

Control document - Assessment Criteria

Version	Source of change	Amendments made	Date of change	Approvals
Version 1	MV sourced WCC criteria from the ADM PID, cabinet reports, CYPP, and overlaid experience from previous criteria used in other children's ADMs	N/A	Created on 30th October for 1st November workshop	N/A
Version 2	Developed and refined in conjunction with SLT and corporate colleagues during a 3 hour workshop on 1st November. This included some additions, removals, refinements and weightings		Wednesday 1st November	SLT and some corporate colleagues approved the criteria subject to final feedback
Version 3	Feedback from workshop attendees (given two days following the workshop to provide final feedback). Feedback received from Hannah Needham and Luke Willets.	Financial liabilities weighting changed from 4-7, to 10, and a few minor wording changes made	Monday 6th November	
Version 4	Feedback from members during Workshop 4 - Cabinet Briefing	1. 'Democratic accountability' weighting changed from 7, to 10 2. On the 'Support improvement' criteria the description changed from 'Does not disrupt' changed to 'minimises'	Tuesday 7th November	Cabinet member approval subject to final feedback
Version 5	Feedback from members via email following the briefing (attendees given two days to provide final feedback)	No feedback received	N/A	
Version 6	Feedback received from David Scott	1. 'Implementation timescales' criteria changed to state 'in go-live form' instead of 'shadow form'. 2. Provided challenge regarding similar criteria and therefore duplicating scores. Following another review from MV the criteria was determined to be appropriate for WCC based on the process of creating it with SLT and what is important for WCC	Wednesday 8th November	David Scott approval subject to feedback being incorporated
Version 7	Feedback received from Trevor Doughty	1.'DfE Expectations' criteria changed to 'Compliant with order of the Secretary of State' 2. New criteria added titled 'Meets expectations of DfE Commissioner', which was weighted 10 3. 'HIGH' score for the 'Enhance Partnership Working' criteria changed to include 'integration of services'	Wednesday 8th November	Commissioner approval subject to feedback being incorporated
Version 8	Amendments by MV, during the scoring	Throughout the scoring process it became apparent that some scoring approaches required a 'MEDIUM'. Therefore a MEDIUM was added to 'Contract Management'	Thursday 9th November	
Version 9	Final amendments due to a thorough sense check	MV conducted a final grammar and wording sense check and made very minor amendments of this nature, but did not change anything material	Friday 10th November	

1. 'Access to LGPS/TPS' - low changed to 'the model cannot guarantee' instead of 'unable to'.
2. MTPS - Medium added 'a degree of influence'
3. Implementation costs - not 1 model only, changed

Version 10

Process for change control following final amendments

1. Report to Hannah Needham
2. Escalate to Cathering Driscoll and / or Steve Stewart if necessary (i.e. contentious and material change)
3. MV to assess impact of change
4. Take to programme board for approval or rejection

Scoring

Version	Source of change	Amendments made	Date of change	Approvals
Version 1	First scoring completed by MV based on scoring approach	First draft	Friday 10th November	N/A
Version 2	Workshop 5 - ADM Steering Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 'Prevents service fragmentation' Strategic partnership changed to 5 'Supports improvement activity' JV changed to 5 'Improves social work practice' and 'Staff retention/attraction' for Outsource changed to 10 'Democratic Accountability' WOC changed to 10 'Enhance partnership working' IO and Outsource changed to 5 'Income generation' Outsource changed to 5 'MTPF savings' Outsource changed to 5 'Implementation costs strategic partnership' changed to 5 	14th Nov	
Version 3	Feedback from David	<p>A number of key rationale added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner's view to revisited following OA submission, and at each decision-point. The criteria has been scored based on current approval to proceed to investigate the 5 shortlisted options. 'Implementation costs' - DfE funding not likely to fund partner costs. Regarding 'Supports improvement activity' - Essex improvement partnership and plans to be taken into consideration regarding any potential partnership model with a different authority 'Staff retention/attraction' - note that the current improvement plan states a requirement for further social workers, therefore a reduction in staff through a partnership is unlikely 'Income generation' - bring out the key differences in rationale between the WOC and the IO further 'Support services -WCC' - same as above 	14th Nov	
Version 4	Feedback from Trevor	No changes made, however rationale was explained in more detail during a phone conversation	14th Nov	
Version 5	Feedback from Hannah	Strategic partnership = 5 (instead of 10) for 'Use of surpluses', as the partner shares the agreement of how these are distributed/used.	14th Nov	
Version 6	Feedback from Sarah Wilkins	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Same point regarding 'Use of surpluses' as Hannah's feedback above. This was not applied to the JV as the JV is entered into in equal partnership across two authorities who have control over their respective ownership shares 'Procurement' of Independent Organisation changed to '5' as there is a small risk of a procurement process Further rationale provided for strategic partnership timescales. 	15th Nov	
Version 7	Feedback from Simon Mallinson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Similar feedback regarding surpluses. Financial liabilities - updated independent organisations which had an error stating 'with partner council' Updated tendering rationale to understand 	15th Nov	
Version 8	Final amendments from MV sense check for spelling/grammar	Minor errors amended	15th Nov	
Version FINAL	Amendments by CBB	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> D10 - Strategic Partnership increased to 10, Outsource decreased to 5 V6 - WOC decreased to 5, instead of 10 	27th Nov	Programme Board

Process for change control following final amendments

1. Report to Hannah Needham
2. Escalate to Catherine Driscoll and / or Steve Stewart if necessary (i.e. contentious and material change)
3. MV to assess impact of change
4. Take to programme board for approval or rejection

Options Appraisal Report

Version	Source of change	Amendments made	Date of change	Approvals
Version 1.0 171117	Mutual Ventures final draft pre-review			
Version 1.0 201117	Comments from Amanda Berry/Hannah Needham regarding appendix and figure references	Appendix numbers and figures amended	20/11/2017	
Version 1.0 211117	Comments incorporated from Sarah Wilkins, Simon Mallinson, Steve Stewart, Simon Geraghty	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference to ACE programme/adoption in scope and salient issues 2. Add Ofsted line to each proposition 3. Note role of Scutiny in holding SMT to account in each proposition 4. Add in that legal advice is required to confirm exemptions that apply to WCC's ADM 5. Note that legal advice is required to confirm the restrictions regarding delegation of statutory responsibilities to an new entity/partner 6. Add the potential maximum score to the overall ranking table 7. Add the potential maximum score per row / criteria within the RAG breakdown table 8. Define 'high', 'medium' and 'low' in the scoring 9. Define 'significant' in the scoring differences 10. Add another salient issue regarding that options may be able to morph into another ADM 11. Bring out the VAT avoidance issue more clearly and quantify the threshold throughout the propositions/salient issues 12. Add in the context section, that the ADM is a vehicle and not an improvement of outcomes for children in itself 13. Change all 'children's services' to 'children's social care services' 14. Typos amended across pages 11, 12, 15, 27, 37 15. Change all LAOC/LATC to WOC 	21/11/2017	Programme Board
Version 1.0 271117	Comments incorporated from CBB that were agreed at the Programme Board on 23rd November 2017. Note: not all CBB comments were agreed in the Programme Board.	<p>In Section 8.1 in the Assumptions:</p> <p>Service Phasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove: 'It is assumed'. • Remove: 'services are likely to transfer into the ADM' and replace with 'services may transfer into the ADM'. <p>Fragmentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove '...that all the options will add some level of complexity' and replace with '...that all the options are inherently disruptive'. <p>DfE Funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional sentence 'and DfE funding related to WCC's ADM development also needs to be agreed in the next phase'. • Add new assumption that if a partnership is chosen it will only be with a 'good' or 'outstanding' partner. Remove these references from the scoring rationale • Add new assumption that if the DfE approve, a twin-track business case may be taken forward to fully explore two options <p>In Section 7 in the financial differences conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 'motivated and focused' from the 3rd bullet. No replacement required. <p>In Section 8.2 Application of the assessment criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D10 changed to increase Strategic Partnership to 10, and reduce Outsource to 5 • V6 changed to reduce WOC to 5 instead of 10 	27/11/2017	Programme Board

Process for change control following final amendments

1. Report to Hannah Needham
2. Escalate to Cathering Driscoll and / or Steve Stewart if necessary (i.e. contentious and material change)
3. MV to assess impact of change
4. Take to programme board for approval or rejection