Finance and Resources Committee

10am, Tuesday, 2 February 2016

Support for Families where Children and Young People are Affected by Parental Substance Use - Award of Contract

Item number 7.7

Report number Executive/routine

Wards All

Executive summary

This report seeks the approval of the Finance and Resources Committee to award a contract following a competitive tendering process.

The term of the contract will be three years, with the option to extend for up to a maximum of two years.

Links

Coalition pledges P1

Council outcomes CP1 and CP2
Single Outcome Agreement S02 and S03



Report

Support for Families where Children and Young People are Affected by Parental Substance Use - Award of Contract

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Finance and Resource Committee:

- 1.1 Approves the appointment of the following Providers for three years, with the option to extend for up to a maximum of two years:
 - 1.1.1 Circle (lead organisation) in partnership with CrossReach/Sunflower Garden.

Background

- 2.1 This report outlines the result of the procurement of the Support for Families where Children and Young People are Affected by Parental Substance Use (CAPSU) provision.
- 2.2 It is estimated that in Edinburgh there are 7,000 children affected by parental alcohol use and at least 2,173 affected by parental drug use; in 2013/14 parental alcohol / drug misuse was recorded as a contributing factor in 27% of child protection case conferences.
- 2.3 The key drivers for service redesign and change included the recommendations from the 2012 independent 'Assessment of need and review of services for children and families affected by parental substance misuse' undertaken by the Edinburgh Alcohol and Drug Partnership (EADP).
- 2.4 A particular driver has been the requirement to address the recommendation regarding the need to provide 'one service' for the City thereby ensuring integrated services and equity of access. Other drivers include addressing ease of access for service users by moving to a locality-based model aligned to adult recovery services.
- 2.5 Key principles informing the redesign have been an increased focus on early intervention and services for children in need, and support for families where there are high levels of risk and a strong likelihood of intervention.
- 2.6 Incumbent delivery organisations were informed early in the planning stages of intention to tender for a redesigned service and were involved in a Collaborative Group which approved the project plan and advised on key service development issues, including priorities for action /change and emerging issues and challenges.

Main report

- 3.1 The service will deliver a single coherent service focused on minimising harm and mitigating risks to children and young people by reducing the impact of parental substance use. There are two strands to the service: whole family support (where there are children aged 0-18 affected by parental substance use) and/or direct one-to-one work with children and young people aged 5-18.
- 3.2 This service was advertised using an open tender published on Public Contracts Scotland on 23 October 2015, resulting in 16 notes of interest. An open invitation was issued to organisations to attend a briefing event to 'walk through' the tender documentation and process. There were 3 tender submissions.
- 3.3 The supplier selection and award was based on a weighting of quality (70%) and price (30%). The quality assessment sought to identify specialist providers of services provided to vulnerable families, children and young people. Key to this is the ability to provide accessible services at a locality level; a focus on outcomes; and an overarching ability to support families to reach a point of stability to transition into mainstream activities and community services.
- 3.4 The qualitative criteria and evaluation, as set out below, specifically addressed the ability to meet the service specification.

| Award Criteria | Weighting (%) |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Service Delivery | 35% |
| Management and Staffing | 20% |
| Performance Management | 15% |
| Partnership and Collaborative Working | 15% |
| Implementation Plan | 10% |
| Community Benefits | 5% |
| Total | 100% |

3.5 The quality outcome (out of 100) was converted by applying 70% weighting to the final score; the pricing weighting was 30%, with the maximum 30% allocated to the lowest priced bid.

The scoring methodology is set out in Appendix 2. The resultant score for the Tender is as follows:

| Provider | Quality (out of 70) | Price (out of 30) | £ (max potential value) | TOTAL | Position |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|----------|
| Circle/CrossReach | 59.50 | 28.50 | 2,096,825 | 88.00 | 1 |
| Provider B | 51.63 | 30.00 | 1,992,122 | 81.63 | 2 |
| Provider C | 42.00 | 27.12 | 2,203,722 | 69.12 | 3 |

3.6 The EADP Support Team and the Communities and Families Commissioning team will be jointly responsible for the contract management of the new contract. This will ensure oversight linked to adult treatment and recovery services as well as community services for children and families.

Measures of success

- 4.1 A successful tender process has been completed and is compliant with EU regulations and Contract Standing Orders.
- 4.2 The contract delivers the specification of requirements within the allocated budget.

Financial impact

- 5.1 The maximum potential value of the contract, including extension, is £2,096,825.
- 5.2 The contract value represents a saving of £24,167 per annum, compared to the allocated budget.
- 5.3 The costs associated with procuring this contract are estimated at £10,001 to £20,000.

Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact

- 6.1 The transition to the new service and implementation of the Contract will be managed by a lead officer within Communities and Families.
- 6.2 Ongoing contract monitoring and compliance, including performance management and management of risk will be overseen by Communities and Families Commissioning.

Equalities impact

- 7.1 A full equalities and rights impact assessment (ERIA) has been undertaken. The recommendations of the ERIA have been addressed.
- 7.2 There are no direct equality and rights impacts arising from this report.

Sustainability impact

8.1 There are no impacts on carbon, adaptation to climate change and sustainable development arising directly from this report.

Consultation and engagement

- 9.1 There was a clear consultation and engagement plan in place to gain feedback to inform the development of the service specification. A Collaborative Group was established involving service providers and key partner agencies. The Collaborative Group was actively involved in discussions advising on service development priorities, and emerging issues and challenges highlighted through consultation and engagement.
- 9.2 Discussions about service redesign and priorities took place within the EADP Children, Young People and Families Commissioning Group with representation from NHS Lothian and EVOC. There was also face-to-face engagement with key professionals in other service areas. The Principal Officer for Substance Misuse in Children and Families responsible for developing the service specification has shadowed existing service providers which included meeting clients accessing the family support services.
- 9.3 Two survey Monkey Questionnaires were developed to gather views from organisations / professionals and service users.
 - 9.3.1 150 responses received from professionals / organisations from range of services – schools, NHS (health visitors), social work, and voluntary organisations.
 - 9.3.2 Engagement with service users has been challenging. 9 responses received from service users, plus meeting with women attending at PrePare group.

Feedback from consultation and engagement helped to inform the requirements outlined in the service specification.

Background reading/external references

Equalities and Rights Impact Assessment

Alistair Gaw

Acting Executive Director, Communities and Families

Contact: Nick Smith, EADP Joint Programme Manager;

E-mail: nicholas.smith@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 529 2117

Contact: Julie Tickle, Policy Officer;

E-mail: julie.tickle@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 529 3244

Links

| Coalition pledges | P1 - Increase support for vulnerable children, including help for f |
|-------------------|---|
| | care |
| Council outcomes | CP1 – Children and young people fulfil their potential |
| | CP2 – Improved health and wellbeing; reduced inequalities |
| Single Outcome | SO2 - Edinburgh's citizens experience improved health and |
| Agreement | wellbeing, with reduced inequalities in health |
| | SO3 - Edinburgh's children and young people enjoy their |
| | childhood and fulfil their potential |
| Appendices | Appendix 1- Summary Tendering and tender evaluation Process |
| | Appendix 2 – Scoring Methodology |
| | |

Appendix 1: Summary of Tendering and Tender Evaluation Processes

| Contract | Children & Young People Affected by Parental Substance Use |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Contract Period | 1April 2016 to 31 March 2019 with the option to extend for up to two years. |
| Estimated contract value | £ 419,365 (Annual) £2,096,825 (Total including extensions) |
| Standing Orders observed | Open Procedure |
| EC Directives | 2004/18/EC |
| Tenders Returned | 3 |
| Tenders fully compliant | 3 |
| Recommended Provider/s | 1 |
| Primary Criterion | Most economically advantageous tenders to have met the qualitative and technical specification of the client department' |
| Evaluation criteria and weightings | Quality (70%) |
| and reasons for this approach | Price (30%); |
| | Quality was of higher importance due to the nature of the provision. |
| Evaluation Team | Council Officers |

Appendix 2 – Scoring Methodology

| Score | Description |
|-------------------|---|
| 0 Unacceptable | Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement. |
| 1 Poor | Response is partially relevant but generally poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirement but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled. |
| 2 Acceptable | Response is relevant and acceptable. The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirement but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas. |
| 3 Good | Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled. |
| 4 Excellent | Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full. |