



## Executive Director/Director Non-Key Executive Decision Report

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Jane Beatson,  
Commissioning Officer, SCART

**Tel:** 0114 2053421

---

**Report to:** John Macilwraith – Executive Director (People Services)

**Date of Decision:** 19/02/2020

**Subject:** Recommission ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support

Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? Children, Young People and Families

Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Children, Young People & Family Support

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes  No

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? **750**

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes  No

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

*“The (**report/appendix**) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (**insert relevant paragraph number**) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”*

### **Purpose of Report:**

Request approval to recommission the ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support which ends in March 2020.

**Recommendations:**

That the Executive Director (People Services) delegate to the Director of Commissioning Inclusion & Learning authority to;

1. approve a procurement exercise to recommission the ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support for a further three years with an updated specification and KPI's at the same level of funding of £63,500 per year.
2. exercise their delegated authority in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Head of Procurement & Supply Chain to determine the appropriate procurement strategy for the provision for an updated ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support service.
3. exercise their delegated authority in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Head of Procurement & Supply Chain to award the contract for the ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support Service in accordance with the procurement strategy. The award of the contract will follow a procurement exercise and conform to Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSOs).

**Background Papers:**

*(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)*

Contract Review: ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support 2 October 2019

<b>Lead Officer to complete:-</b>	
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.
	Finance: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> <b>Paul Jeffries</b>
	Legal: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> <b>David Cutting</b>
	Equalities: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> <b>Bashir Khan</b>
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Jane Beatson
	<b>Job Title:</b> Commissioning Officer
<b>Date:</b> 21/02/2020	

## **1. PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 This report seeks approval for the recommissioning of the ADHD Parenting Programme and Schools Support for a further three years with an updated specification and KPI's at the same level of funding of £63,500 per year.
- 1.2 The current Provider has delivered this service for the past four years. This service provided involves city-wide help and support for families with children who have a diagnosis of ADHD by way of telephone advice, home visits and running six "Managing ADHD Groups" (MAG) each year.
- 1.3 The contract is due to end in March 2020 and to continue the service a tender must be completed. This service is not a statutory duty.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 The ADHD Service utilises an inclusive learning approach to help parents support their children in schools by addressing concerns about ADHD so that parents and schools gain a better understanding of how the young person affected by ADHD is reacting and how they can be supported to assist with any additional needs.
- 2.2 This ADHD service is unique in that the programmes are co-delivered with ADHD Nurses from Ryegate thereby offering both clinical and medication specification elements as well as knowledge and understanding of ADHD to parents.
- 2.3 A gap in service was identified by the current provider in 2018 around the support offered to schools regarding education and information about the topic of ADHD. As a result the provider now delivers training to staff in schools, consultation with schools on anonymous cases, support to parents in school meetings and Guest speakers with ADHD presenting to schools on the subject. This all helps to reduce the barriers to inclusive learning for young people.
- 2.4 The delivery by the current provider has consistently out-performed the targets set in the original contract. The home visits and parent support work in preparation for those that do attend a MAG ensure that there is an 80 % retention rate of parents on the programmes.
- 2.5 This work reduces inequalities for Families living with ADHD and the support they receive aims to prevent children dropping out of education and requiring further and more expensive intervention work later in life. The decision to continue with this ADHD Service will allow these children and their families a more inclusive educational experience.

### **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 There is no statutory requirement for consultation nor does any element in this re-procurement trigger a requirement for consultation with regard to the ongoing provision of the Service.

### **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

#### **4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

Decisions need to take into account the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 which identifies the need to:

- 4.1.1
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
  - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
  - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- 4.1.2 The Equality Act 2010 identifies the following groups as a protected characteristic: age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion and belief; sex and sexual orientation.
- 4.1.3 An EIA has been carried and highlights that This service provides city-wide help and support for families with children who have a diagnosis of ADHD by providing telephone advice, home visits and Managing ADHD Groups (MAG). This work reduces inequalities for Families living with ADHD and the support they receive aims to prevent children dropping out of education and requiring further and more expensive intervention work later in life. The decision to continue with this ADHD Service will allow these children and their families a more inclusive educational experience.

#### **4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications**

- 4.2.1 The contract value is £63,500 per year for three years which equates to £190,500 for the term of the contract. Based on parents attending programmes alone the cost of a 1 session place on a MAG is £542 per person (£68 per person per session). This does not include the home visits undertaken. Sufficient budget is in place within the Citywide Contracts budget.

#### **4.3 Legal Implications**

- 4.3.1 The Council does not have a specific statutory duty to maintain this Service, however, power to proceed is provided through the General Power of Competence in Part 1 of Localism Act 2011. It also has the power to deliver the project, under s.111 of the Local Government Act 1972.

4.3.2 The Services that are the subject of this Report are social care services covered by the “light touch” regime set out in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. However, the value of the proposed contract is below the threshold set out in those Regulations, although the Council does have a duty to act in accordance with its general European Treaty principles of transparency and fairness during procurement.

4.3.3 There are no further legal implications arising directly from this report or the proposed contract.

#### 4.4 Other Implications

4.4.1 Any TUPE implications should only affect the incumbent existing and any new Provider. This dynamic shall be taken into consideration through the re-procurement process, however, there are no TUPE implications for the Council other than ensuring that the Provider’s comply with their obligations.

4.4.2 All current Service Providers are advised to take their own legal advice on this dynamic and will be required to provide information on the Workers they believe are eligible for TUPE in the event they are unsuccessful in continuing to provide the service. This information will be made available to prospective Tenderers to allow them to accurately price their tender submission.

### **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

5.1 Not to re-commission the course. This proposal was rejected because this contract and the service it provides are unique. The outcomes it achieves are proven and it has a good reputation with professionals and the public alike. It is also specific to this Service Provider and the developments they have made with clinicians at Ryegate. It would be difficult to replicate this elsewhere.

5.2 The delivery has been flexible during the past 2 years and reacted to issues and themes that have arisen with the parents it already supports, and developing to support the inclusion and learning agenda around Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in The Children’s Inclusion and Learning Service (CILS).

### **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 This contract and the service it provides are unique. The outcomes it achieves are proven and it has a good reputation with professionals and the public alike. It is also specific to the current Service Provider and the developments they have made with clinicians at Ryegate. It would be difficult to replicate this elsewhere.

6.2 Accordingly, in order to continue with the provision of this Service there is a need to approve a tender to re-commission the ADHD Parenting

Programme and Schools Support for a further three years with an updated specification and KPI's at the same level of funding of £63,500 per year.