Tameside
Metropolitan Borough

“Big six” transformation priorities for 25/26

Summary

Recommendation: SLT is asked to:

- consider and comment on the next iteration of OBCs; and
- agree detail to be reported to October Board.

IMPOWER is supporting the development of outline business cases for six agreed priority transformation programmes to achieve financial savings for 2025/26 and beyond.

This paper provides the latest status update on development of the priority outline business cases and appended are the latest business case for each of the priority programmes.

These continue to be iterated with services, particularly to develop the detail of delivery plans, develop full understanding of the enabling support asks, and fully test savings options and ranges. This work continues at pace with services and AD leads for proposals.

Alongside development of these priority transformation programmes, for Tameside to both achieve a balanced budget position and create the organisational capacity for the scale of change required to be on a more sustainable footing longer-term, it is integral that work continues in parallel on:

- Service reduction/ cessation options to mitigate any shortfall in 25/26; and
- Development of a 3-5 year transformation strategy and programme

Transformation priorities to mobilise immediately	
1	Demand management: Adults social care review of front door and operating model
2	Demand management: Cared for children, placements and sufficiency
3	Demand management: SEND (high needs) demand management and cost reduction programme
4	Demand management: Homelessness – acceleration of demand & supply programme
5	Corporate review of commissioning
6	Council operating model – quick wins on structures

Financial opportunity & investment requirements – current estimates

Current spend reduction estimates

Row Labels	Sum of 2024/25	Sum of 2025/26	Sum of 2026/27	Sum of 2027/28	Sum of 2028/29	Sum of Total spend reduction
DSG: High Needs Block		1.2	2.8	3.3	3.4	10.7
SEND - demand management and cost reduction		1.2	2.8	3.3	3.4	10.7
Modelled cost avoidance to the High Needs Block as a result of demand management programme		1.2	2.8	3.3	3.4	10.7
Impact of sufficiency strategy on cost of meeting demand - TBC						0.0
General fund		6.6	9.8	8.3	2.7	27.2
Adult social care - demand management		0.3	1.1	1.1		2.5
Diverting 3 people a week from entering residential or nursing care leading to a net reduction of 3.5 placements a week		0.2	0.6	0.6		1.5
Diverting 8 people a week from requiring a home support package leading to a net reduction of 3 people a week		0.1	0.5	0.5		1.1
Children's Social Care - placement costs		2.9	3.3	1.8	0.3	8.1
12 CYP step down in 25/26 (1 per month)		1.5	1.2			2.7
Stretch: assumption of further cohort of 12 CYP stepped down in 26/27			1.5	1.2		2.7
Contract management of external provision (5% reduction in costs of care for 72 CYP)		1.0				1.0
12 CYP reunification in 25/26 (1 per month)		0.3	0.3			0.6
Stretch: assumption 12 further reunifications per annum in two subsequent years			0.3	0.6	0.3	1.1
Impact of CYP "ageing out" of cared-for cohort - TBC						0.0
Commissioning - short-term supplier management		1.0	3.0	3.0		7.0
Low ambition - equivalent to 1% reduction in spend on top 20 suppliers		0.5	1.0	1.0		2.5
Stretch to high ambition - equivalent to 3% reduction in spend on top 20 suppliers		0.5	2.0	2.0		4.5
Homelessness - demand and supply programme						0.0
Savings TBC						0.0
Op Model - short-term focus on structures)		2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	9.6
1% reduction in employee costs per annum		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.8
Stretch: increment to 2% employee costs per annum		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.8
SEND - demand management and cost reduction						0.0
Revenue impacts of reduced demand for EHCPs - impacts on transportation and SEND / Ed Psych capacity (TBC)						0.0
Grand Total		**7.8**	**12.6**	**11.6**	**6.1**	**37.9**

£10.7m to HNB

£27.2m to GF

Current investment requirements

Row Labels	Sum of 2024/25	Sum of 2025/26	Sum of 2026/27	Sum of 2027/28	Sum of Total investment
Adult social care	**0.45**	**0.25**			**0.7**
Change management support to support with baselining, design and implementation (indicative to be tested further with service and finance)	0.45	0.25			0.7
Potential additional capacity in HR, OD and Legal to be defined					0
Children's Social Care	**0.25**	**0.6**			**0.85**
Delivery capacity (IMPOWER capacity delivering until November 2024)	0.25	0.6			0.85
Reunification workers - TBC					0
Commissioning	**0.06**	**0.24**	**0.18**		**0.48**
2 year fixed term appointment of a Strategic Commissioning Lead and Commissioning Programme Manager	0.06	0.24	0.18		0.48
Homelessness	**0.25**	**0.25**			**0.5**
TBC - placeholder	0.25	0.25			0.5
Op Model	**0.1**				**0.1**
TBC - placeholder	0.1				0.1
SEND	**0.2**	**0.4**			**0.6**
One-off external change support for demand management work	0.2	0.4			0.6
Transformation support to deliver broader SEN improvement also required (programme lead and 2x officers to deliver) but may be achievable within existing resourcing envelope					0
Grand Total	**1.31**	**1.74**	**0.18**		**3.23**

Please note that savings and investment figures are working estimates and subject to further iteration and validation

IMPOWER

Tameside Metropolitan Borough

EDGE WORK

Demand Management | Children's Social Care - Cared for children, Placements & Sufficiency

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating Deliverability: **A**

Directorate	**Children's social care**
Project title	**Demand Management: Children's Social Care - Cared for Children, Placements & Sufficiency**
Lead responsible officer	**Alison Montgomery**
Equalities Impact Assessment required	**Full**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Priority One: Best Start in Life**
Nature of Saving	**Transformation**

Summary of proposal

TMBC continues to spend a significant proportion of its budget on CSC (more than statistical neighbours). This spend is driven by high numbers of cared for children and the costs of their placements. A Children's improvement plan is in place which the service continues to work towards delivering with oversight from a children's commissioner and Ofsted. There remains a need to focus on the financial resilience of the service through implementation of a 'Demand Management' approach which ensures children are looked after in the right place, at the right time and within their families when it is safe to do so.

Key interventions to deliver financial sustainability are;

Addressing numbers of cared for children

- Targeted review of Cared for Children, their needs and strengths and the strengths of their family to ascertain whether it is appropriate for them to be cared for or whether they could be reunified with family. (Specifically, children currently in foster care which learning has indicated results in higher numbers of successful reunifications)
- For those children who cannot return to their parents, exploring wider family networks and opportunities for kinship care and SGO

Addressing sufficiency, availability and costs of homes for cared for children

- Working to reduce the number of children in external residential placements through 'stepping down' to internal provision or family based foster homes
- Contract management of current external residential placements
- Review of internal residential provision to understand true costs and opportunities to reduce vacancy rates
- Reviewing funding agreements with partners for children with complex health or mental health needs
- Commissioning differently to meet sufficiency requirements
- Increasing sufficiency of internal fostering

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
Ofsted oversight and continued need to improve services	Children's outcomes are improved by managing risk to allow them to remain in their family or by living a family-based home e.g. foster care
Instability / permanency of senior leadership team	Recruitment for a permanent DCS is underway and stability of current AD is supporting workforce confidence
Lack of data and performance information	Additional capacity required to develop performance approach and capability to use data to steer the service
Internal fostering sufficiency and availability of family-based homes for children who cannot live with their family	Work required to increase recruitment and retention activity and assessment of new carers to improve fostering pipeline and increase internal sufficiency
Breakdowns of family-based placements which lead to placements with higher costs	Earlier intervention where there is 'risk' of breakdown and improved response to reduce occurrence of breakdowns as a cost avoidance measure

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
Review of all children in residential care to identify cohort who will likely remain, and cohort for step down	October - November 2024
Review internal residential provision including vacancy rates and costs	December 2024
Full review of current external residential placement costs and services to understand VFM and opportunities for reduction	March 2025
Extend review of cared for children (VCARE) to a greater number of children	February - July 2025
Deliver opportunities to change / reduce support identified through reviews	April 2025 – March 2026

Financial Case

Savings deliverable						
Detail of saving	**2025/26 £m**	**2026/27 £m**	**2027/28 £m**	**2028/29 £m**	**2029/30 £m**	**Total saving £m**
12 CYP step down in 25/26 (1 per month) Low ambition	£1.51m	£1.18m	-	-		**£2.69m**
12 CYP step down in 26/27 (1 per month) High Ambition	-	*£1.51m*	*£1.18m*	-		***£2.69m***
Contract management of external provision (5% reduction in costs of care for 72 CYP)	£1.02m	-	-	-		**£1.02m**
12 CYP reunification from IFA in 25/26 (1 per month)	£0.32m	£0.25m	-	-		**£0.57m**
12 CYP reunification from IFA 26/27 (1 per month)	-	£0.32m	£0.25m	-		**£0.57m**
12 CYP reunification from IFA 27/28 (1 per month)	-	-	£0.32m	£0.25m		**£0.57m**
Impact of children turning 18 and leaving care						
TOTALS	**£2.85m**	**£3.26m**	**£1.75m**	**£0.25m**		**£8.11m**

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	**2024/25 £m**	**2025/26 £m**	**2026/27 £m**	**2027/28 £m**	**2028/29 £m**	**Total £m**
Reunification workers?						
Delivery capacity (IMPOWER capacity delivering until November 2024)	£0.25m	£0.6m				
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						Indicative 1:3 based on currently known costs
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						Revenue
What will the payback period be in years?						2025/26 (year 1)

Demand Management: SEND (high needs) demand management and cost reduction programme

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating Deliverability

Directorate	**Children's - Education**
Project title	**Demand Management SEND**
Lead responsible officer	**Deborah Myers**
Equalities Impact Assessment required	**Full**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Priority 2 - Opportunity to Learn and Earn**
Nature of Saving	**Transformation (demand management and behaviour change)**

Summary of proposal

The SEND system is in crisis nationally, but Tameside is a national outlier in the proportion of children and young people with EHCPs (c10% TMBC, c4% England). Rates of early SEND support and inclusion in mainstream schools are lower in Tameside than for comparators. On current trajectory, the deficit on Tameside's High Needs Block budget is set to increase rapidly from circa £8m at present, presenting a real risk to the overall financial sustainability of the Council if the ringfence arrangement is removed.

Based on an extensive diagnostic and set of front-line deep dives carried out in Spring / Summer 2024, a major programme is proposed to improve outcomes and manage unnecessary costs within Tameside's SEND / high needs system. The key interventions proposed are:

1. **Empowering SEN coordinators** in schools to have better, evidenced-based conversations with parents and professionals in order to see and meet emerging needs earlier and prevent unnecessary escalation. This will be focused at key points such as phase transfer between primary and secondary schools and aim to support better conversations around individual children and young people.
2. **Reviewing the Council's outreach offer to schools** and SENCOs to provide early, relational advice and prevent unnecessary requests for EHC assessments.
3. **Shifting our practice at the front door** around referrals and assessments for EHCNAs to ensure that we follow a strengths-based approach, only agree to a plan where it is required, and that we refer parent carers and professionals to the most effective sources of support and guidance other than a plan where appropriate.
4. **Redesigning our SEND service** to optimise structures and capacity, and update our model of practice.
5. **Strengthen our system leadership fundamentals**, including partnership working and data dashboard.

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
Fragility of relationships with schools and wider partners	- strengthen comms, re-stating shared ambition - working within LAP governance from the outset - test and learn approach before scaling up
Embedded expectations of parents	- strengthening the evidence base for conversations between parent carers, schools and SEND professionals - engagement and collaboration with parent carer forum from the outset
Capacity to lead and manage change	- clarity around short-term support required - recruitment to permanent roles - operational stabilisation of SEND services
Impact of national drivers / pressures affect ability to reduce net costs	- demonstrating the potential for cost avoidance / better outcomes through targeted intervention

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
To follow	
Implementation	

Financial Case

Savings deliverable						
Detail of saving	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	2029/30 £m	Total saving £m
Modelled cost avoidance to HNB (IMPOWER)	-1.2	-4	-7.3	-10.7		-10.7m
TOTALS	-1.2	-4	-7.3	-10.7		-10.7m

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	Total £m
One-off external change support for demand management work	0.2	0.4				
Transformation support to deliver broader SEN improvement also required (programme lead and 2x officers to deliver) but may be achievable within existing resourcing envelope						
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						1:2 in-year
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						Revenue
What will the payback period be in years?						In-year

IMPOWER modelling assumptions are based on a baseline forecast provided by TMBC an ambition of:

- a 32% reduction (by third year) of new EHCPs being established each year
- reducing the overall average cost of an EHCP by preventing escalation of existing EHCPs to specialist provision by 70% (of a small number of targeted cases)
- increasing the number of cessations by 3% through identifying cases where EHCP is no longer needed

These assumptions are drawn from work in other systems and are based on real impact achieved with similar interventions.

FURTHER WORK IS REQUIRED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT ON THE GENERAL FUND e.g. THROUGH REDUCED DEMAND FOR HOME TO EDUCATION TRANSPORTATION AND REDUCED CASELOAD WITHIN SEND TEAM

Data used in the model (outlined on return on investment page) is to be tested and updated with the service to ensure it reflects latest EHCP demand baseline position

Tameside Metropolitan Borough

Demand Management: Adult Social Care review of front door and operating model

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating Deliverability

Directorate	**Adult Social Care**
Project title	**Adult Social Care review of front door and operating model**
Lead responsible officer	**Tracey Harrison / Sharon Davies**
Equalities Impact Assessment	**Full**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Priority 4 – Healthy and Active Lives**
Nature of Saving	**Transformation**

Summary of proposal

Requests for Support from ASC are comparable to statistical neighbours, yet the number of people entering services is significantly greater (2291 per 100k of the population compared to 524 on 22/23 benchmarking – although recording processes have been changed from April 23 and analysis is required to confirm the baseline for this work). Once people enter short-term support, they are more likely to progress to long-term care. From 22/23 data, TMBC is only diverting c23% of people requesting support to universal services compared to 65% of requests made in statistical neighbour areas. Further to this, national data indicates a much lower rate of CHC cases than neighbours. Pathways into ASC are heavily interdependent with the NHS both in terms of community response and hospital discharge.

Key interventions to deliver financial sustainability through demand management include:

- **Pathway mapping** to determine the decision points for people requesting support and ensuring these are streamlined and strength based. This includes reviewing hospital discharge pathways
- **Reviewing the resources** (capacity and capability) along the pathway to ensure that the ASC operating model is making best use of resource at each stage
- Ensuring a **strength-based approach** is being used at each stage of the pathway
- Feeding gaps in universal provision into the development of the **prevention strategy and commissioning work** to ensure sufficient community assets
- **Targeted case reviews** to understand application of policy, process and cost drivers in decision-making across CHC, Continuing Care, S117 and Funded Nursing Care. Immediate discussion with NHS leads where appropriate
- Ambition setting for use of **Tech Enabled Care** within the pathways

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
• Capacity to review pathways and processes whilst continuing to deliver services	• Additional capacity required to support the design and implementation of a new operating model
• Relationship with the NHS being maintained whilst changing the status-quo	• Development of a strong communication and engagement plan with NHS partners fully engaged in the development of the ambition and change proposals
• Pressure within hospital discharge driving overall system demand	• A robust understanding of the baseline position, ambition and potential impact on flow that can be discussed with partners to share risk
• Lack of experience and skills in change management and transformation delivery within the ASC Operational Delivery team	• Additional capacity required to support the design and implementation of a new operating model
• Lack of ability to track impact and measure success	• Resource to undertake baseline assessment and determine success measures ahead of implementing new models
• Potential impact of significant HR changes, required to deliver a new operating model	• Early engagement with HR to understand potential impact and ensure appropriate resource is available

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
• Targeted case reviews of identified CHC cases	Dec 24
• Baseline analysis, engagement and mapping completed	Jan 25
• Opportunity Analysis completed	Feb 25
• Develop 'To be' model	March 25
• Develop detailed recommendations	March 25
• Gateway decision on progressing to implementation	March 25
• Model implemented	Sept 25

Financial Case

Savings deliverable							
Detail of saving		2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	2029/30 £m	Total saving £m
Diverting **3** people a week from entering residential or nursing care leading to a net reduction of 3.5 placements a week	Pressure assumption reduction	0.17	0.64	0.64			**1.45**
Diverting **8** people a week from requiring a home support package leading to a net reduction of 3 people a week	Pressure assumption reduction	0.13	0.47	0.47			**1.07**
Totals		**0.3**	**1.1**	**1.1**			**2.5**

Notes:

- These savings reflect the high ambition identified by the working group on 19/09
- Average rates for residential care: £941
- Average rates for home support: £218/£410
- Assumption of 6-month savings in 25/26 with full year impact from 26/27
- Demand management will mitigate growth as well as contribute to an overall budget reduction through churn of placements – further modelling required
- Figures are net savings – gross is a total of £3.95m
- **Further work is required to refine, validate and iterate these figures, including testing scale of opportunity against reductions achieved in other comparator places**

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	Total £m
Change management support to support with baselining, design and implementation (indicative to be tested further with service and finance)	0.45	0.25				0.7
Potential additional capacity in HR, OD and Legal to be defined	TBC					
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						3.6
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						
What will the payback period be in years?						

Tameside
Metropolitan Borough

Corporate Review of Commissioning

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating Deliverability

Project title	**Corporate Review of Commissioning**
Lead responsible officer	**Tracey Harrison/ James Mallion**
Equalities Impact Assessment	**Summary**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Financially Sustainable Public Services**
Nature of Saving	**Transformation**

Summary of proposal

TMBC currently spend c44% of the gross budget (c. £240m pa) on commissioning 'people-based' services, yet it is recognised that there are a number of challenges. There is only partial insight into the full range of third-party spend; there is duplication in commissioned and grant provisioned services; there is inconsistency in commissioning and contract approaches; there is insufficient commissioning and contract resource; there is a lack of insight into whether service provision is commissioned based on need and the impact of services delivered; and there is limited benchmarking insight on costs and outcomes. The majority of commissioned spend delivers downstream interventions (crisis management and tertiary prevention) rather than more preventative, early interventions.

This proposal is for investment into a Strategic Commissioner and a Commissioning Programme Manager to work across ADDG (with a focus on Children's, Adults, Homelessness and Public Health commissioned services) to lead the development of a strategic commissioning approach and associated delivery plan for the council to realise the efficiency and embed a corporate approach to Strategic Commissioning. The financial ambition will be to achieve a minimum of 1-3% saving on the total annual commissioned spend, to realise between £2.4m and £7.2 of annual savings over the next 5 years.

To achieve the efficiency at scale and pace, there is an urgent need to consider and understand the current commissioning approaches in each of part of the organisation along with current contracts and financial pressures. In order to clearly define and agree commissioning intentions there is a need to align all contracts and commissioning cycles within the scope of people functions. Further work is required to collate all information into a single place, and for commissioners to determine early areas for integration of commissioning intentions.

Data analysis on the scale of the opportunity and potential quick wins is underway, with a workshop planned for the 19th September to test the analysis assumptions and refine the business case to secure investment for the full Commissioning Business Case.

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
• Efficiencies from contracts are not realised despite increased commissioning capacity.	Initial 'Proof of concept' work and strong programme management
• Identification of duplication in provision may lead to decommissioning that generates negative publicity	Development of a strong communication and engagement strategy
• Unable to recruit necessary skill set into a temporary contract	Advertise for the right role at the right grade – an AD level post is required to manage this and influence services.
• Current commissioned spend is reactive and does not prioritise early intervention and preventative interventions	A strategic commissioning approach is based on a robust commissioning cycle, with evidence based spend against needs and prioritising preventative approaches"
• Drive for financial savings leads to unintended negative consequences from decommissioning/budget reductions	Development of prevention strategy and clear commissioning review principles to ensure impacts of any changes are fully evaluated

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
• Data analysis (identifying scale of opportunity) including sense-check of specific commissioning areas identified with key service leads	Underway
• Develop approach for proof of concept (incl. all contracts with 25/26 end date, and those that have rolled over 24/25)	19th Sept
• Presented to SLT for agreement	1st October 24
• Recruitment of additional capacity	Nov 24
• Initial delivery plan developed	May 25
• Impact of savings	Sept 25

Financial Case

Savings deliverable						
Detail of saving	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	2029/30 £m	Total saving £m
Low ambition	*0.5*	*1*	*1*			***2.5***
High Ambition	*1*	*3*	*3*			***7***
TOTALS (maximum)	*1*	*3*	*3*			***7***

As an illustration, reducing annual average spend on the Council's top 20 suppliers by 1-3% would save £1.2-3.5m in future years. These numbers have been rounded down with an assumption of half-year effect in 2025/26 whilst the approach is implemented. See appendix for more details.

These amounts should be seen as an illustration as further validation of supplier spend and contracts data will be required as part of delivery.

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	Total £m
2 year fixed term appointment of a Strategic Commissioning Lead and Commissioning Programme Manager	0.06	0.24	0.18			0.48
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						Ambition is for 1:5 minimum over three years
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						Revenue
What will the payback period be in years?						2025/26

Demand Management: Homelessness – acceleration of demand & supply programme

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating
Deliverability

Directorate	**Place**
Project title	**Homelessness – acceleration of demand & supply programme**
Lead responsible officer	**Nicola Elsworth**
Equalities Impact Assessment required	**Full/Summary (delete as appropriate)**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Safe, Green & Supportive Communities**
Nature of Saving	**Efficiency/Transformation**

Summary of proposal

Tameside has more people who become homeless than the national average. We want to make sure that the Council uses every opportunity to prevent people who live in Tameside from becoming homeless, and to also make sure that, if a person or family does become homeless, they get the right support at the right time to help them get back on their feet. We think there are eight areas where we can deliver better outcomes for people, and where, if we get that right, the Council can make significant savings:

1. Providing more support for people when they are at risk of becoming homeless. This would be better for them and be less expensive than the Council providing support after they become homeless.
2. Looking at opportunities at the 'front door' to prevent people from becoming at risk of homelessness in the first place.
3. Make sure the service is legally robust and that our internal policies to allocate housing means that people who get housing are those who most need it.
4. Support to move people in temporary accommodation onto more permanent or appropriate housing
5. Procure additional homes to diversify TA stock, drive up quality and drive down costs
6. Develop a CBL model and mutually beneficial relationships with Registered Social Landlords to reduce how much we need to use Temporary Accommodation.
7. Use procurement of new IT software system to achieve operating efficiencies and significant savings without loss of quality.
8. Make sure that the Homelessness Service has the right structures to deliver the above.

In the longer term, it will also be important for the Council to make sure we have a proactive approach to ensuring that the right number and type of homes are built in the borough. Having the right commissioning approach in place is also critical for homelessness – this is being picked up in the Commissioning priority area.

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
There isn't enough resource in place to project manage and deliver the changes required	Service review underway. Bring in the right expertise and advice to drive forward specific workstreams that will add capacity to achieve savings and improvement
Lack of political support	Regular meetings with Portfolio Holder who has a good understanding of the issues and pressures Improvement suggestions are lower risk for members to support
Invest to save business cases do not demonstrate a positive impact and cannot be supported	Savings opportunities identified have been selected on the basis it is clear a positive outcome can be achieved. Robust businesses cases will be prepared.
RPs do not want to sign up to a CBL system	Jigsaw (largest RP and stock transfer) have confirmed their support for CBL. This will help to convince other RPs to sign up

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
Neil Morland report on homelessness developed	End-September 2024
Savings workstreams identified	End September 2024
Support required on savings workstreams identified	Early October 2024
Building Neil's recommendations into the MTFS	October 2024
Financial approval to provide additional investment to support delivery of workstreams confirmed	October 2024
Workstreams underway	End October onwards
Further milestones to be added	

Financial Case

Work is underway to develop more detailed financial modelling that will enable the identification of savings. Based on the IMPOWER index, if Tameside were to achieve the same value for money in housing and homelessness as its top 75th percentile of neighbours, the cumulative annual savings profile would be:

Y1	Y2	Y3
£181,303	£604,344	£1,208,687

Savings deliverable						
Detail of saving	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	2029/30 £m	Total saving £m
1. Providing more support for people when they are at risk of becoming homeless						
2. Front door prevention						
3. Robust and universally applied allocations policy						
4. Temporary accommodation 'move on'						
5. Procure additional homes to diversify TA stock						
6. CBL model and building relationships with Registered Social Landlords to reduce Temporary Accommodation						
7. AdviceAid						
8. Homelessness Service structure						
TOTALS						

Work underway with Finance to model savings profile

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	Total £m
Overarching project management support						
1. Targeted preventative support [DESCRIPTION]						
2. Front door prevention [DESCRIPTION]						
3. Robust and universally applied allocations policy [DESCRIPTION]						
4. Four temporary posts focussed on 'move ons'						
5. Procure additional homes to diversify TA stock [DESCRIPTION]						
6. CBL model and building relationships with Registered Social Landlords to reduce Temporary Accommodation [DESCRIPTION]						
7. AdviceAid system – tool and implementation						
8. Homelessness Service structure [DESCRIPTION]						
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						
What will the payback period be in years?						

Work underway with Finance to model investment profile

Tameside
Metropolitan Borough

Council Operating Model

Proposal Overview

RAG Rating
Deliverability

Directorate	**Chief Executive's**
Project title	**Council Operating Model**
Lead responsible officer	**Tracy Brennand**
Equalities Impact Assessment required	**Full**
Alignment to Corporate Plan	**Financially sustainable public services**
Nature of Saving	**Efficiency/Transformation**

Summary of proposal

The Council needs to make sure that it has the right people, processes and systems to deliver modern, value for money services. This proposal will focus on quick wins to move forward the Council's structure, while laying the building blocks for what our workforce needs to look like in the coming years.

We will do this by focussing on key areas that are likely to release substantial savings:

1. Developing an '**establishment**' of the Council's employees. This is an important first step to enable the other projects in this proposal.
2. Proactive **management of policies**, including sickness absence, agency expenses and overtime.
3. Getting more permanent staff in place to stabilise our services, while **reducing expensive agency** spend. We will focus first on Children's Social Care to do this.
4. Identifying where there might be **duplication** across Council services, and it might be more effective to bring services together.
5. Looking at the '**spans and layers**' across the Council, to make sure that the most efficient numbers of employees and management structures are in place. This includes making sure that the right leadership capacity and skillsets are in place to lead the big changes the Council needs to make.

Some of our longer-term ambitions are to:

1. Clarify key corporate processes to improve compliance and improve efficiency.
2. Enhance IT functionality and employees' digital skills.
3. Develop our approach to culture change and values.

Key Risks and mitigations

Key Risks	Mitigating Actions
Establishment data is not able to be developed at the pace required to deliver transformation	Early identification of resource required, and regular discussions with SLT to ensure progress
Instability within service areas (e.g. Children's Social Care) impacts TMBC's ability to recruit and retain permanent staff and reduce agency spend	Close work with services to support recruitment and retention
Lack of understanding amongst staff as to why these changes are needed, which could impact morale	Clear communications will be needed to explain the reasoning behind decisions that directly or indirectly affect staff, including the benefits of the new approach

Headline Project timelines

Milestone	Date
Deep dive into existing HR and Finance data	w/c 30 September
Workshop with HR, Finance and Systems to identify objectives and next steps to gain overarching view of TMBC workforce	w/c 30 September
Workshop with Children's as the 'pioneers'	4 October
Follow-up session to update on Children's implementation plan and application of learning to future phases/service areas	w/c 7 October
Development of individual-level establishment data	November 2024
Analysis of staffing structure to identify duplication of efforts	November 2024
Further milestones to be added	

Financial Case

Further work is needed to define the in-year and longer-term savings potential of these proposals, as well as to understand how inflationary/salary increases would impact the below figures.

Savings deliverable						
Detail of saving	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	2029/30 £m	Total saving £m
Low ambition (1% annual reduction in 24/25 budgeted employee spend)	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	-	4.8
High ambition (2% annual reduction in 24/25 budgeted employee spend)	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	-	**9.6**

Investment required						
Detail of investment required	2024/25 £m	2025/26 £m	2026/27 £m	2027/28 £m	2028/29 £m	Total £m
1. Developing an 'establishment' of the Council's employees.						
2. Proactive management of policies						
3. Getting more permanent staff in place to stabilise our services, while reducing expensive agency spend.						
4. Identifying where there might be duplication across Council services						
5. Looking at the 'spans and layers' across the Council						
Return on investment (total savings value divided by total investment required)						
Is the investment required Capital or Revenue?						
What will the payback period be in years?						

To be defined