

Report

Report to:	Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee
Date of Meeting:	9 December 2019
Report by:	Chair of Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group

Subject:	Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Cost Savings from the Promoting Positive Behaviour Programme
----------	---

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ inform the Joint Committee of the cost savings realised by the Clyde Valley Councils through using the Promoting Positive Behaviour (PPB) Programme in comparison to previous programmes

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Joint Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that it be noted that cost savings of delivery based on a comparison of provision before and after the introduction of PPB amount to £361,348 for the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019;
- (2) that similar savings can be demonstrated each year when comparing with the costs of purchasing alternative training models from external providers;
- (3) that further cost savings can be realised through efficient management of course numbers, exchange of course scheduling information and shared course delivery to mixed groups from different Councils; and
- (4) that the PPB programme has been successful in terms of the evaluation of its primary outcomes while simultaneously making significant cost savings across all eight participating Councils.

3. Background

- 3.1. As was originally reported in a previous paper to the Joint Committee (10 June 2013), the PPB Programme was developed and implemented following a request from the Health and Social Care Collaborative Group representing the eight founding Clyde Valley Councils.
- 3.2. At the time, a business case was put forward to the Collaborative to develop a national standard for behaviour management. This was the beginnings of the project which eventually yielded the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) accredited Professional Award in Promoting Positive Behaviour and, thereafter, one of the Clyde Valley Learning and Development Group's flagship programmes, Promoting Positive Behaviour.

- 3.3. The primary motive for introducing a Clyde Valley model was to develop a consistent approach to the subject matter, based on best practice and which could be sustainably delivered from within the Group's combined resources.
- 3.4. Nonetheless it was implicit in the decision to proceed that any new programme being adopted would be cost neutral as a minimum, compared to previous models. Some preliminary calculations were carried out which suggested that such a development could meet this goal, however, it was difficult to accurately assess demand and potential uptake at this stage.
- 3.5. The recent project to commission an independent evaluation of the PPB programme, did not include the comparison of costs within scope, however, the data gathered through the exercise presented an opportunity to carry out some analysis.

4. Identification of Data for Analysis

- 4.1. During the evaluation project it was agreed that the analysis should be focused on a fixed time period of one year. The dates selected were 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019.
- 4.2. This period was chosen as it represents a cycle where all eight of the Clyde Valley Councils from the founding members were now actively using the various PPB programmes. The selection of a year's data would allow future comparisons of evaluation outcomes and costs.
- 4.3. The analysis is therefore based on the figure of 2,014 participants who have been trained in one of the PPB programmes during this period.

5. Variables Affecting Costs

- 5.1. The analysis of the data involved producing a model which provided indicative costs for the delivery of the training programmes. As an internally delivered programme, there are no external costs incurred to training providers. The basis of the analysis therefore is staff time to attend and deliver the combined suite of PPB training events.
- 5.2. The calculated costs are then compared with theoretical costs which would have been incurred had PPB not been in place. The assumption being that each Council would have continued to use the previous models, purchased externally.
- 5.3. To create a meaningful calculation several fixed parameters were used along with a selection of assumptions and variables.
- 5.4. The fixed parameters were:-
 - ◆ Number of days required to deliver each PPB course (i.e. train the trainer, core adult, core children, refresh cycle for all three categories)
 - ◆ Number of days required to deliver each alternative model (pre-PPB)
 - ◆ Annual registration fee requirement from one of the pre-PPB providers
 - ◆ Frequency of refresh cycle (set by PPB Strategic Governance Group)
 - ◆ Frequency of refresh cycle (set by each specific external training provider)
 - ◆ Number of participants to be trained
 - ◆ One trained trainer and one trained practitioner required per course (as per agreed governance)
 - ◆ No cross council training permitted pre-PPB (single agency only)

5.5. The assumptions and variables were:-

- ◆ Daily cost per participant based on original business case (2011) and conservative daily rate
- ◆ Daily cost per trainer and training practitioner estimated (conservative daily rate)
- ◆ Inflation multiplier factor of 1.26 to calculate current rates based on same rationale
- ◆ Average number of participants on courses pre-PPB (this variable has a direct bearing on the number of courses required)
- ◆ Average number of participants on PPB courses (as above)
- ◆ Cross council training can be included to accommodate small numbers or to fill course capacity
- ◆ With one exception, the train the trainer model is assumed for pre-PPB courses (for this exception the external training costs are included)
- ◆ The costs of backfilling posts for participants attending training (service cover), may be regarded as an additional cost, but has not been included in this model

6. Sensitivity and Accuracy of Calculations

- 6.1. Both the fixed parameters and the variables based on assumptions have a bearing on the final figures. For example, prior to the establishment of PPB, the inability to train staff from a different authority (as dictated by the training provider), meant that each Council was required to make an autonomous decision about running a course to meet the refresh cycle. This frequently resulted in courses running with two or three participants.
- 6.2. The alternative outcome would be that the Council concerned would fail to meet the non-negotiable refresh cycle also defined by the training provider.
- 6.3. One of the driving forces behind initiating this model was a recognition that the unit costs of delivery for each course were often dictated by the rules of the provider (as opposed to Clyde Valley Councils). As a result courses were often run at higher unit costs.
- 6.4. For the purposes of this exercise, the average number of participants attending has been set at six per course for pre-PPB course providers, based on previous data and the average number attending PPB courses has been set at ten per course.
- 6.5. The choice of these values illustrates that there is scope for the PPB courses to be run even more economically if class sizes were consistently run to accommodate 14 learners (the agreed maximum number per class).

7. Cost Comparisons

- 7.1. The results shown by the model based on the above factors for the year from 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 is summarised below:-

No of courses required pre-PPB (Children)	235	No of PPB courses required (Children)	77
No of courses required Pre PPB (Adults)	216	No of PPB courses required (Adults)	126
Costs of delivery pre-PPB (adults and Children)	£812,100	Costs of PPB delivery	£450,752
Overall cost savings in delivery			£361,348

- 7.2. Altering the class sizes for training before PPB and for PPB now has a significant influence on the costs of delivery. By way of a comparison, should the class sizes be set to the pre-PPB level (six per class), the savings would be as follows:-

No of courses required pre-PPB (Children)	235	No of PPB courses required (Children)	128
No of courses required Pre PPB (Adults)	216	No of PPB courses required (Adults)	209
Costs of delivery pre-PPB (adults and Children)	£812,100	Costs of PPB delivery	£506,684
Overall cost savings in delivery			£305,416

- 7.3. Similarly, if the class sizes before PPB had been the same as the current actual PPB level (ten per class), the savings would have been as follows:-

No of courses required pre-PPB (Children)	146	No of PPB courses required (Children)	77
No of courses required Pre PPB (Adults)	131	No of PPB courses required (Adults)	126
Costs of delivery pre-PPB (adults and Children)	£763,837	Costs of PPB delivery	£450,752
Overall cost savings in delivery			£313,084

- 7.4. In summary, the PPB programme makes savings regardless of the class sizes attending.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1. The introduction of PPB across the eight founder Clyde Valley Councils during the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 has been calculated to have saved £361,348 in delivery costs.

- 8.2. Although the data is not currently available, it is clear that this figure would increase significantly if service cover costs were also factored into the calculation.
- 8.3. Should the number of participants in each PPB programme be maximised for each class (14 attending) the unit costs will be reduced. Similarly, if the daily costed rate for participants, practitioners and trainers increases, there will be a further rise in cost savings.

9. Employee Implications

- 9.1. The continued commitment of all Clyde Valley Councils to provide trainers and practitioners to deliver PPB across the partnership remains critical to the ongoing success of the programme. It will be necessary for the Clyde Valley Councils to identify suitable staff to be trained as Principal and Lead PPB Trainers, in order to secure the future of the programme

10. Financial Implications

- 10.1. By maximising class sizes consistently through sharing course information across the partnership, the unit costs of delivery will be reduced further with the knock on effect of increasing the cost savings overall.

11. Other Implications (Including Environmental and Risk Issues)

- 11.1. No specific risks have been identified beyond maintaining the commitment and application of members of the Group.
- 11.2. The sustainability of the programme is contingent on the continuation of the Clyde Valley Learning and Development Group (CVLDG) and the ongoing commitment of its members.

12. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements

- 12.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore no impact assessment is required.
- 12.2. Data used in this report was provided by all participating Councils. The cost comparison model was consulted on and shared with members of the Social Care Group prior to completion.

Gill Bhatti

Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group

12 November 2019

Previous References

- ◆ 10 June 2013 - Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project - Promoting Positive Behaviour
- ◆ 10 December 2018 - Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project – Update on Social Care Group Projects

List of Background Papers

- ◆ Clyde Valley Learning and Development Joint Committee Minute of Agreement

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Gill Bhatti, Chair, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Project Steering Group

Ext: 5604 (Tel: 01698 455604)

E-mail: gill.bhatti@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Gerry Farrell, Project Manager, Clyde Valley Learning and Development Group

Ext: 4240 (Tel: 01698 454240)

E-mail: gerry.farrell@southlanarkshire.gov.uk