

|   | Criteria category                                 | Assessment Criteria  | Scoring approach   | Weighting   |
|---|---|--|--|-------------|
| D | <b>Operational independence</b>                   | The option provides the conditions for operational independence (outside the operational control of the Council).  |  | Pass / Fail |
| D | <b>Singular focus on improving outcomes</b>       | The option provides a single and unwavering focus on providing the best services and outcomes for CYPF.  |  | Pass / Fail |
| D | <b>Compliant with Secretary of State</b>          | The option complies with the order of the Secretary of State (DfE Commissioner).   |  | Pass / Fail |
| D | <b>Meets expectations of the DfE Commissioner</b> | The option meets the expectations of the DfE Commissioner (during the Options Appraisal stage - once informed by the appraisal the Commissioners view must be revisited)   | HIGH: The option meets the expectations of the DfE Commissioner<br>LOW: The option does not meet the expectations of the DfE Commissioner  | 10          |
| D | <b>Prevents service fragmentation</b>             | The option does not add unnecessary additional complexity or fragmentation into the local children's services system.  | HIGH: The model does not add complexity/fragmentation and fits effectively within the existing children's services system<br>MEDIUM: The model does not add unnecessary levels of complexity/fragmentation to the existing system<br>LOW: The model is likely to add unnecessary complexity/fragmentation to the existing children's services system   | 6           |
| D | <b>Service expansion / Phasing</b>                | If desired, the option could accommodate a range of children's services additional to those under direction including phasing of existing WCC services post 'go live', in order to enable growth and/or reduction in the future. | HIGH: The model offers opportunities to accommodate further services at a later stage in addition to those under direction<br>LOW: The model does not allow for accommodation of further services at a later stage to those under direction  | 8           |
| D | <b>Supports improvement activity</b>              | The option complements and actively supports the existing improvement work within children's services (and minimises disruption for CYP services during implementation).   | HIGH: The model is likely to enhance and accelerate delivery of improvement activity (e.g. provide a singular focus on outcomes, provide a dedicated budget to children's services)<br>MEDIUM: The model will deliver improvement activity in-line with the current WCC improvement plan<br>LOW: The model is likely to impair or disrupt current improvement activity   | 10          |
| D | <b>Contributes to strategy</b>                    | The option significantly contributes to the delivery of WCC's Children & Young People's Plan and the council's wider corporate plans.  | HIGH: The model would enhance and accelerate delivery of WCC CYPP objectives and wider Council plans<br>MEDIUM: The model would deliver objectives in-line with the CYPP and wider Council plans<br>LOW: The model is likely to impair/disrupt delivery of CYPP objectives and wider Council plans   | 10          |
| D | <b>Improves social work practice</b>              | The option is able to maintain and develop the best social work practice to support children and families.   | HIGH: The model would enhance and accelerate activity to improve social work practice (e.g. provide new opportunities to support and develop staff)<br>MEDIUM: The model would support current plans to improve social work practice<br>LOW: The model would disrupt activities to improve social work practice  | 10          |
| D | <b>Staff retention/attraction</b>                 | The option demonstrates opportunities to retain and attract high-calibre staff (e.g. the model is an attractive employer and there are opportunities to develop Terms & Conditions to retain and attract staff).                 | HIGH: The model offers clear and innovative mechanisms to retain and attract staff<br>MEDIUM: The model would support current staff retention/attraction activity<br>LOW: The model is likely to be unattractive to current and future staff   | 10          |
| D | <b>Staff engagement &amp; motivation</b>          | The option demonstrates a theoretical ability to positively engage and motivate children's services staff (e.g. staff involvement in decision-making of the new model).  | HIGH: The model could offer formal staff engagement mechanisms (e.g. staff Board representatives)<br>MEDIUM: The model could offer informal arrangements to engage staff<br>LOW: The model would have low/no opportunities to engage staff in decision-making  | 10          |
| D | <b>Democratic accountability</b>                  | The option enables clear democratic accountability over the performance of children's services (clear reporting lines into WCC Executive & Non-Executive functions, and Corporate Parenting Board).                              | HIGH: The model maintains and improves (streamlines) reporting lines to all CYP accountability arrangements<br>MEDIUM: The model maintains existing reporting lines to accountability structures<br>LOW: The model is unable to demonstrate clear reporting to accountability structures and/or will add unnecessary complexity to reporting.  | 10          |
| D | <b>Enhance partnership working</b>                | The option demonstrates a theoretical ability to operate at the heart of local partnerships for children's services (acting as focal point for improving outcomes for children and families) e.g. CCGs, Police, local VCS, LSCB  | HIGH: The model presents clear opportunities to form new partnerships and to involve partners in governance arrangements, and ultimately leading to integration of service delivery (in part or full)<br>MEDIUM: The model presents some opportunities to improve partnership working and/or informally involve partners in decision-making<br>LOW: The model is not likely to improve partnership working and would not involve partners in decision-making | 8           |
| D | <b>Voice of CYPF</b>                              | The option enables opportunities for meaningful engagement of CYPF (Voice of the Child), e.g. in the decision-making arrangements of the new model.  | HIGH: The model demonstrates meaningful and innovative options to engage CYPF<br>MEDIUM: The model could maintain existing opportunities to engage CYPF<br>LOW: The model cannot demonstrate any meaningful opportunities to engage CYP  | 10          |
| D | <b>Access to LGPS &amp; TPS</b>                   | The option enables current staff to retain access to the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) and Teachers' Pension Scheme (TPS).  | HIGH: The model enables staff to retain access to the LGPS and TPS (As is scenario)<br>MEDIUM: N/A<br>LOW: The model cannot guarantee that staff retain access to the LGPS and TPS   | 10          |
| V | <b>Grant and other external funding</b>           | The option enables opportunities to access external grant funding and other external funding/income.   | HIGH: The model presents clear options to access sustained levels of grant funding / external income<br>MEDIUM: The model presents some opportunities to secure external grant funding / external income<br>LOW: Is it unlikely that the model will be able to secure external grant funding / external income   | 6           |
| V | <b>Income generation (through growth)</b>         | The option enables growth through increasing the geographical footprint of the new organisation and/or an ability to introduce new services lines (income generation).   | HIGH: The model provides clear opportunities for growth (e.g. new service geographies)<br>MEDIUM: The option would provide some scope for growth over time<br>LOW: The option is likely to present no opportunities for growth   | 6           |
| V | <b>Financial stability (post go-live)</b>         | The option enables long-term financial stability (has sustainable running costs).  | HIGH: The model would enable long-term financial stability<br>MEDIUM: The model, in time, may offer long-term stability<br>LOW: The model cannot demonstrate that it would enable long-term financial stability  | 10          |
| V | <b>MTFP Savings</b>                               | Ability to achieve / influence MTFPS over and above contractual arrangements   | HIGH: The model enables WCC to influence MTFP savings over and above contractual arrangements<br>MEDIUM: The model enables WCC to have a degree of influence over MTFP savings over and above contractual arrangements<br>LOW: The model does not enable WCC to influence MTFP savings over and above contractual arrangements   | 4           |

|   |                                       |   |   |     |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----|
| V | <b>Implementation costs</b>           | The option does not have unnecessarily high implementation and procurement costs including the cost of changes to existing commissioned services (service specific and support services).                                       | HIGH: Implementation of the model is likely to incur a low implementation cost<br>MEDIUM: Costs of implementing the model are neither high nor low<br>LOW: Implementation of the model is likely to incur a high implementation cost  | 4   |
| V | <b>Client function costs</b>          | The option does not require unnecessarily high client function costs.   | HIGH: Client function is likely to incur a low cost<br>MEDIUM: Costs of client function are neither high nor low<br>LOW: The client function is likely to incur a high cost   | 7   |
| V | <b>Tax &amp; VAT</b>                  | The option does not present unviable tax and VAT implications for the new model or for WCC.   | HIGH: The model will not present any tax & VAT issues for the new model/WCC e.g. irrecoverable VAT will not be material.<br>MEDIUM: The model does not present tax/VAT issues for WCC/the new model over the short term<br>LOW: The model will present tax/VAT issues for the new model and/or WCC                        | 8   |
| V | <b>Use of surpluses</b>               | The option provides the local authority with a high degree of influence over any profits/surpluses generated by the new model.  | HIGH: The model would provide WCC with direct control over any profits/surpluses<br>MEDIUM: The model provides indirect control (e.g. via a contract) over any profits/surplus<br>LOW: The model would not give WCC any influence over the use of any profits/surplus   | 3   |
| V | <b>Financial liabilities</b>          | <i>The option enables WCC the opportunity to transfer liabilities to the new model (e.g. redundancies, pension liabilities and financial deficit).</i>  | <i>HIGH: The model enables WCC to transfer all liabilities to the new model<br/>MEDIUM: The model allows WCC to transfer liabilities to the new model apart from those resulting from direct WCC actions (e.g. reduction in core funding, resulting in redundancies)<br/>LOW: All current liabilities remain with WCC</i> | 6   |
| F | <b>Partner support</b>                | There is evidence of support for the option from relevant children's services partner organisations (the option would not place undue pressure on partnership relationships).   | N/A - cannot be measured at this stage  | N/A |
| F | <b>Market maturity of option</b>      | The option can demonstrate sufficient market maturity.  | N/A - cannot be measured at this stage  | N/A |
| F | <b>Procurement</b>                    | The option can be procured by WCC in a straightforward way.   | <i>HIGH: A competitive tendering process is not required<br/>MEDIUM: Tendering is likely to be straightforward<br/>LOW: Tendering is likely to be complex</i>   | 8   |
| F | <b>Contract management</b>            | <i>The option can be contract managed in a straightforward way by WCC's client function.</i>  | <i>HIGH: Contract management of the model is likely to be straightforward<br/>MEDIUM: Contract management of the model is likely to incur some complexity<br/>LOW: Contract management of the model is likely to be complex (e.g. management of multiple contractual arrangements)</i>                                    | 10  |
| F | <b>Support services - operational</b> | <i>The option has the ability to choose its own support services provider (e.g. HR, Finance, ICT)</i>   | <i>HIGH: The model allows for full flexibility over choice of support services providers from 'go live'<br/>MEDIUM: The model has some flexibility after a transition period (e.g. 2 years)<br/>LOW: The model has limited ability to choose its own support services provider</i>  | 5   |
| F | <b>Support services - WCC</b>         | <i>The option enables stability in WCC support service operations with manageable impact for the local authority.</i>   | <i>HIGH: The model presents no negative impact to WCC support services (e.g. economies of scale)<br/>MEDIUM: The model presents some negative impact to WCC support services<br/>LOW: The model has significant impact on current WCC support service arrangements (e.g. costs)</i>                                       | 5   |
| F | <b>Service specific commissioning</b> | <i>For service specific commissioning, the option enables WCC to continue delivering its wider service portfolio with a manageable impact on related council services (e.g. contracts that cut across children's services).</i> | <i>HIGH: The model presents minimal impact to wider WCC commissioning<br/>MEDIUM: The model presents some negative impact to wider WCC commissioning (e.g. complexity, costs)<br/>LOW: The model has significant impact on wider WCC commissioning</i>  | 3   |
| F | <b>Implementation timescales</b>      | <i>The option can be established in go-live form within DfE expectations of implementation timescales (April 2019) for those services included in the statutory direction.</i>  | <i>HIGH: The model can be established in go-live form by April 2019<br/>MEDIUM: N/A<br/>LOW: The model cannot be established in go-live form by April 2019</i>  | 10  |
| F | <b>Managing risk</b>                  | The option is able to minimise potential risks to WCC and it's elected members (reputational and financial).  | HIGH: The option enables WCC to effectively monitor and manage risks<br>MEDIUM: The model presents some opportunities to manage/mitigate risk (e.g. contractual arrangements)<br>LOW: The model presents no clear opportunities for WCC to monitor & manage risks   | 10  |

NOTE: The affordability of the models will be taken into consideration during the business case phase as the specific costs associated with the 5 models are not known at this stage.

NOTE: There are a number of children's ADMs up and running which are currently not paying VAT however this may change based on upcoming guidance from HMRC