficiencies.

Along with Option 1, this option would have the least negative consequences for services, staff and beneficiaries. However, no organisations interviewed were able to identify any obvious efficiencies which could be made within the timescale required. Four organisations identified that they could consider giving up their membership and therefore annual subscription to their national parent organisation for the years ahead if Fife Council could support them with some of the subscription services. Others were very willing to share premises, equipment and systems if appropriate accommodation could be found. However, every organisation identified that immediate savings could only be made by cutting staff hours and/or eating into diminishing reserves.

Impact

It is impossible to foresee the full impact of a £410,000 cut to the Third Sector. In interview, most organisations identified no possible efficiency savings and some organisations had already made the sorts of savings being proposed here. Most stated that they are struggling to retain loyal and experienced staff who are committed to their work but have seen no uplift in their salary for several years. In fact, some staff have already taken cuts to their hours and, commensurately, to their salaries. In several instances, interviewees spoke of the shortfall in funding for maintenance of premises or upgrading of IT; one organisation will shortly lose its in-kind, rent-free office with no obvious provision in its budget to rent alternative market-rate accommodation.

All interviewees argued that the saving would inevitably have to be sought from staffing, with knock-on effects on service provision and the wellbeing of individual families, children and young people. A £410,000 saving equates to around 15 full-time equivalent posts with on-costs, across the organisations. Larger organisations would need to make experienced staff redundant and, potentially, compromise, or even lose, whole areas of their current SLA. Most small-to-medium organisations would have to reduce the hours of one or more workers to make the required saving, impacting on those staff concerned and the sustainability of their reduced-hour posts.

In terms of effects on beneficiaries, services had difficulty in quantifying the

impact of the cut. They estimate that a total of around 1000 children, young people and families are likely to be affected in the immediate aftermath of a budget reduction of this magnitude – some organisations will end outreach and social activities, group work with children and with parents; many will reduce their intensive 1:1 work and respite provision; most will unwillingly close their waiting lists. All of this, of course, will have knock-on effects for Statutory services which will receive more referrals from a strapped Third Sector, more self-referrals from people in high levels of need who cannot access voluntary sector services, and an increased level of demand for intensive support further down the line.

Given that much of the Third Sector's work is around early intervention, there will be consequences too for the prevention and early intervention agenda, with some increases envisaged by interviewees in levels of family breakdown and childhood trauma with potentially long-term and serious consequences for the mental and physical health, educational attainment, and lifelong wellbeing of those who are unable to access support.

Finally, Fife's Third Sector Children's Service are highly successful at attracting funding from Trust and Lottery Funds. These depend on matching other, secured income and, most often, organisations use their Council funding to match additional income. With a reduction in Council income, there will be a commensurate fall in the potential level of external funding which the Third Sector can attract.

Outstanding issues and possible next steps

Because of the very tight timescales for this review we have not been able to complete some of the tasks that we would have wished to complete. We approached both SCVO and COSLA to try to get a clearer picture of practice across Scotland in terms of how funding for the Third Sector was managed and what was considered to be best practice in engagement between the Third, and Statutory, Sectors. Unfortunately, we were not able to meet with them or have any detailed conversations before the report deadline.

We would recommend that these links are pursued, possibly through the Third Sector Children's Services Forum. A joint briefing and discussion involving the Forum and Council officers based on this would be a useful next step following on from the review. It would make clear that the process of the review had not ended with the submission of the report and any decisions that might be taken by the Children's Services Committee based on the report.

Although the submission of the review report marks the completion of the contract, we would be happy to discuss the possibility of our involvement in briefings about the report if that were considered to be of value.

Whether we are involved or not, we would argue that it would be useful to build on the momentum which the report appears to have generated. We recommend that the sorts of workshops that we have run with Third Sector representatives, be adapted and run with mixed groups of Third and Statutory Sector staff. We appreciate the pressures that there are on the time of colleagues in both sectors, but feel that early exercises of this kind would greatly assist in building a culture of trust.

If there were to be a move toward recommissioning following on from Council decisions, it would be useful to have a clear timetable for that process to ensure that the process was transparent and that there was full engagement of all parties involved. A tentative programme is set out below as an illustration of what the process might look like.

November/December 2019 – workshops to determine commissioning framework, partnership, management, governance

January/February 2020 – workshops to scope out and prioritise need and to shape options for responses across prevention, early intervention, additional support and intensive support

February/March 2020 – workshops with communities of interest/geography/service users to consider priorities and potential responses and approaches; Committee report on progress

March 2020 – workshops with all relevant providers to consider improvement processes –definition of criteria and thresholds, referral pathways and protocols, lead advocate model, shared needs and impact assessments, shared accounting, shared monitoring framework..

April 2020 – options paper with delivery models to best meet prioritised needs
Committee report on progress

May/June – develop options for delivery and commissioning models

July/August – develop commissioning model

September/October - recommissioning

We would also recommend that Fife Council look beyond the immediate context of this review. As indicated earlier in this report, there is inevitable overlap between services to adults and to children. The complexity of the issues facing families and the multiplicity of problems make this unavoidable, as does the pressure to address issues with parents before the birth of children. The view that we would take would be that the Council decides which options it wishes to pursue in its relationship with the Third Sector, but once that relationship is established, the new grouping consider how further joint working “focused on families” might be developed.

Going further, there is a tension for all Councils and, certainly, for Fife between remediation and regeneration. Much of the work invested by both the Statutory, and the Third, Sector is rendered less effective because the circumstances in which families are living do not change.

It would be interesting to look at the impact that Stirling Council has had in the Raploch area. The Council took a decision to focus most of their efforts in regeneration in a comprehensive strategy focussed on what was deemed to be their most deprived area. This is an approach that has been considered by Fife where the limitations of single-strand approaches to regeneration have been recognised. In Raploch there was investment in housing, economic development, environmental improvement, redevelopment of educational provision and cultural regeneration. The strategy required considerable courage, because of the pressures from other areas experiencing significant

challenge, but there is evidence that the approach did achieve long-term and sustained change. The review team were unable to access evidence about the current situation in Raploch and in Stirling more widely, but it is worth considering following this up.

One of the issues creating pressure on the Council budget is that of external placements for young people. As reported earlier, this is an area where the Council has made headway, however it remains a significant cost. We are aware that Stirling Council commissioned work on this through KPMG some time ago and it may be worth seeking access to that. It would also be worth seeing what other work, if any, has been done on this as it is very much a shared problem across Scotland.

We are also very aware that this review has been conducted at a time of significant changes which may well have a significant impact on levels of need and the nature of the responses that are required. The expansion of early years provision is a very obvious example. The future of Pupil Equity Funding is another. The review of girfec is a third major possible change with huge potential implications. It would be ideal if any new mechanisms for engagement between the council and the Third Sector were to be established so that the impact of these changes could be dealt with as part of their ongoing work.

There is some evidence that one or two Local Authorities are beginning to move away from rigid outputs and outcomes in tenders and service level agreements. Plymouth City Council, for example, has identified that evidence of a continuous process of learning and adapting within an organisation can be a better proxy for commissioning improvement than a standard, standstill service. This also supports the Third Sector to sustain its innovative, flexible traits while commissioners become stewards of a healthy system²¹. Elsewhere, strength of relationships – with service users, communities, partner agencies, and commissioners—is becoming a barometer for monitoring and evaluation. Joint discussion of, and agreement on, shared impact assessment measures between all public sector partners might be useful at this point in Fife.

Conclusion

Fife has an excellent infrastructure in place on which to build, from ABCD and Wellbeing Pathways to Collaboratives and mature Strategic and Local Partnerships. The Third Sector have made some recommendations to improve outcomes for families, children and young people in Fife and many of their

²¹ https://eprint.ncl.ac.uk/file_store/production/240032/DB2F2519-F397-46E8-903D-040099CD18C2.pdf

proposals are already there to be built on. One of the most significant changes which could bring the greatest impact would be to enable the Third Sector to contribute fully to driving improvement. This requires a transformational approach to commissioning by Fife Council, supporting organisations, partners, communities and service users to inform priorities and approaches and to co-design recommissioned delivery. All of this needs mutual trust and respect and an agreement to harness and build on the very best of the systems, professional relationships and delivery models which Fife has worked so well to develop over the past years. In making any short-term savings, strong efforts must be made to avoid damaging relationships, services and outcomes to the detriment of the longer-term re-commissioning process.

Appendix 1

Steering Group Membership

Kenny Murphy, Fife Voluntary Action

Laura Crombie, Clued-Up Project

Lynne Gillies, Social Work

Kathy Henwood, Social Work

Fiona McKay, Fife Health and Social Care Partnership

Chris Campbell, Fife Health and Social Care Partnership

Appendix 2

Third Sector Organisations Interviewed

Aberlour Childcare Trust
Barnardos
Cottage Family Centre
Children's Parliament
Clued-Up
Crossroads
Drugs, Alcohol and Psychotherapies Limited
Early Years Scotland
Families First
Families Outside
Family Mediation Tayside/Fife
Fife Gingerbread
Fife Women's id
Fife Young Carers
Homestart Dunfermline
Homestart Glenrothes
Homestart East Fife
Homestart Kirkcaldy
Homestart Levenmouth
Homestart Lochgelly
Relate Fife
RNIB
Scottish Childminding Association
SEAL Association

Other Services/Organisations Interviewed

Fife Council Education
 Social Work
 Communities
NHS Fife Community Nursing
Fife Health and Social Care Partnership
Includem
Fife Voluntary Action

Appendix 3

A. Interview Schedule for Reviewed Organisations

1. The services you are currently providing in Fife and their contribution to early intervention/prevention/additional support/intensive support
2. Key outcomes for families and children /impact of your services across Fife
3. Added value to services in Fife (for example, bringing in additional services via other funding, volunteering, community involvement, fundraising...expertise from parent body..)
4. Key Statutory services your organisation works with in Fife (eg Health Visitors, Social Workers, Nurseries) and key Third Sector services your organisation works with in Fife (Eg Homestart, The Cottage, SCMA, Gingerbread..)
5. How referrals are made and received and your thoughts on quality of joint working in Fife
6. Any joint delivery of services with other agencies and how this has developed and with what impact?
7. Impact of national agenda (eg extension of nursery provision) in relation to your services?
8. Anything which you feel could improve outcomes for families, parents, children and young people in Fife?
9. Services provided in Fife and is the service provided similarly across all areas of Fife?
10. What effect would a 10% cut to your organisation's budget have on outcomes in Fife? Where would you envisage such a cut being made if it were to be implemented? Is there any scope for savings that you can identify in your own service or in ways of working with other services in Fife?
11. Is there any other information you feel it is important to convey in relation to this review?

B. Interview Schedule – Commissioners/Partner organisations and services

1. What is your role and remit re commissioning, monitoring and overseeing delivery of Voluntary Sector children's services?
 - potted history of past 5-10 years of funding Children's Services
2. What is working well with Fife's Voluntary Sector Children's Services organisations?
 - best practice organisations? Examples
 - impact? Evidence
3. What is missing or not working so well
 - Examples, impact, evidence
 - Which areas (geographic/issue/demographic-base) are underfunded?
4. How do Council/NHS/Voluntary Sector work together to deliver children's services? What are the delivery models?
 - What decisions have driven redesign in Fife?
 - To what effect? Interface between statutory and voluntary?
5. How does commissioning support delivery of key outcomes for children and families?
 - Any unintended consequences?
 - Any ways to improve/do it differently?
 - How effective is the monitoring/link role of the Link Officers?
 - What is the scope to apply the Pupil Equity Fund/other funds?
 - What is the effect of reducing budgets on bringing in other funding?
6. What are the impacts of funding on prevention and early intervention, additional, intensive and universal support?
 - how far do approaches and activity contribute to the Children's Wellbeing Pathway?
 - what is the plan/journey for the shift to prevention/early intervention?
7. How are children, families and wider communities involved in co-design and participation in informing decision-making/resilience?
8. Where do you feel savings could be made with least impact on the key outcomes sought for children and families in Fife?
 - structural change
 - back office
 - staffing
 - where could savings reductions be borne with least severe outcomes?
9. How do you think Children's Services will look in Fife in 5 years' time?
 - what steps need to be taken to safeguard the most vulnerable children, young people and families over the next 5 – 10 years?
 - which models and options might be applicable in the Fife context?
10. Anything you would like to add?

Appendix 4: Workshop Discussion Points

A. June 2019

1. Characteristics of Children's Services in Fife

- What are the strong points of Children's Services in Fife? – at strategic, governance, management and operational levels?
- Where are the gaps in Children's Services in Fife – geographical? demographic? Need/issue-based?
- What are the weak points of Children's Services in Fife? –at strategic, governance, management, and operational levels?
- What do we need to explore in terms of integrated service delivery and referrals to and from other services/organisations? For example, how well do partnerships with schools, health, police, Family and Community Support Teams work?

2. Service design and delivery

- How are communities and children, young people and families who use services currently involved in evaluation/decisions/design/delivery concerning Children's Service in Fife? What scope is there for increasing or reducing this current level of community involvement?
- How do you anticipate pathways and approaches to service design and delivery might change over the next five years?
- What is the scope for more integrated service delivery by Fife's Children's Services organisations and what might the potential pitfalls and benefits be?
- What would support Fife's third sector to deliver Children's Services as effectively and efficiently as possible?
- How and where can savings best be made to have the least impact on vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife?

3. Past and Future

- What progress have we made in policy and understanding regarding the needs of children, young people and families in Fife and what progress have we made in practice?
- What should be done now to safeguard the most vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife over the next five years?
- What key changes should be made in Children's Services over the next six months/the next six years to support delivery of the prevention/early intervention agenda in Fife whilst ensuring additional and intensive support services are in place for those children, young people and families for whom they are vital?
- How might accountability, monitoring and evaluation of Fife's third sector children's services organisations be configured to best meet the needs of both commissioners and commissioned organisations?
- How and where can savings best be made to have the least impact on vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife?

4. Capacity and Accountability

- What factors need to be considered in maintaining Third Sector capacity?
- What works well about commissioning and monitoring/accountability measures at the moment? What could work better and how?

- What are the current impacts of funding on prevention, early intervention, additional support and intensive support for children, young people and families in Fife?
- What are the key challenges faced by children, young people, families, service providers and funders?
- What would support Fife's third sector to deliver Children's Services as effectively and efficiently as possible?
- How and where can savings best be made to have the least impact on vulnerable children, young people and families in Fife?

B. September 2019

1. Identifying what kinds of support are needed

What are the key difficulties/issues/hardships facing children/young people/families at the moment?

Are there any emerging issues you are noticing/hearing about?

Are there any aspects of life which have got better/easier for children/young people/families in the past 1-3 years?

2. Outcomes

Can you identify up to five key outcomes relating to children/young people/families which all relevant voluntary organisations might contribute to?

3. Prevention

Which factors are key to successful prevention?

What five activities/approaches might help to prevent escalation of the issues and difficulties identified in question 1?

What might improve/strengthen prevention work in Fife?

4. Early Intervention

What factors are key to successful early intervention?

What five activities/approaches might help to strengthen the success of early intervention to tackle the issues and difficulties identified in question 1?

Are there any improvements to be made to referrals or to other aspects of joint working which might help?

5. Continuing and Intensive Support

What factors are key to successful continuing and intensive support?

Which approaches might improve support to children/young people/families who require continuing support from Third Sector and other organisations?

Which approaches might improve support to children/young people/families who require intensive support?

Workshop 2

1. Joined Up Service Delivery

What should good wrap-around services look like for children/young people/families?

What factors are key to successful wrap-around services?

What inhibits good wrap-around services?

2. Participation

How can children, young people, families and communities most meaningfully participate in determining the shape, location, content...of the services available to them?

What improvements can be made to participation in Fife?

What strengths can be built on?

3. Joint Working

What works well about joint working across the Third Sector and with statutory sector partners?

What does good partnership look like?

What improvements could be made to support joint working?

4. Commissioning

How can commissioning best support creativity and innovation?

How can commissioning best support responsive and flexible services?

How can commissioning best support successful wrap-around services for children, young people and families in Fife?

How could the role of the third sector be strengthened in commissioning?

5. Measuring Delivery and Outcomes

What should/can we be measuring to identify change, outcomes and impact for children, young people and families accessing Third Sector and statutory services in Fife?

How can funders best be assured of value for money and good governance? What factors are key to good accountability?

Appendix 5: Organisational Remits and Geographies

A. Fife-wide

Third Sector

Aberlour	Respite breaks for children and young people
Barnardos	Support and assessments for families, cyp at risk
Children's Parliament	Group and creative support to care experienced cyp
Clued-Up	Support, incl outreach to 12-18s affected by substance use
Couple Counselling Fife	Do not work directly with children or young people
DAPL	Support, incl counselling to CYP affected by substance use
Early Years Scotland	Support to playgroups
Families Outside	Support to families affected by imprisonment
Family Mediation	Mediation and cyp counselling
Fife Crossroads	Home respite for cyp with autism/receiving palliative care
Fife Gingerbread	Support to lone parents and teen parents
Fife Women's Aid	Support to women and cyp affected by domestic abuse
Fife Young Carers	Respite, therapeutic, group support to young carer
RNIB	One to one and group support to cyp with sight loss & ASN
Who Cares? Scotland	Independent advocacy for cyp

(and a range of other Third Sector organisations such as Includem, CARF, YWCA etc which provide services to children and young people across Fife, funded from other budgets)

Health & Social Care Partnership

Breast Feeding Support Service
 Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
 Community Children's ADHD Team
 Community Paediatricians
 CYP Occupational Therapy
 CYP Community Nursing Service
 Family Nurse Partnership
 Health Visiting
 Immunisations
 Midwifery
 Paediatric Physiotherapy Services
 Paediatric Psychology Service
 School Nursing
 Speech and Language Therapy Services for Children

Fife Council

Emergency Support Team
 Children & Families Teams
 Education Home Visiting Service
 Family Support Teams

Area-based

Third Sector

Age	Kirkcaldy	Glenrothes	Levenmouth	East Fife	Dunfermline	Lochgelly
0-5	Homestart	Homestart	Homestart	Homestart	Homestart	Homestart
0-7	Cottage					
0-8	SCMA	SCMA			SCMA	SCMA
0-12	Barnardos		Barnardos			
5-16				Families First	SEAL	

Bibliography

Campbell, C., Smith, G., Shovlin, R., *The Provision and Impact of Alcohol in Fife*, January 2018 (viewed online 15/08/2019 <https://know.fife.scot/knowfife/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/05/The-Provision-and-Impact-of-Alcohol-in-Fife-Full-Report.pdf>)

Canongate Youth webpage (visited 14/07/2019 <https://canongateyouth.org.uk/edinburgh-together/>)

Fife Alcohol and Drug Partnership *Delivery Plan 2015-2018* (viewed online 11/07/2019 <https://wordpress.fifedirect.org.uk/fadp/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/05/FifeADPDeliveryPlan2015-2018FINALDRAFT.pdf>)

Fife Children's Services Partnership, *Fife Children's Services Plan, 2017 - 2020* (viewed online 14/07/2019 http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_D.1.AreaLeadershipMeeting-ChildrensServicesPlan2017.pdf)

Fife Council, *Education & Children's Services Committee 17/09/2019* (viewed online 22/09/2019 <https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/WorkingTogetherR2.pdf>)

Fife Council, Education & Children's Services *Directorate Improvement Plan, 2017-2010* (viewed online 22/09/2019 http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_ECSDPlan2017-20-forupload.pdf)

Fife Council Research Team, *Levenmouth Area Local Strategic Assessment, 2018* (viewed online 12/10/2019 <https://know.fife.scot/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/12/LSA-2018-Levenmouth-FINAL.pdf>)

Fife Council Research Team, *North East Fife Local Strategic Assessment, 2016* (viewed online 12/10/2019 <https://know.fife.scot/knowfife/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2018/01/North-East-Fife-Strategic-Assessment.pdf>)

Fife Partnership, *Fife Partnership Resource Pack, May 2007* (viewed online 10/10/2019 <https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/WorkingTogetherR2.pdf>)

Fife Partnership, *Plan4Fife Local Outcome Improvement Plan, 2017-2027, June 2019* (viewed online 15/08/2019 http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_Plan_for_Fife_2017_2027_June192.pdf)

Funding Ideas Limited, *South West Fife Family Nurture Hub: an external evaluation of the Public Social Partnership*

Improvement Service, *Place-based Approaches to Joint Planning, Resourcing and Delivery: an overview of current practice in Scotland, April 2016* (viewed online, 17/07/2019 <http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/documents/research/place-based-approaches-report.pdf>)

Lowe, T. *Performance Management in the Voluntary Sector-responding to complexity*, Voluntary Sector Review, University of Newcastle, 2017 (viewed online

18/07/2019 https://eprint.ncl.ac.uk/file_store/production/240032/DB2F2519-F397-46E8-903D-040099CD18C2.pdf)

Public Health Department, NHS Fife, *Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) in Fife, Exposures and Outcomes*, October 2018 (viewed online 11/07/2019 <https://know.fife.scot/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2019/01/ACEs-in-Fife-Exposure-and-Outcomes-Profile-Oct-2018.pdf>)

SAMH, *Counselling in Schools*, October 2018 (viewed online 16/10/2019 https://www.samh.org.uk/documents/SAMH_View_Counselling_in_Schools_Updated_October_2018.pdf)

Scottish Government, *Children's Social Work Statistics 2017-2018* (viewed online 11/07/2019 <http://scotland.mylocalcouncil.info/Data.aspx?id=S12000015&cat=14193&data=12491&lang=en-GB#data>)

Scottish Government, *Early Learning and childcare expansion - 2 year-old eligibility: BRIA*, July 2019 (viewed online 11/10/2019 <https://www.gov.scot/publications/business-regulatory-impact-assessment-expansion-early-learning-childcare-2-year-old-eligibility/>)

Scottish Government, *National Parenting Strategy*, October 2012 (viewed online 14/07/2019 http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_Plan_for_Fife_2017_2027_June192.pdf)

Scottish Government, *Pupil Equity Funding: school allocations 2019 to 2020*, February 2019 (viewed online 11/07/2019 <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pupil-equity-funding-school-allocations-2019-to-2020/>)

Scottish Government, *SIMD16 Analysis Fife*, 2016 (viewed online 15/08/2019 http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_SIMD2016AnalysisFife.pdf)

UK Government Official Statistics, *Personal tax credits: Children in low-income families local measure-2016 snapshot as at 31 August 2016* (viewed online 9/7/2019 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/personal-tax-credits-children-in-low-income-families-local-measure-2016-snapshot-as-at-31-august-2016>)