



**NOTTINGHAM  
CHILDREN'S  
PARTNERSHIP**

PROUD OF NOTTINGHAM'S CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE

<b>Title of paper:</b>	<b><i>Coalition Government: Impact Update no 2</i></b>	
<b>Report to:</b>	Children's Partnership Board	
<b>Date:</b>	13 October 2010	
<b>Director(s)/Corporate Director(s):</b>	Candida Brudenell	<b>Wards Affected:</b> All
<b>Contact Officer(s) and contact details:</b>	Colin Monckton, Head of Insight and Improvement, Children and Families, Nottingham City Council  Geoff Jenkins, Policy and Planning Manager, Children and Families, Nottingham City Council	
<b>Other officers who have provided input:</b>		
<b>Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) Strategic Objective(s) :</b>		
1. <b>Safeguarding and Early Intervention</b> - Children, young people and families will benefit from early and effective support and protection to empower them to overcome difficulties		✓
2. <b>Strong families</b> - More families will be strong and healthy, providing an enjoyable and safe place for children to grow up		✓
3. <b>Healthy and positive children and young people</b> - Children and young people will be healthier, fitter, more emotionally resilient and better able to make mature decisions		✓
4. <b>Achievement</b> - All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning		✓
5. <b>Economic well-being</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced		✓
<b>Summary of issues (including benefits to customers/service users):</b>		
The attachment provides the most recent information on government announcements and the anticipated impact on the CYPP 2010 -14. It ensures that the Board is briefed on the key changes to Government policy as they affect the strategic and operational objectives of the CYPP 2010 – 14.		
<b>Recommendations:</b>		
<b>This report is for information.</b>		

## 1. TITLE OF REPORT: *Coalition Government: Impact Update no 2*

### 2. REASON:

The SOG and CPB have requested regular updates on Government policy and expenditure announcements. The update report enables CPB and SOG members to have an overview of the impact on partnership working and the delivery of the CYPP.

### 3. SUMMARY:

Appendix 1 provides information on government announcements and the anticipated impact on the CYPP 2010 -14. Additions to the impact grid since June are highlighted in red.

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS:

This report is for information.

### 5. BACKGROUND

All Additions to the CYPP impact grid (appendix 1) since the last update are in red text. The main entry is under 'ending childhood poverty (operational objective 15)

While much remains to be revealed, budget announcements on welfare benefit reform are being assessed for impact in Nottingham. The known impact on families with children is summarised in appendix 1 under operational objective 15 (ending child poverty)

Other changes announced or implemented since the last update include:

- Behaviour Partnerships These were due to take legal effect on the 1 September 2010 but commencement has been revoked by SI 2010/1891. Partnerships had to promote good behaviour and reduce persistent absence. Each partnership was required to report to their relevant Children's Trust Board for monitoring and accountability. There was an explicit assumption in the legislation that partnerships should cover schools in a particular area and should not be non-contiguous (as several groups of Academies are).
- Children's trust and the CYPP The withdrawal of Children's Trusts the removal of the duty on schools to co-operate with the local authority and other bodies to promote the well-being of children, and the reversion of the CYPP from statutory plan to voluntary local arrangement is due to pass into law in the autumn. An Explanatory Memorandum to the regulations states that "local areas will be informed that they are no longer required to produce a plan through a communications strategy that is fully embedded in wider messages about reducing bureaucracy" It is understood that there will be a 5-page leaflet in the Autumn explaining these changes

- The Ian Kennedy Report , Sir Ian Kennedy was asked by the previous government to review health and wellbeing services for children and young people. His report raises a number of concerns about cross-agency co-operation, the sharing of information, the role of GPs and the culture of the NHS which creates obstacles to a holistic and proactive approach to the healthy and safe development and the welfare of children and young people. In a series of recommendations, Sir Ian makes proposals for local partnerships and children's and young people's plans to become the vehicle for integrated working, with a strong emphasis on the active involvement of children and young people.
- DfE Explanatory Note *Achieving Excellence and Equality for Children*  
This was released last month - in part as a response to the Kennedy Report.. Not surprisingly, the recommendations for local partnerships and the role of the CYPP in ensuring improved inter-agency collaboration are rejected. It does little to address his particular concerns about GPs' lack of pediatric expertise, likely to be a significant issue in relation to the proposed central role of GP commissioning. The note also summarises the benefits for children and young people foreshadowed in the Health White Paper. In particular, it comments that local and national arrangements for HealthWatch that would mean that children and young people's voices "are fed into local commissioning" and that the internet and evidence-based tools for engagements will be used to gather the views of children, young people and their parents, drawing on the expertise of local authorities
- National Audit Office: Report on the Performance of This report provides an overview of the programme to date, including the implications of the planned expansion. The report finds that most academies are achieving increases in academic attainment for their pupils compared to their predecessor schools, and that GCSE performance is improving faster than in maintained schools with a similar intake. It observes that there has been a reduction in the number of academy pupils eligible for free school meals, though it remains over twice the national average, and that the performance of disadvantaged groups has improved over time – but that the gap between disadvantaged pupils and others has grown wider in academies than in comparable maintained schools.
- The report notes the positive achievements of the academies programme (for example increasing attendance rates. but raises a number of concerns, particularly in the context of the planned major expansion These concerns include:
  - An uneven pattern of collaboration with maintained schools and local 14-19 consortia.
  - Financial management and governance arrangements that do not comply with requirements may raise the level of financial risk as the programme is rolled out..

## 6. RISKS:

If regular updates are not produced, there is a risk that CPB and SOG members will not have an opportunity to form a view on the impact of changes across the whole field of partnership activity.

## 7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

None specific to this report..

## 8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Governance, service delivery and spend will need to change as new legislation and statutory guidance comes into effect.

## 9. CLIENT GROUP:

All vulnerable groups are potentially affected by potential loss of services following cutbacks.

## 3. IMPACT ON EQUALITIES ISSUES

Neutral at this stage. But specific proposals may affect vulnerable children and young people disproportionately and reports to the Board would benefit from equalities screening reports and impact assessments as specific proposals are considered.

## 4. OUTCOMES AND PRIORITIES AFFECTED

All priorities targets and the objectives set in the Children and Young People's Plan will be affected by budget constraints and new policy directions. The next milestone will be the autumn expenditure review (20<sup>th</sup> October).

## 5. CONTACT DETAILS

Candida Brudenell  
Director, Children's Trust  
Transition Programme  
Children & Families

[candida.brudenell@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:candida.brudenell@nottinghamcity.gov.uk).

Tel: 0115 915 0782

Geoff Jenkins  
Manager  
Policy & Planning  
Children & Families

[geoff.jenkiins@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:geoff.jenkiins@nottinghamcity.gov.uk).

Tel: 0115 915 7841

# CYPP Impact Assessment General Points (Updated to October 2010) – Appendix 1

- 1) **Partnership: Trust Arrangements and the CYPP.** The Department for Education has confirmed that the statutory underpinning of the Trust and the CYPP will be withdrawn in the autumn.
- 2) **Academisation impacts:** The increase in the number of Academies will increase the importance of the Partnership and change the nature of its role. It will become more important to ensure that the CYPP is reflected in all plans and that Academies are fully represented on the Partnership Board. Free schools are also a new element in the education provider firmament.
- 3) **Schools' finances:** There will be an impact through the reduction of certain grants for example IT based grants and budget pressures.
- 4) **Influencing role:** The Local Authority will have a fundamentally different role to play, being focused on strategic influence.
- 5) **Traded services:** a number of functions, including centralised HR and payroll for example are traded services which on academisation may have reduced demand. All traded services will need to assess demand and understand fully their break even points. There is a benefit that traded services may need to align better to meet the needs of schools.
- 6) **GP Representation:** GP consortia will have a more prominent role in commissioning health services for their practice areas and will need to be effectively represented on the Board.
- 7) **Police Impact:** The Government focus on licensing and alcohol is welcome but the effect of the major cutback in resources will be substantial – the definition of frontline (as in protecting frontline resources) is unclear.
- 8) **VCS Impact:** The Voluntary and Community sector have a key role in the 'Big Society' but the focus is on individuals and volunteering; capacity of the 'Government funded' VCS activity will, as in other sectors, be reduced by the progressive reduction in grant funded programmes.
- 9) **Sector led improvement from agencies** such as Training and Development Agency, Qualifications Development Agency, NCSL and Children's Workforce Development Council have been subjected to cutbacks which reduces the capacity to provide for sector led workforce development.
- 10) **Engagement** will be more important to undertake rigorously as part of the locality focus.
- 11) There is absence of comment on partnerships – the Partnership will need to demonstrate the local commitment to partnership and the agreed principles.
- 12) **Place Based Area Budgets (formerly known as Total Place):** Although there is no Government commitment to this approach, there is vigorous lobbying taking place (from the Local Government Association etc) to import the key principles into Local Based Area Budgets.

Many aspects not clear until CSR is announced in October.

## 2010-11 Announced Budget Savings

### Department for Education - £670M

#### Headlines

1. The department spokesman confirmed that reducing bureaucracy in 14 to 19 curriculum and qualifications, by scaling back activities such as marketing, would save a further £60m.
2. Up to £40m will be saved by cutting red tape on the City Challenge scheme to raise attainment in schools and the administrative functions associated with Education Maintenance Allowances (EMA).
3. The Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA), budget will be cut by £20m, £13m of which come from getting rid of a development fund, the remainder of which is a surplus of cash that is yet to be allocated to schools and colleges.
4. The department confirmed that the YPLA would be left with a contingency budget despite the cuts.
5. More savings will be achieved by ending the centralised monitoring and evaluation of initiatives such as one-to-one tuition.

#### In addition:

The Government has announced that it will re-examine all spending approvals made since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010 and all pilot schemes, to ensure they are consistent with the priorities of the new Government. Only those judged to represent value for money may go ahead. This may include ending any pilot schemes that would be too costly to implement. The Government has since withdrawn the Free Schools Meals Pilot and the assisted nursery places pilot.

## The Children and Young People's Plan 2010 – 2014: Coalition Government Impact Assessment – Oct 2010

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>1. Safeguarding and Early Intervention</b> Children, young people and families will benefit from early and effective support and protection to empower them to overcome difficulties.</p>	<p><b>(1) Stronger safeguarding</b> Improving safeguarding across all agencies, to keep children and young people safe from physical, emotional and sexual abuse, neglect, and accidental injury.</p>	<p>CA1: Publish serious case reviews, with identifying details removed.</p> <p>CA2: Review the criminal records and vetting and barring regime and scale it back to 'common sense' levels.</p> <p><u>P1: Safeguarding Review:</u> Prof Eileen Munro, from the London School of Economics, will examine ways of cutting bureaucracy to give social workers more time with children. She will also consider ways of improving links between social workers and other agencies like the police.</p>	<p>Danger here is of tabloid fuelled witch hunts which would damage the reputation and self esteem of child protection services. Partnership (and the actions of individual partners) will be under much greater scrutiny. Staff referred to in SCRs may need a high level of support following this type of exposure.</p> <p>Existing scheme is supposed to be proportionate, balanced and effective – hard to gauge what difference this Coalition commitment will make.</p> <p>The recommendations (expected in the autumn) could require a complete overhaul of statutory returns and social workers social care data reporting.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>1. Safeguarding and Early Intervention (con.)</b> Children, young people and families will benefit from early and effective support and protection to empower them to overcome difficulties.</p>	<p><b>(1) Stronger safeguarding (con.)</b> - Improving safeguarding across all agencies, to keep children and young people safe from physical, emotional and sexual abuse, neglect, and accidental injury.</p>	<p>Academisation (see below)</p>	<p>Experience suggests it is more difficult to affect changes in non-maintained schools and to steer the safeguarding agenda – new approaches may be needed to assure safeguarding in Academies – some of which may consider buying in their own service.</p>
	<p><b>(2) Shifting resources to early intervention and prevention</b> – Achieving a growing shift of mainstream resources towards early intervention and prevention to ensure that families in challenging circumstances are identified early.</p>	<p>CA3: Investigate a new approach to helping families with multiple problems.</p>	<p>Still no agreed Government definition of early intervention but seems to be supporting the learning from Family Intervention Projects (FIPs).</p>
	<p><b>(3) Reducing infant mortality</b></p>		



STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>2. Strong families</b> More families will be strong and healthy, providing an enjoyable and safe place for children to grow up.</p>	<p><b>(4) Improving parenting support</b> - Improving support for parents and carers, particularly younger.</p>	<p>CA4: Continue support for provision of free nursery care for pre-school children / diverse range of providers / improve gender balance in the early year's workforce.</p> <p>CA5: Take Sure Start back to its 'original purpose' of early intervention, increase its focus on the neediest families, better involve organisations with a track record of supporting families; and investigate ways of ensuring that providers are paid in part by the results they achieve.</p> <p>CA6: Refocus funding from Sure Start peripatetic outreach services, and from the Department of Health budget, to pay for 4,200 extra Sure Start health visitors.</p>	<p>Sounds positive – but the devil is in the detail. Universal entitlement to 15 hour's childcare for all 3 and 4 year olds comes into effect in Sept. 2010. The City currently benefits from a targeted Pilot programme to provide 15 hours free childcare a week for 2 year olds (£600K in 2009-10) .</p> <p>Funding for the pilots has been reduced and a more limited programme is being rolled out nationally. Funding cut takes effect from September 2010: impact is likely to be that 600 -800 eligible children (all families on benefits) will be reduced to approx. 300 children per year.</p> <p>Sure Start funding is guaranteed but the coalition want a shift to targeted service provision just as Nottingham is completing its universal offer through 18 Children's Centres. The withdrawal of outreach services seems to conflict with the enthusiasm for targeted provision as it is the hardest to reach families that will be hit.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>2. Strong families (con.)</b> More families will be strong and healthy, providing an enjoyable and safe place for children to grow up</p>	<p><b>(4) Improving parenting support (con.)</b> - Improving support for parents and carers, particularly younger</p>	<p>CA7: Encourage shared parenting from the earliest stages of pregnancy – including the promotion of a system of flexible parental leave.</p> <p>CA8: Put funding for relationship support on a stable, long-term footing, and make sure that couples are given greater encouragement to use existing relationship support.</p> <p>CA9: Conduct a comprehensive review of family law in order to increase the use of mediation when couples do break up, and to look at how best to provide greater access rights to non-resident parents and grandparents.</p> <p>CA 10: End the detention of children for immigration purposes.</p>	<p>Positive for family development and recognising the role of fathers. Organisations with flexible working arrangements should not find this a problem – however, smaller service providers may be less well placed to provide a flexible approach.</p> <p>CA8 and CA9 are seeking less confrontational solutions when relationships are in trouble. This may strengthen the role of the extended family in providing care. To the extent that couples may be helped to resolve difficulties and stay together, this may have a positive impact on the number of children in care. This will be occurring where applications for refugee status by asylum-seekers have been rejected and the whole family is detained pending extradition. Numbers in Nottingham would be small – there may be a question of temporary care while the future of the family is resolved.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>2. Strong families (con.)</b> More families will be strong and healthy, providing an enjoyable and safe place for children to grow up.</p>	<p><b>5) Supporting children with learning difficulties and disabilities</b> – Providing better co-ordinated care for children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, emotional and behavioural difficulties.</p>	<p>CA11: The belief that the most vulnerable children deserve the very highest quality of care, improve diagnostic assessment for school children, prevent the unnecessary closure of special schools, and remove the bias towards inclusion.</p> <p><u>The Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA)</u>, budget will be cut by £20m, £13m of which will come from getting rid of a development fund, which has been used to support learners with learning difficulties and disabilities</p>	<p>We have developed our special schools – impact low</p> <p>Uncertain impact. The City Council's current provision of special schools has been consolidated through BSF and is unlikely to change.</p> <p>Increased pressure on the budget for post 16 learners with learning difficulties / disabilities that is due to transfer from YPLA to Local Authorities in 2012.</p>
	<p><b>(6) Improving corporate parenting</b> – Improving the quality of life and outcomes for children living in care and preparing for independent living.</p>	<p>The Academies Bill proposes to remove the obligation on Academies to have a designated teacher for children in care</p>	<p>Children in care are one of the most vulnerable of all groups to educational under-performance.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>3. Healthy and positive children and young people - Children and young people will be healthier, fitter, more emotionally resilient and better able to make mature decisions.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Healthcare White Paper: Equity and Excellence/ Liberating the NHS</u></b>  <b><u>Key Proposals</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giving statutory responsibility for commissioning budgets to consortia of GP practices, working in partnership with local communities and local authorities to commission the majority of local healthcare services.</li> <li>• Setting up an NHS Commissioning Board to support GP consortia, set commissioning guidelines, commissioning certain services which cannot be handled by GP consortia and allocating and account for NHS resources.</li> <li>• Changing the role of the Secretary of State to include setting a formal mandate for the NHS Commissioning Board.</li> <li>• Abolishing PCTs by 2013.</li> <li>• <b>Appointing local Directors of Public Health, to be employed by local authorities, by jointly appointed with the Public Health Service.</b></li> <li>• <b>The public health budget will be ring-fenced and will be allocated to reflect the health needs of different local populations, with a new health premium designed to improve population-wide health and reduce health inequalities.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Secretary of State, through the Public Health Service, will set local authorities national objectives for improving the health of their local population. It will be for local authorities to determine how best to secure these objectives.</b></li> <li>• <b>Establishing new statutory arrangements with local authorities to promote local wellbeing through ‘health and wellbeing boards’ or within existing partnerships. They will take on the function of commissioning local NHS services, social care and health improvements.</b></li> <li>• <b>Giving local authorities new functions to include promoting integration and partnership working between all healthcare providers and other local services, leading joint strategic needs assessments and building partnerships for service changes and priorities.</b></li> <li>• Creation of a new independent consumer champion called HealthWatch England within the Quality Care Commission. Local authorities will be able to commission a local Health Watch, funded by and accountable to them.</li> </ul>	<p>These proposals are complex and far reaching but generally positive. Nottingham is already well placed since its Director of Public Health is jointly funded (as proposed in the White Paper)</p> <p>One Nottingham can discharge the function of the Health and Well Being Boards through its theme partnerships.</p> <p>NHS Nottingham has developed a good working relationship with the four GP clusters serving the city - this could be developed further in a partnership setting as the Bill is enacted and GPs take on new commissioning responsibilities for health improvement.</p> <p>However, the health improvement agenda is currently shared between two theme partnerships (City Health and Children’s Partnership). A decision will be needed on how and where to lodge the functions of the Health and Well Being Board and develop supporting commissioning arrangements.</p> <p><b>Kennedy Report and DoH response published (see main report)</b></p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>3. Healthy and positive children and young people -</b> Children and young people will be healthier, fitter, more emotionally resilient and better able to make mature decisions.</p>	<p><b>(7) Promoting healthy living -</b> Tackling childhood obesity, improving diets, improving oral health, cutting smoking rates</p>	<p>CA12: Crack down on irresponsible advertising and marketing, especially to children.</p> <p>CA13: Take steps to tackle the commercialisation and sexualisation of childhood.</p> <p>CA14: Introduce a new dentistry contract that will focus on achieving good dental health and increasing access to NHS dentistry, with an additional focus on the oral health of school children.</p> <p>Free School Meals Pilot - £3m government has been withdrawn</p>	<p>Lifestyle implications – could have a positive impact <u>but</u> the Government will need the compliance or acceptance from the formidable Food and Drinks industrial lobby to be effective.</p> <p>The focus on oral health re-enforces the <i>City Smiles</i> campaign, strengthens the role of school nurses and school engagement with this issue.</p> <p>Nottingham responsible for match funding and a multi-agency package was being put together - this will not now proceed.</p>
	<p><b>(8) Reducing teenage conceptions –</b> Reducing the rate of teenage conceptions.</p>		
	<p><b>(9) Reducing substance misuse –</b> Reducing substance misuse and its impact on children and young people.</p>	<p>CA15: Allow councils and the police to shut down permanently any shop or bar found to be persistently selling alcohol to children.</p>	<p>Positive – though may only have a marginal impact on sources for under-age drinking.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>3. Healthy and positive children and young people (con.)</b> - Children and young people will be healthier, fitter, more emotionally resilient and better able to make mature decisions.</p>	<p><b>10) Strengthening positive behaviour</b> - Divert children and young people from anti-social and offending behaviour (including homophobic and other forms of bullying) and promote socially responsible behaviour.</p>	<p>CA16: Help schools tackle bullying in schools, especially homophobic bullying.</p> <p>CA17: Give heads and teachers the powers they need to ensure discipline in the classroom and promote good behaviour.</p> <p>CA18: Give anonymity to teachers accused by pupils and take other measures to protect against false accusations.</p>	<p>More guidance on its way. Recognition of homophobic bullying (explicitly mentioned in the new CYPP) may help this issue to be exposed and dealt with in schools.</p> <p>This could have a positive impact on attainment (but a negative one on attendance). There is a risk that temporary and permanent exclusions may rise and increase demands for PRU places and alternative learning. However, this may be contained if schools bear the cost for excluded places.</p>
<p><b>4. - Achievement</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>11) Engaging learners better</b> - Improving school attendance and improving engagement and progression from age16 in education, employment and training.</p>	<p>Academisation (see below)</p>	<p>Current experience suggests that reporting of non-attendance may have a lower priority at Academies. Accurate up to date reporting provides the basis for effective intervention. Children missing from school and not reported may also pose a safeguarding risk.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>(12) Improving attainment-</b> Improving educational attainment and skills.</p>	<p>QS1 The Academies Bill – to accelerate academies</p> <p><b>Proposals include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow maintained schools to apply to become Academies and power for the Secretary of State to issue an Academy order requiring the Local Authority to cease to maintain the school.</li> <li>• Remove the requirement to consult the Local Authority before opening an Academy, thus simplifying and accelerating the process.</li> <li>• Require the consent of any existing (mainly church) foundations before a school applies to become an Academy.</li> <li>• Deem Academy trusts to be exempt charities.</li> <li>• Provide for secondary, primary and special schools to become Academies.</li> <li>• Ensure there is no change of religious character in the conversion process (such changes can be made through separate existing provisions).</li> </ul>	<p>Priority Bill (Summer 2010)</p> <p>This could have direct funding implications.</p> <p>As schools become Academies the LA loses that share of the budget held back for central services. If sufficient schools opt out this will create a critical position where a number of services may become unviable. It will certainly be necessary to totally rethink the whole basis on which we trade services to both maintained and non-maintained schools. This loss of funding will directly impact on the Council’s ability to address any of the CYPP priorities other than through strategic influence.</p> <p>Academies are not subject to LA monitoring, challenge and intervention – this means that we can only impact on achievement through influence and not direct action. This inevitably will lessen our impact.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>(12) Improving attainment-</b> Improving educational attainment and skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much greater autonomy –e.g. obligations to promote the health and well being of children, to promote social cohesion and to have regard to the CYPP are removed.</li> <li>• As are the 14-19 entitlement, nutritional standards, impartial advice on careers and designated teachers for children in care.</li> <li>• SEN obligations will remain and admissions and exclusions arrangements will be specified in the funding arrangement for each Academy.</li> </ul>	<p>Currently, there are 15 schools in Nottingham with ‘outstanding’ Ofsted inspection results (11 primary, 2 secondary and 2 special schools).</p> <p>The Government offered all outstanding schools a ‘fast-track ‘to Academy status by September 2010 – <b>however no Nottingham schools have been fast-tracked.. The pace of academisation for eligible schools is slower than anticipated. It is therefore unlikely to directly impact on budget in 2010 /11 and have a small impact in 2011/12.</b></p> <p>One potential stimulus to speed through primary school academisation would be 3-19 through – put on education. Currently the Nottingham Academy is pursuing this model but others may follow.</p> <p>The impact initially would be on services provided directly for schools</p>



STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>(12) Improving attainment-</b> Improving educational attainment and skills.</p>	<p>QS2 The Education &amp; Children’s Bill – to provide parent generated start up schools where demand exists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide schools with the freedoms to deliver an excellent education in the way they see fit.</li> <li>• To reform Ofsted and other accountability frameworks to ensure that head teachers are held properly accountable for the core educational goals of attainment and closing the gap between rich and poor.</li> <li>• To introduce a slimmer curriculum giving more space for teachers to decide how to teach.</li> <li>• To introduce a year 6 reading test to make sure that young children are learning and to identify problems early.</li> <li>• To give teachers and head teachers the powers to improve behaviour and tackle bullying.</li> <li>• We expect standards across the education sector to rise through the creation of more Academies and giving more freedom to head teachers and teachers. We will also ensure that money follows pupils, and introduce a ‘pupil premium’ so that more money follows the poorest pupils.</li> </ul>	<p>Bill to be introduced in the Autumn 2010</p> <p>Opportunities for new schools will be heightened where there is a local undersupply of places – this may well be a factor in Nottingham</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p>13) <b>Closing the gap</b> (Closing the gap in attainment and skills between disadvantaged groups and their peers</p>	<p>CA25: Ensure that all new Academies follow an inclusive admissions policy.</p> <p>CA26: Work with faith groups to enable more faith schools and facilitate inclusive admissions policies in as many of these schools as possible'</p>	<p>Academies will have statutory responsibilities for SEN</p>
		<p><u>The pupil premium</u> The pupil premium will be in the form of a separate grant which schools will decide how to use. The amount will not be known until the autumn spending review. Three potential indicators of deprivation are outlined (subject to consultation until October) together with their respective advantages and disadvantages – the government is attracted to using eligibility for free school meals (FSM)..</p>	<p>This would have a limited impact in Nottingham. No definition is provided of an 'inclusive' admissions policy and the rather nebulous commitment in CA26 is unlikely to have more than a marginal impact on admissions to faith schools. Given the extent of deprivation in Nottingham, schools should benefit from pupil premiums - though levels of funding will not be not known until the CSR is announced in October. Consultation on the funding criteria closes in October.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>13) Closing the gap (con)</b> – Closing the gap in attainment and skills between disadvantaged groups and their peers</p>	<p><u>Pupil Premium (con.)</u></p> <p>There is a separate methodology in respect of looked after children. They would be funded at the same rate with eligibility limited to pupils who have been in care for more than six months.</p> <p>Authorities would receive funding based on the number of pupils in the area who came into in this category in the previous financial year. Las will then pass the funding on to the schools educating pupils who have been looked after for six months or more, regardless of the authority in which they are located.</p>	<p>The pupil premium, will not be ring-fenced at school level so there is still no ‘guarantee’ that it will be spent on those for whom it is intended. Much depends on the references in the document to monitoring the progress of disadvantaged children who are likely to benefit from the premium.</p> <p>Subject to economic conditions, the Government <u>may</u> wish to extend the premium to early years (under fives) where research is showing that disadvantage is already developing and becoming entrenched.</p> <p>The Coalition Government’s continued commitment to “maintain the goal of ending child poverty in the UK by 2020” is likely to be at least as important as school funding in reducing attainment gaps in the longer term.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>4. Achievement (con.)</b> All children and young people will leave school with the best skills and qualifications they can achieve and will be ready for work or further learning</p>	<p><b>14) 14-19 reform</b> – Preparing for significant changes for this age group, with a new 14-19 strategy and the raising of school leaving age.</p>	<p>CA27: improve the quality of vocational education, including increasing flexibility for 14–19 year olds and <u>creating new Technical Academies as</u> part of plans to diversify schools’ provision.</p>	<p>Major changes in policy direction are likely and it is possible that funding for 16-19 learning may be pulled back into a new quango. The final three proposed diploma courses have been cancelled and the Government has a clear preference for developing apprenticeships as the cornerstone of post 16 vocational education.</p> <p>The principles of choice competition being developed in the school sector are likely to flow on into the FE sector.</p> <p>Nottingham is likely to be earmarked for the development of a technical Academy, having previously been engaged in discussions with Lord Baker regarding this development.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE		PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>5. Economic well-being</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>14) 14-19 reform</b> – Preparing for significant changes for this age group, with a new 14-19 strategy and the raising of school leaving age.</p>	<p><u>Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)</u> EMDA is to be abolished (by March 2012), along with all RDAs in the Public Bodies Bill in Autumn 2010. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) are to replace them. . In cases where local politicians like their existing Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) these bodies may simply be rebranded as LEPs. Further clarity on the role, powers and responsibilities will be provided in a White Paper on sub-national growth to be released this summer.</p> <p>Funding requires clarification but it seems likely that local authorities will be responsible for funding the LEPs of which they are a part. In addition, a £1 billion Regional Growth Fund is being established to provide for those areas particularly adversely affected by the public spending cuts. Details about when this fund will be made available to authorities and how they will access funds under it remain to be confirmed in the White Paper on sub-national</p>	<p>These could become important players in inward investment and job creation in the city. Nottingham almost certainly qualifies as ‘particularly adversely affected’ by public sector spending cuts’ and so access to and use of the <u>Regional Growth Fund</u> will be an important tool in efforts to reduce poverty.</p> <p>Nottingham is proposing to join a LEP with Nottinghamshire, Derby and Derbyshire (12 person Board proposed). <b>LEP has now submitted its preliminary bid and an announcement is expected shortly.</b></p>

		<p>growth, this summer.</p> <p>They will be formed out of bids put forward by local authorities. They are partnerships between local authorities and business. The ruling boards can be headed by either a local elected official or a local business leader although the Government indicate a preference for a local business leader to be chair. Equal business/ local politician representation should be included on the Board. The coalition document states that the LEPs “may take the form of the existing RDAs in areas where they are popular.”</p>	
--	--	--	--

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>5. Economic well-being (con.)</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>(15) Tackling child poverty</b> – Tackling worklessness and supporting adults to gain Level 2 skills or higher so they are able to progress in work and earn more.</p>	<p>CA28: Maintain the goal of ending child poverty by 2020</p> <p><b>Welfare Reform Changes</b>  <u>B1 All benefits increase by CPI not, as now by the RPI</u></p> <p><u>B2 Tax credit changes</u></p>	<p>The intent of the Government’s measures is to “ensure that every part of society makes a contribution to deficit reduction while supporting the most vulnerable, including children and pensioners”.</p> <p>Welfare benefit reform will affect Nottingham disproportionately – both because of the large number of citizens claiming benefit and because of concentrations in particular wards. A detailed report has been submitted to the One Nottingham Board assessing the impact of announced changes on Nottingham</p> <p>A lower rate of increase in benefits with impact increasing over time</p> <p>TUC estimates that half a million families will lose £1000 per annum as a result of changes – those whose income falls significantly due to serious illness will be particularly adversely affected.</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>5. Economic well-being (con.)</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>(15) Tackling child poverty –</b> Tackling worklessness and supporting adults to gain Level 2 skills or higher so they are able to progress in work and earn more.</p>	<p><u>B3 Benefits relating to children and babies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Child benefit frozen for 3 years;</li> <li>➤ Health Pregnancy Grant abolished;</li> <li>➤ Sure Start Maternity Grant limited to the first child</li> </ul> <p><u>B4 Lone Parent Income Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lone Parents with youngest child over 5 will move from Income Support to JSA. Benefit will become conditional on actively seeking work for which they will receive advice and support</li> </ul>	<p>These are universal benefits so will affect all families with children.</p> <p>Current estimate suggest that 2500 lone parents in Nottingham (just under 50% of total claimants) will be affected by this change.</p> <p>There may be an increased demand for wrap-around care for school-age children of lone parents who move into work. Although difficult to quantify, the freezing of child benefit and linking of benefit increases to CPI will decrease the value of household income in real terms over time for those who are already struggling. This is likely to increase stress and pressure on these families, which may result in health (particularly mental health) issues and safeguarding concerns</p>



STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>5. Economic well-being (con.)</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>(15) Tackling child poverty –</b> Tackling worklessness and supporting adults to gain Level 2 skills or higher so they are able to progress in work and earn more.</p>	<p><u>B5 Housing Benefit</u></p> <p>The budget announcement contained a package of reforms to Housing Benefit (HB) aimed at restricting entitlement and reducing the value of awards over time.</p>	<p>Specific effects on families with children is not yet clear. However: -</p> <p>The various restrictions on housing benefit may force people to seek cheaper, lower quality accommodation resulting in concentrations of benefit claimants in certain areas of the city, working against the policy goal to have balanced communities.</p> <p>There may also be an increase in applications for transfers in the social housing sector. Nottingham City Homes (NCH) is currently assessing the likely impact on its tenants and its business as a whole</p>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>5. Economic well-being (con.) -</b> Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>(16) Science City</b> – promoting science and innovation in schools, to improve the city’s long term competitiveness.</p>		
	<p><b>(17) Transforming learning</b> – investing in new and improved schools in every neighbourhood, with schools becoming hubs of wider services.</p>	<p>The BSF Programme is ended and the Government has launched a comprehensive review of all capital investments in schools and early years. (Sebastian James to lead review).</p> <p>The review will guide future spending decisions over the next Spending Review period (2011-12 to 2014-15). It will look at how best to meet parental demand; make current design and procurement cost-effective and efficient; and overhaul how capital is allocated and targeted.</p>	<p>The withdrawal of the BSF programme affects Nottingham’s schools as follows. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Oak Field, Hadden Park High and Big Wood schools have been completed (£38M)</li> <li>➤ The following 4 schools are under construction (£111M) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Bulwell Academy</li> <li>- NUSA</li> <li>- Rosehill School - due for completion n April 2011). ---</li> <li>Nottingham Academy -due for completion in Sept2011</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ The following 5 schools are unaffected by the announcement. – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ellis Guilford;</li> <li>○ Nethergate</li> <li>○ Woodlands;</li> <li>○ Farnborough</li> <li>○ Bluecoat School (Wollaton site)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE	PROPOSAL	IMPACT EVALUATION
<p><b>. Economic well-being (con.)</b> - Child poverty will be significantly reduced</p>	<p><b>17 Transforming learning</b> – investing in new and improved schools in every neighbourhood, with schools becoming hubs of wider services. (con)</p>	<p>BSF Suspension of Programme (con)</p>	<p>The status of one BSF project is unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Manning (earmarked for further discussion)</li> </ul> <p>BSF improvements for the following 5 schools and 6 pupil referral units are 'stopped' (£92M)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Westbury</li> <li>○ Top Valley</li> <li>○ Trinity</li> <li>○ Fernwood</li> <li>○ Bluecote (Aspley Lane site)</li> <li>○ Plus 6 PRUs</li> </ul> <p>There is to be a review before the stop orders are confirmed. Government has concerns over the expense and alleged inefficiency of the BSF Programme – nationally its implementation has been variable. However, Nottingham's record of project delivery on time and in budget is assessed (independently) as exemplary.</p>

