

Schools Forum - 1 December 2020

Title of paper:	CENTRAL EXPENDITURE BUDGET 2021/22 – Historic Commitments
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Catherine Underwood, Corporate Director for Children and Adults Laura Pattman, Chief Finance Officer
Report author(s) and contact details:	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance 01158 764 128 ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Clive Chambers, Head of Service, Children in care 01158 764 373 clive.chambers@nottinghamcity.gov.uk John Matravers, Service Manager Safeguarding Partnerships 01158 765 367 john.matravers1@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Jasmin Howell, Service Manager - Virtual School 01158 764 726 jasmin.howell@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Janine Walker, Head of SEND & vulnerable pupils 01158 764 698 janine.walker@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Julia Holmes, Senior Commercial Business Partner, Children & Adults 01158 763 733 julia.holmes@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Aman Patel, Solicitor 01158 765 072 aman.patel@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Rachael Morris, HR Business Lead Children & Adults 01158 763 459 rachael.morris@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Summary

Funding for some central services provided by the Local Authority (LA) to schools are funded through the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The funding given through the CSSB is split into two streams, funding for historic commitments and for ongoing commitments.

This reports requests approval of the historic commitments within the CSSB for the financial year 2021/22.

The report sets out the recommendations of the Schools Forum Sub Group (SFSG) on specific items of expenditure for inclusion in the 2021/22 budget setting process. The SFSG met on the 13 and 16 November 2020 and were content to accept the proposals put forward by the Local Authority (LA) on the funding of historic commitments for the financial year 2021/22.

This process is in accordance with the terms of reference of the SFSG which was presented to Schools Forum (SF) on 22 June 2017, as per **Appendix A** to ensure that SF can undertake the investigative work required to approve elements of the budget and that the LA can achieve the Central Government deadlines.

The supporting documentation is included in **Appendix B to F**.

The central expenditure for “Ongoing Commitments” proposals are included in a separate report to Schools Forum (SF) on 1 December 2020.

Approval is also being sought for the allocation of funding for SEN Transport in the financial year 2021/22. This is funded from the High Needs Block but is also classed by the Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) as a historic commitment, this is why it has also been included in this report.

Recommendation(s):

1	Approve historic commitments set out in Table 3 totalling £4.632m for the financial year 2021/22, noting the additional historical detail set out in Appendices B to F .
----------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1 Reasons for recommendations

- 1.1 Under the Schools & Early Years Financial Regulations 2020 and the Schools Forum Operational Guidance issued in July 2020, SF approval is required for individual central expenditure items in the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB).
- 1.2 On 21 July 2020 the ESFA released the illustrative funding allocations for the financial year 2021/22. In keeping with the Department of Education’s (DfE) commitment to reduce historic commitment funding, Nottingham City’s historic commitments funding have been cut by a further 20% in 2021/22 which also happened in the financial year 2020/21.

In the financial year 2020/21 Nottingham City saw a reduction of -£1.060m in historic commitments funding and a further cut of -£0.908m has been made in the financial year 2021/22. **The total funding reduction to date is -£1.968m**. The ESFA have stated that this funding will be cut year on year until LA’s only have the value of the termination of employment and prudential borrowing remaining budgets, for those LA’s who have commitments for these costs.

During the budget setting process for 2020/21 £0.029m of the historic commitments funding was allocated to on-going commitments to support the associated costs; this rolls over into 2021/22 and therefore reduces the gap to **£1.939m**.

- 1.3 As a consequence of this reduction in funding the LA has reviewed the historical commitments in the CSSB and adjusted the amounts sought to be approved by Schools Forum (SF). The process and detail of these reviews is contained within the attached appendices demonstrating a financial overview of the service, how the funding is allocated to the service and areas of delivery.
- 1.4 On 13 and 16 November 2020 SFSG undertook a rigorous review of the historic commitments in the CSSB. The SFSG analysed and discussed the supporting evidence provided by the LA officers for each historic commitment and **were**

content with the evidence provided and the responses to the questions raised.

As a result of this the SFSG were in agreement to recommend the approval of the historic commitments proposed for the financial year 2021/22. See appendices B to F for copies of the supporting evidence.

- 1.5 The process and detail of these reviews is contained within the attached appendices demonstrating a financial overview of the service, how the funding is allocated to the services and areas of delivery.

2 Background (including outcomes of consultation)

- 2.1 As the historic commitments budget had already been approved at SF on the 8 October 2019 for the financial year 2020/21 by the time the historic commitments funding was announced in late October 2019 SF on 3 December 2019 approved the allocation of £1.060m from the Statutory School Reserve to cover the shortfall in funding in the financial year 2020/21.

The funding from the SSR was approved for one year only.

- 2.2 **Table 1** shows the movement in funding sought to be approved by SF between the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22. The changes in the funding of services has been based on:

- a) A 'keeping it simple' approach from the LA's accounting perspective in relation to the CSSB contributions;
- b) Ensuring officer time is not allocated over a number of areas and
- c) Reflects new business models.

The allocations do not reflect a reduction in services at this time however the mitigation of this funding and the implication on services will for part of the LA's budget setting process.

Table 1: Comparison of 2020/21 historic commitments to proposed commitments for 2021/22			
	Budget 2020/21	Budget 2021/22	Variance
Historic commitments in the CSSB			
Family Support	£0.981m	-	-£0.981m
Integrated placements – Appendix A	£1.327m	£1.127m	-£0.200m
Safeguarding Training – Appendix B	£0.109m	£0.109m	-
Virtual School – Appendix C	£0.470m	£0.376m	-£0.094m
Termination of employment costs – costs exceed budget but unable to increase in accordance with guidance	£1.609m	£1.609m	-
Capital expenditure in revenue accounts	£0.801m	£0.173m	-£0.628m
Prudential borrowing	£0.274m	£0.238m	-£0.036m
Historic commitments in the CSSB Total	£5.571m	£3.632m	-£1.939m

Historic commitments in the High Needs Block			
SEN Transport – Appendix D	£1.000m	£1.000m	-
Total Historic Commitments	£6.571m	£4.632m	-£1.939m

In order to be able to set a balanced budget within the historic commitments funding envelope in 2021/22 the LA has removed the commitment for the contribution to Family Support which was previously funded at £0.981m and this is a risk to the LA.

The integrated placements contribution has been reduced from £1.327m to £1.127m. This figure has been reduced by -£0.200m to balance the historic commitments within the funding available, however, the costs will not disappear and this shortfall in funding is a risk to the LA.

The Virtual School has also had its funding reduced by 20% from £0.470m to £0.376m. This shortfall is to be met by using the Pupil Premium Plus Grant to cover the costs that can legitimately be charged to the grant.

The Safeguarding training budget has remained the same in 2021/22 at £0.109m.

Capital expenditure in revenue accounts has been adjusted to remove the contribution to the capital infrastructure and this is a risk to the LA. The value now covers PFI payments only.

- 2.3 The supporting information in relation to the above budgets in **Table 1** are shown in appendices B to F.

3 Other options considered in making recommendations

- 3.1 No other options are available as the recommendations align to the financial regulations issued by the DfE in relation to the allocation of DSG.

4 Outcomes/deliverables

- 4.1 To obtain an agreed 2021/22 Schools Budget, enabling updated schools budgets to be issued to schools within the statutory deadline of the 28 February 2021.

5 Finance colleague comments (including implications and value for money/VAT)

- 5.1 This report has been prepared in accordance with the financial regulations issued by the DfE for the financial year 2020/21 and the Schools revenue and funding 2021/22 - operational guidance – July 2020 issued by the ESFA and forms part of the DSG budget.

- 5.2 The Central School Services Block (CSSB) is made up of two categories of funding:

- Historic commitments and
- Ongoing commitments

Noted in **Table 2** are the budgets which are funded from the CSSB.

Table 2 : Central Schools Services Block Budgets	
Commitment	Classification
CERA	Historic commitment
Prudential borrowing	Historic commitment
Termination of employment costs	Historic commitment
Contribution to combined budgets	Historic commitment
Admissions	Ongoing commitment
Copyright licences	Ongoing commitment
Schools Forum	Ongoing commitment
Retained Duties (Former ESG)	Ongoing commitment

5.3 The items seeking approval in this report are for Historic commitments in the financial year 2021/22 and the detail supporting the values are shown in **Table 3**.

TABLE 3: CENTRAL EXPENDITURE - APPROVALS REQUIRED

Service Description	2021/22 £m	Narrative
HISTORIC COMMITMENTS – CENTRAL SCHOOLS SERVICES BLOCK		
1. Contribution to combined budgets	1.614	<p>Family support</p> <p>No longer applicable</p> <hr/> <p>£1.127m – Integrated placements</p> <p>See Appendix A</p> <hr/> <p>£0.109m – Safeguarding Training</p> <p>See Appendix B</p> <hr/> <p>£0.376m – Virtual School</p> <p>See Appendix C</p>
2. Termination of Employment Costs	1.609	<p>This budget is used to pay for ongoing pension and redundancy from historic restructures pre 1st April 2013.</p> <p>2020/21 commitments are estimated at c.£1.645m. It is anticipated that these costs will reduce over time.</p> <p>Detailed information on the termination of employment due to data protection confidentiality.</p>

3. Prudential Borrowing	0.238	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scheme</th> <th>Loan Value £m</th> <th>2019/20 £m</th> <th>2020/21 £m</th> <th>2021/22 £m</th> <th>2022/23 £m</th> <th>2023/24 to 2052/53 £m</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Education BSF</td> <td>0.400</td> <td>0.028</td> <td>0.027</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BSF 06/07</td> <td>1.149</td> <td>0.086</td> <td>0.082</td> <td>0.078</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BSF Academies</td> <td>0.026</td> <td>0.002</td> <td>0.002</td> <td>0.002</td> <td>0.002</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southwark Primary</td> <td>0.294</td> <td>0.023</td> <td>0.022</td> <td>0.021</td> <td>0.020</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BSF - In lieu of Revenue Costs Transfer</td> <td>0.900</td> <td>0.069</td> <td>0.067</td> <td>0.064</td> <td>0.061</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emanuel School</td> <td>0.265</td> <td>0.020</td> <td>0.020</td> <td>0.019</td> <td>0.018</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nottingham Academy</td> <td>1.078</td> <td>0.054</td> <td>0.054</td> <td>0.054</td> <td>0.054</td> <td>0.054</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>4.113</td> <td>0.283</td> <td>0.274</td> <td>0.238</td> <td>0.155</td> <td>0.054</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Scheme	Loan Value £m	2019/20 £m	2020/21 £m	2021/22 £m	2022/23 £m	2023/24 to 2052/53 £m	Education BSF	0.400	0.028	0.027	-	-	-	BSF 06/07	1.149	0.086	0.082	0.078	-	-	BSF Academies	0.026	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	-	Southwark Primary	0.294	0.023	0.022	0.021	0.020	-	BSF - In lieu of Revenue Costs Transfer	0.900	0.069	0.067	0.064	0.061	-	Emanuel School	0.265	0.020	0.020	0.019	0.018	-	Nottingham Academy	1.078	0.054	0.054	0.054	0.054	0.054	TOTAL	4.113	0.283	0.274	0.238	0.155	0.054	<p>This funding is used to meet the borrowing commitments around the initial set up costs of the Building Schools For the Future programme and Nottingham Academy. These values are fixed and cannot be amended.</p>
		Scheme	Loan Value £m	2019/20 £m	2020/21 £m	2021/22 £m	2022/23 £m	2023/24 to 2052/53 £m																																																										
		Education BSF	0.400	0.028	0.027	-	-	-																																																										
		BSF 06/07	1.149	0.086	0.082	0.078	-	-																																																										
		BSF Academies	0.026	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	-																																																										
		Southwark Primary	0.294	0.023	0.022	0.021	0.020	-																																																										
		BSF - In lieu of Revenue Costs Transfer	0.900	0.069	0.067	0.064	0.061	-																																																										
		Emanuel School	0.265	0.020	0.020	0.019	0.018	-																																																										
		Nottingham Academy	1.078	0.054	0.054	0.054	0.054	0.054																																																										
TOTAL	4.113	0.283	0.274	0.238	0.155	0.054																																																												
4. Capital Expenditure from Revenue Accounts	0.174	This expenditure supports Private Finance Initiative payments (fixed element) that have to be allocated and capital improvements ensuring that all buildings continue to meet the legal requirements.																																																																
SUB-TOTAL	3.632																																																																	
HISTORIC COMMITMENTS – HIGH NEEDS BLOCK																																																																		
1. SEN Transport	1.000	SEN transport where the Schools Forum agreed prior to April 2013 a contribution from the schools budget (this is treated as part of the high needs block but requires Schools Forum approval as a historic commitment.																																																																
SUB-TOTAL	1.000																																																																	
GRAND TOTAL	4.632																																																																	

- 5.4 **Appendix F** shows the values of these items compared to previous years budgets and actuals.
- 5.5 Any items not approved through this report will not necessarily create a full year saving in 2021/22 due to the implementation time required to initiate a service reduction (consultation/approval/notice etc).

Julia Holmes, Senior Commercial Business Partner
Email: julia.holmes@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Tel: 01158 763733
11 November 2020

6 **Legal and Procurement colleague comments (including risk management issues, and legal, Crime and Disorder Act and procurement implications)**

- 6.1 The current law in force in this area is the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2020. However, these regulations apply for the financial year starting 1 April 2020 only and are updated annually. However, it will be necessary to review these proposals once 2021 regulations have been produced.

Aman Patel, Solicitor
Email: aman.patel@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Tel: 01158 765072
17 November 2020

7 **HR colleague comments**

- 7.1 There are no direct Human Resources implications as part of this report.

However, if recommendations are not approved and there is an impact or shortfall for the **local authority services delivered to schools**, these will need to be fully scoped and understood from a financial element before a formal consultation process is instigated.

After scoping and if reductions are required resulting in impacts to the workforce, a genuine and meaningful consultation process should commence with Trade Unions and affected staff, with the correct policies and procedures being adhered to, with HR support provided.

Rachael Morris, HR Business Lead, Children & Adults
Email: rachael.morris@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Tel: 0115 876 3459
18 November 2020

8 **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 8.1 Has the equality impact of the proposals in this report been assessed?

No



An EIA is not required because:
(Please explain why an EIA is not necessary)

Not captured as part of this report, the impact will be included in Nottingham City Council's budget report.

Yes

Attached as Appendix x, and due regard will be given to any implications identified in it.

9 List of background papers other than published works or those disclosing confidential or exempt information

9.1

10 Published documents referred to in compiling this report

10.1 DfE - Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2020.

10.2 ESFA – Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 - Operational guide July 2020

10.3 ESFA - Central school services block national funding formula – Technical note – July 2020

10.4 DfE – Schools Forum – Operational and good practice guide – September 2018

10.5 DfE – The national funding formulae for schools and high needs 2021- 2022 –July 2020

APPENDIX A

SCHOOLS FORUM - 22 JUNE 2017

Title of paper:	SCHOOLS FORUM SUB GROUP – TERMS OF REFERENCE & FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Alison Michalska, Corporate Director for Children and Adults
Report author(s) and contact details:	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance 01158 764 128 ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Sarah Molyneux Solicitor and Legal Service Manager 01158 764 335 sarah.molyneux@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Lynn Robinson HR Business Partner 01158 764 3605 lynne.robinson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Summary	
<p>At the Schools Forum (SF) meeting on 23 February 2017 it was agreed that the Terms of Reference for a Schools Forum Sub Group (SFSG) would be established to formalise the requirements and membership of this group and a timetable of budget activity be presented for consideration by the Sub Group.</p> <p>This report sets out those requirements and membership.</p>	
Recommendation(s):	
1	To approve the SFSG's Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A .
2	To approve the membership of the SFSG for financial year 2017/18 detailed in paragraph 2.2.
3	To agree at least one further member of SF from the secondary sector for the SFSG.
4	To note the work programme in Appendix B for 2017/18 which has required 2 SFSG meetings in accordance with other activities to ensure a robust budget setting process.

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 The recommendation will support the establishment and use of the SFSG on a more formal basis, undertaking the financial reviews required to support the development of school budgets. This group have no formal powers and are set up as a consultative group of the SF.

2. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

- 2.1 During the last few years a number of financial issues have arisen which have required a more detailed discussion with SF e.g. the implementation of the National Funding Formula, and the use of the SFSG in these instances has enabled:
- a detailed analysis/discussion of these issues to be undertaken;
 - the ability to undertake detailed consultation regarding budget issues;
 - a more detailed understanding of the budget to be gained by SF members and

- recommendations to be presented back to SF that have been agreed with their representatives. This prevents SF from having to undertake lengthy detailed operational discussions ensuring that SF time is focused at more strategic educational issues.

2.2 Based on the discussions at SF the 2017/18 SF members assigned to the SFSG will be:

- Sian Hampton – Head - Secondary sector and Chair of SFSG
- Judith Kemplay – Head - Primary Sector
- James Strawbridge – Governor Primary sector
- Janet Molyneux – Business Manager – Primary sector

The group will also include Local Authority Finance Officers and, where appropriate, either other officers or Head Teachers.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Not establishing a SFSG would prevent the detailed discussions required on certain budget issues to be undertaken.

4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

4.1 To ensure that SF have the assurance that challenge and understanding of decisions being taken at SF has been achieved.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY)

5.1 The formal establishment of the SFSG will enable detailed budget discussions to be undertaken with members of SF. This reduced group size will facilitate more robust discussions ensuring the budgets set support value for money.

5.2 **Appendix B** sets out a number of areas requiring SFSG focus for the financial year 2017/18 in the context of other internal and external deadlines/activities and the required dates of those meetings.

5.3 These discussions will ensure budget construction is developed in accordance with the latest Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS)

6.1 There are no legal implications arising from the content of this report.

7. HR ISSUES

7.1 None

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 An EIA is not needed as the report does not contain new or changing policies or proposals or financial decisions

9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

9.1 None

10. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

10.1 Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Budget 2016/17 – 8 December 2016

10.2 Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Budget 2016/17 – 19 January 2017

10.3 DfE - Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2017.

APPENDIX A

Schools Forum Sub Group (SFSG)
Terms of Reference

1 The role of the (SFSG) is:

1.1 To act as a consultative group on all financial matters relating to schools and any wider education issues referred to it by the Schools Forum (SF).

Financial matters include areas such as the school funding formula, benchmarking analysis, review of use of reserves and any other financial issues that may require consultation with the group on behalf of SF.

2 Appointment of SFSG:

2.1 The membership of SFSG will align to financial years and the budget cycle. The membership and Chair of the group will be agreed by SF and members can remain on the SFSG for consecutive terms.

2.1 The membership of the group will not exceed 6 and the representatives will need to cover Primary Maintained (if applicable), Primary Academy, Secondary Maintained (if applicable) and Secondary Academy.

2.2 Chair of Schools Forum will be Chair of the SFSG.

3 Meetings

3.1 Finance officers will arrange, attend and set the agendas in consultation with the Chair of SFSG. There will be meetings where the Finance Officers request the attendance of other Local Authority officers and Head Teachers which are deemed appropriate to facilitate discussions. This will be after consultation with the Chair of the SFSG.

3.2 The agenda and supporting papers will be issued at least 3 working days before the meeting. The purpose and outcomes required from the meeting will be made clear on the agenda to enable the meeting to be as efficient and effective as possible.

3.3 Members are required to accommodate the meetings to ensure a balanced discussion is undertaken. No substitutes will be required and meeting dates will be

issued with at least 4 academic weeks notice however, there may be exceptional circumstances where this timeline is not achievable.

3.4 In a majority of cases the meetings will be no more than 2 hours.

Meeting Date		Requirement
22 June 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016/17 Outturn Report/Reserves update
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on pupil growth principles for secondary schools views on what they think secondary schools should be fun through to secondary schools. A paper will then be brought through to secondary schools. A paper will then be brought through to secondary schools. A paper will then be brought through to secondary schools.
W/C 10 th July 2017	Sub Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sub-group meeting laying out the proposed changes to groups opinions on the proposals.
11 th September 2017	Sub Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of formula SG meeting.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESG replacement funding – to include managers of services Central expenditure funding – to include managers of services
15 September 2017	Gov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation document must be completed
18 September	Deadline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify schools on Scene of the consultation and ask for responses
9 November 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> De-delegation requests ESG funding requests Revision of the pupil growth criteria Consult with Schools Forum on high needs places
7 December 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Formula changes 2018/19 report Pupil Growth Contingency Fund request for 2018/19 Central Expenditure requests
18 January 2018	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools Budget Report 2018/19

APPENDIX B

Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Contribution Impact Statement September 2020

Schools Forum contribution underpins placement for children in care (CiC). Current numbers of CiC are 676 (as of 30.09.20).

Overview of the Services: CiC Placements

	Sept 2019	Sept 2020
Total Budget:	£35.041m	£33.421m
Other Contributions:	£1.377m UASC Grant £2.000m Health Contribution	£1.271m UASC Grant P6 FOT £1.485m Health Contribution P6 FOT

Number of Children Supported:	626 (as at 9 th September 2017)	676 (as at 30 th September 2020)
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

Funding Allocation:

Area	Intervention/Support	Reach
Placements (Internal and External)	<p>Internal Placements – Foster Care or Internal Residential Provision</p> <p>External Placements – External Residential or Independent Fostering Association.</p> <p>All carers are commissioned to support the educational outcomes for children in their care including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging and enabling children and young people to achieve their academic potential and promote study and learning, in line with national guidance • Working in line with individual care plans, education health care plans, personal education plans, pathway plan and attend and contribute at all reviews • Supporting the education provision of the child, including all home to school transport, encouragement and clear expectations in relation to attendance • Supporting with homework assignments and extra-curricular activities • Providing school books and educational equipment where required, to supplement learning, for example through home tuition • Supporting and funding day school outings and visits and overnight trips • Attendance at Personal Education Plan (PEP) meetings • Attendance at parents evening, sports days, etc • Providing all school uniforms and clothing, including and specialist or replacement clothing requirements, e.g. unusual sizes or for children or young people with disabilities • Providing all individual educational resources and sports or hobby equipment, within reason, to support the child or young person develop their talents and life chances • Providing access to a computer in the home that is principally for education and homework. • Providing equipment for a disabled child or young person • Maintain all health checks and appointments (dental, opticians, statutory LAC health reviews), which may ultimately reduce the instances of absence due to sickness • Collect and return absconding child or young person to care placement 	676 (Sept 2020) versus 626 (Sept 2019)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take all reasonable steps to avoid the criminalisation of the child and young person • Provide appropriate specialist resources to meet the needs of specialist placements. This may include evidence based therapeutic input, DfE registered education or care for young people with complex medical needs. These resources are in addition to existing mainstream or specialist NHS and Placing Authority funded Services already available to young people, which are free at point of delivery. • During the Covid related lock down period residential care staff and foster carers) played a critically important role in supporting young people to engage in education. School was open for children in care but not all children were able to attend and seen those who did required much higher than usual levels of support and encouragement. Although schools have returned, carers continue to offer significantly higher levels of input to enable young people to access education provision and respond to the increasing number of full or partial school closures. 	
Edge of Care Interventions	<p>We currently fund three interventions to provide intensive 24/7 support for families who have children on the edge of care. These services are Multi Systemic Therapy (MST), Multi Systemic Therapy Child Abuse and Neglect (MST-CAN) and a new programme, PAUSE, to support Mums who have had multiple children removed from their care. These services work with our complex edge of care cohort to provide holistic, therapeutic support to build resilience in families and address issues that are impacting negatively on children and young people. These services cost a total of £1.02m.</p> <p>The Edge of Care Hub provides intensive and assertive community based support to children and families that are on the edge of care and may also be subject to CP Plans, Child in Need and support the reunification of looked after children. The team work on a family's capacity to change; focusing intervention on parental motivation, rules and boundaries, emotional warmth, stimulation of child, parental ability to protect, DV, substance misuse, poor parental mental health, and environmental factors such as poor living conditions and hygiene. We work alongside children and their families from birth until 17.</p> <p>See case study attached as an example of how these teams support families to improve educational outcomes for children and young people.</p>	Capacity to work 75 families per year (multiple children)

Intended Outcomes:

- Provide a safe and stable home environment that is able to meet the child/young person's holistic needs so that they can play an active and positive part in their community (school, neighbourhood etc.)
- Keep children with their families wherever possible or if accommodated to provide placement stability and increase the number of children placed within 20 miles of Nottingham City to reduce pupil mobility.
- Provide a parenting experience that encourages positive behaviour, attendance at school and that builds on a child/young person's aspirations.
- Avoid persistent absenteeism, exclusions or poor behaviour that means that children are at risk of exclusion in a mainstream school setting.
- Ensure that children access health services (dentists, GPs etc.) to reduce the likelihood of absence from schools.
- Improve the social and emotional wellbeing of children in care to support their self-confidence and self-esteem.
- Contribute to the child/young person's attainment, achievement and progress at school/college.

Impact

Children in care are often negatively impacted by their experiences in their families before being accommodated. There is a wealth of national research that evidences that these historical experiences will impact on the outcomes for that child/young person for the rest of their lives. Whilst care provides a safe and stable environment and often mitigates the impact of these experiences (particularly where children have been in care from a young age or for a significant amount of time) the outcomes of this cohort are generally worse than their peers.

- The attendance rate has decreased from 93.5% in 2018/19 to 90.9% in 2019/20
- There was one permanent exclusion relating to a CiC in 2019/2020 and 109 incidents of fixed-term exclusions, down from 122 incidents in the previous academic year

See Att.1 – Attainment Data - 2018/19

See Att.2 – Fixed-Term Exclusions & Attendance Data - 2019/20

In relation to broader outcomes (also detailed below):

- Collectively, 65.6% of care leavers are in Education, Training or Employment – a rise of 8.0ppts against the previous year
- The % of CiC who offend has increased; however, it is comparable with the 2018 statistical neighbours figure
- The majority of eligible CiC have had their development checks, health assessments, dental checks and immunisations with the percentages similar to those of the previous year
- 90.2% of care leavers (all ages) are deemed to be in suitable accommodation
- The average score for strengths and difficulties questionnaires (SDQs) is reducing over time, which suggests that the mental health and wellbeing of this cohort is improving

- 94.5% of CiC participate in their Reviews – an increase of 4.6ppts on the previous year.

Measure	2017	2018	2019	2020	2018 SNG Ave.
Children Looked After					
CLA As At 31st March	622	618	629	656	803
Total CLA in year	824	830	838	868	1,072
CLA rate per 10,000 child population	93	91	92.6	95	94
Of which are UASC	33	31	41	36	38
% of CLA that are UASC	5.3%	5.0%	6.5%	5.5%	4.8%
Admissions	235	212	224	251	315
Discharges	216	217	216	222	279
Care Leavers					
Suitable Accommodation, 19 - 21 year olds	85.4%	86.2%	89.2%	89.9%	84.0%
Suitable Accommodation, 17 - 18 year olds	92.1%	88.2%	90.5%	91.0%	87.0%
Suitable Accommodation (All ages)	86.9%	87.4%	89.6%	90.2%	N/A
EET, 19 - 21 year olds	67.3%	57.3%	55.6%	63.4%	52.0%
EET, 17 - 18 year olds	81.0%	66.7%	64.6%	70.9%	67.0%
EET (All ages)	70.4%	60.0%	57.6%	65.6%	N/A
OC2					
Offending	4.8%	5.5%	2.7%	4.4%	4.3%
Development checks	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.1%
Immunisation	95.2%	97.4%	96.2%	95.6%	88.2%
Health Assessments	88.2%	88.7%	93.9%	93.9%	89.1%
Dental checks	86.8%	92.8%	93.0%	93.2%	87.7%
Substance Misuse	4.5%	7.0%	4.0%	3.5%	3.1%
Number of CLA for 12 months at 31st March	440	459	445	456	574.7
SDQ - % Complete	73.0%	81.0%	78.6%	84.4%	82.6%
SDQ - Average Score	14.6	15.3	15.5	14.4	14.1
SDQ - Normal	41.9%	46.6%	40.0%	43.6%	51.9%
SDQ - Borderline	16.6%	10.7%	12.0%	13.4%	11.8%
SDQ - Concern	41.5%	42.7%	48.0%	43.0%	36.3%
Reviews					
Proportion of reviews in-time (Monthly Report)	92.9%	95.9%	95.9%	89.6%	N/A
NI66 Childs reviews all within timescales. (% of CLA which should have been reviewed during year that were reviewed on time during the year, excl V4 and PFA)	83.0%	83.2%	87.3%	93.8%	N/A
Proportion participated at review (Monthly Report)	92.9%	92.3%	89.9%	94.5%	N/A
PAF C69 Child Participated in all reviews	86.8%	88.0%	84.3%	83.2%	N/A
Placements					

NI63 Long Term Placement Stability	76.3%	73.5%	68.7%	67.5%	69.0%
NI62 Placement changes	7.8%	9.4%	10.2%	8.8%	N/A
The % of CLA at 31 March placed Less than 20 miles from where they used to live	78.7%	78.8%	75.5%	83.9%	74.2%

MST Case Study

Background:

Child Y was 12 year old male, who was open to the Nottingham Multi-Systemic Therapy Team from July to December 2019.

Y had been permanently excluded from mainstream school in Year 7. He was attending two alternative provisions however there were increasing concerns about his attendance and behaviour at one of these provisions, particularly physically challenging behaviour, using abusive language and disrespecting staff. Y often stayed out later than his curfew and at times would sneak out of the house in the night. His mum did not report him missing and despite her keeping some contact with him by telephone, professionals believed that she did not know where he was or who he was with

Y was well known to the local police due him and his group of friends causing antisocial behaviour in the community. The police suspected that Y had been threatening others with a knife and had information to suggest that he was involved with drugs and firearms. Information from the police had also linked Y to concerning individuals who were linked to gang activity, knife crime and county lines. It was believed he may be getting coerced into drug dealing for others and may be in debt to them as a result of being caught with money and cannabis by the police. He was arrested in July 2019 with an amount of cannabis that indicated intent to supply, along with a large sum of money.

Mum had been dismissive of the concerns, she would tend to 'take his side' against the issues raised by professional agencies. There were concerns that she was struggling to maintain boundaries in the house and that Y would largely get his own way. Work was ongoing in terms of mum's parenting of all of her children especially with the older children who were all known to the local police due to antisocial behaviour. Y had witnessed domestic abuse towards his mother from her previous partner and the family had recently suffered two bereavements and this impacted on mum's emotional wellbeing. It did not appear that Y had a positive relationship with his paternal grandmother or his father, who lived in Jamaica.

Work completed:

The family engaged well with the MST intervention, meeting regularly with their therapist. These sessions included work with mum, older siblings and Y, as well as sessions with the whole family. The therapist also met with Y individually within the education environment or at home.

We were able to complete extensive work with Y and his mum, collaboratively developing a safety plan around the episodes when Y was returning home late or going missing. Mum was able to increase her positive communication with Y and was able to establish clearer and more consistent boundaries. Mum was able to increase her level of supervision and monitoring of his whereabouts, tracking where he was when he was out and who he was with, as well as monitoring his communication with friends on Social Media.

Working with school and the family we were able to increase his desire to attend education and developed specific goals for him to return and increase attendance. In joint meetings and sessions we were able to review progress and barriers and greatly improve communication and cooperation between home and school. The therapist worked closely with education to identify what supported his engagement and what areas to avoid, including interactions that maintained or escalated his disengagement and attainment. This was filtered across all teaching staff to adopt.

With support from the family and education we were able to identify a plan that also supported Y complete his school day with leaving in frustration or being sent home.

Rewards and consequences were developed and shared in both home and school environment.

The therapist was able to review with Y the sequences of conflict between him and school staff and pupils and identify coping strategies and ways to re-direct it. This included the use of exit and wait plans with agreed spaces for Y to go to within his provision, emotional regulation strategies regarding his feelings of shame and rejection and his fight, flight, freeze responses. This work was extended to the conflicts that arose in the home with his family, with attention to the Coercive Cycle model of parent-teenager conflict. We were able to increase mum's awareness of her parenting style and how this impacted on the interactions in the family.

We completed extensive work collaboratively with Police, the family and Social Care to disrupt the risk of Child Criminal Exploitation and his association with negative peers and adults. The family and Police were able to develop an agreement in which the Police would retrieve him if he was seen with key individuals and was out beyond curfew. Work was completed with Y and family around healthy and unhealthy peer relationships, peer refusal skills and consequential thinking.

Outcomes:

By the end of treatment we had seen significant and sustained change (more than 6 weeks) in all of the prioritised areas. Y was returning home on time and was not going out without permission or going missing.

Mum was able to demonstrate an increase of responsibility in supervision and monitoring. There was increased positive relationship with Y and older sibling, in which the older sibling was able to educate Y on risks, ways to refuse peers negative offers from their individual experience.

He was attending all of his education provision as required, he was engaging positively and completing the work as asked. His relationship with the providers had greatly improved. Home and education were communicating in a timely and positive manner.

Information from the police was able to confirm there was no further incidents of antisocial behaviour or association with other concerning individuals. Again, the relationship between family and the local police had greatly improved with really positive signs of mum working cooperatively with the police.

2020/21 Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Contribution Impact Statement

Schools Forum contribution to ‘Safeguarding Training’ is the education element of partnership funding to the Nottingham City Safeguarding Children Partnership (NCSCP) and other partnership safeguarding interventions.

Background

Working Together 2018 requires each Local Authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Partnership (LSCP) for their area and specifies the organisations and individuals (other than the local authority) that should be represented on LSCPs. LSCPs should be Independent and Working Together 2018 requires that they have an Independent Chair or be able to show Independent scrutiny.

“All LSCP member organisations have an obligation to provide LSCPs with reliable resources (including finance) that enable the LSCP to be strong and effective. Members should share the financial responsibility for the LSCP in such a way that a disproportionate burden does not fall on a small number of partner agencies” - Chapter 3 (paragraph 19) of Working Together 2018.

Overview of the Services: Nottingham City Safeguarding Children’s Partnership (NCSCP)

Total Budget:	£390,582(funded by the LA, CCG and Police)
Additional funding from DSG Contribution:	£109,273
Other Contributions:	Training Income - £9,000 (from all profit-making partners, including academies)

Funding Allocation:

Chapter 3 of **Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018** sets out the objectives of LSCPs, which are:

- (a) The three safeguarding partners should agree on ways to co-ordinate their safeguarding services; act as a strategic leadership group in supporting and engaging others; and implement local and national learning including from serious child safeguarding incidents (see chapter 4).
- (b) The purpose of these local arrangements is to support and enable local organisations and agencies to work together in a system where:
 - children are safeguarded and their welfare promoted
 - partner organisations and agencies collaborate, share and co-own the vision for how to achieve improved outcomes for vulnerable children
 - organisations and agencies challenge appropriately and hold one another to account effectively

- there is early identification and analysis of new safeguarding issues and emerging threats
- learning is promoted and embedded in a way that local services for children and families can become more reflective and implement changes to practice
- information is shared effectively to facilitate more accurate and timely decision making for children and families to ensure the effectiveness of what is done by each such person or body for those purposes.

Schools, colleges and other educational providers

Schools, colleges and other educational providers have a pivotal role to play in safeguarding children and promoting their welfare. Their co-operation and buy-in to the new arrangements will be vital for success. All schools, colleges and other educational providers have duties in relation to safeguarding children and promoting their welfare. The statutory guidance ‘Keeping Children Safe in Education’ should be read alongside this guidance.

The safeguarding partners should make arrangements to allow all schools (including multi academy trusts), colleges and other educational providers, in the local area to be fully engaged, involved and included in the new safeguarding arrangements. It is expected that local safeguarding partners will name schools, colleges and other educational providers as relevant agencies and will reach their own conclusions on how best locally to achieve the active engagement of individual institutions in a meaningful way. Once designated as a relevant agency, schools and colleges, and other educational providers, in the same way as other relevant agencies, are under a statutory duty to co-operate with the published arrangements.

Function	Local Delivery	Impact
Developing policies and procedures for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area of the authority.	<p>NCSCP has a full suite of inter-agency safeguarding procedures and practice guidance available for use across the partnership. These are reviewed regularly to ensure that guidance to professionals is up to date, reflects changes in national policy or legislation, and reflects emerging safeguarding issues or themes identified in our local learning. This ensures that agencies using the Procedures can be confident that their safeguarding practice is in line with national expectations and best practice. These procedures are published and are available here</p> <p>The NCSCP also works to develop and approves Nottingham City’s threshold document – The Family Support Pathway – which provides the partnership with a clear</p>	<p>Continued growth in access to the NCSCP website which continues to build on the previous two years’ increases. The NCSCP Twitter account continues to expand its reach and targeted involvement with partners.</p>

	<p>framework in relation to the needs of children in the City and when to make a referral. The most recent version having been updated in early 2019.</p> <p>A further example of the work of the NCSCP in this area was that the Safeguarding Partnership consults each year with staff about how best to enable them to access safeguarding policies and procedures. Work is underway to change our approach to work in this area</p>	<p>This provides key safeguarding information and other resources.</p>
<p>Producing and delivery of safeguarding in Education training programme</p>	<p>The Schools and Education Officer oversees the delivery of the Safeguarding in Education training programme. The courses are available to all education providers including academies, alternative education providers and the further education sector. The training is delivered by the ADSL's with the materials being maintained by 3 of the ADSL's to ensure consistency in materials and training delivery. The school that the ADSL is from is reimbursed £220 for each session delivered.</p> <p>The course programme is administered through Education Partnerships at a cost of £9,000 a year, including facilitating DSL networks, as there is no administration capacity within the Safeguarding Partnership team for this.</p> <p>DSL1 and 2 are the most popular courses.</p> <p>The ADSL's have also delivered 26 in house courses to schools, including their own.</p> <p>The maintained sector is able to access this training programme at no cost.</p> <p>The ADSL'S also deliver a training programme to Academies a cost of £100 per day course as per the NST/local authority service level agreement.</p>	<p>In 2019-20 177 delegates attended courses. The income from the Safeguarding in Education Programme is £9,170</p>
<p>Communicating to persons and bodies in the area of the</p>	<p>NCSCP is proactive in raising awareness about safeguarding issues in the City. They</p>	

<p>authority the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children, raising their awareness of how this can best be done and encouraging them to do so</p>	<p>triangulate the learning from serious case reviews, Multi-Agency audit activity and other sources of intelligence to develop materials that promote knowledge and understanding. These are published and are available here</p> <p>The NCSCP have recently developed the “Missing Appointments Matters” animation as a following up to the Internationally successful ‘Rethinking Did Not Attend to Was Not Brought’ animation and are in the early stages of developing a partnership animation aimed focusing on Neglect. Schools are a key area in the targeting of this resource.</p> <p>They promote free e-learning to partners that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent • Female Genital Mutilation • Child Sexual Exploitation • Forced Marriage • Children’s Attachment • Information Sharing • Child Criminal Exploitation • ACES <p>The NCSCP also supports the accredited Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSL) Network. The DSL Network goes from strength with this being co-ordinated and hosted by John Matravers Strategic Lead for Safeguarding Partnerships, alongside Pete McConnochie Head of Access to Learning and Pat Whitby, Education Partnerships and Intervention Manager.</p> <p>Format for the network includes updates both local and national, key note speakers linked to a specific safeguarding subjects and opportunities for networking</p>	<p>There have been 5 DSL Network events since Oct 19 when the DSL Network started. Since September 2020 this network has been delivered virtually. Over 110 delegates attend each termly event from all education provision.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>both individually and within the DSL cluster groups.</p> <p>Designated Safeguarding Leads network</p> <p>The remains a key area of engagement with the education sector and is critical in providing training and updates on National and Local developments in safeguarding children in education. We delivered three half-day meetings during the 2019-2020 academic year, one each school term. The meetings include a policy update with national and local summaries. A reflection sheet linked to each agenda is available for colleagues to complete and share with teams in their school/setting. One hundred and ten delegates on average attend each event. The learning and resources from this are then shared and disseminated throughout each education organisation. Colleagues can access related presentations and document via a dedicated webpage. It also provides a crucial networking link for education to meet with key colleagues in children's services and ensure that pathways for communication and escalation are in place. This continues to be an invaluable resource for ensuring clear and effective communication between all partners in the NCSCP. There are three meetings planned for the academic year 2020-2021</p> <p>Advanced Designated Leads in Schools (ADSL)</p> <p>ADSLs are validated, experienced practitioners who meet eligibility criteria including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - number of years' experience, leadership experience and 	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>demonstrable evidence based good practice.</p> <p>During the academic year 2019-2020 fifteen ADSLs supported Designated Safeguarding Leads and school/academy leaders by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - • Offering advice and guidance on policy and procedure. • Supported newly appointed DSLs during induction. • Acted as a forum for communication • Supported the functioning of the DSL Network. • Developed and share evidence based good practice at ADSL network meetings. • Supported school DSLs in localities. • Support training and development. • Undertook audit activity (28 in school audits completed as part of a rolling programme) <p>This support will continue from September 2020 with all ADSLs.</p> <p>The NCSCP also delivers our annual Every Colleague Matters, Excellence in Safeguarding week. The fourth event of its type took place in 2020 and delivered sessions on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contextualised Safeguarding: What is it? • Mental Health Safety Tool Kit • Trauma Informed Practice in Nottingham City Council • Learning from Reviews • Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) • Young Carers: Who are they and how can we support them? 	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic Abuse in Same Sex Relationships • Understanding and Responding to the Effects of Child Sexual Abuse • Learning from the IICSA • Safer Sleeping 	
Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of what is done by the authority and their Board partners individually and collectively to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and advising them on ways to improve	<p>The NCSCB facilitates a themed Multi-Agency audit programme. In 2019-20 the themes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neglect • Children subject to Child Protection plans for 3 months or less • Sexual abuse referrals <p>The ADSL's have continued to support schools by conducting safeguarding audits to inform their self-evaluation and improvement planning. This can also include intensive support, advice and guidance for schools that require it. This role also plays a key part in the allegations management process and the response to critical incidents.</p>	<p>13 education audits have been completed to contribute to Multi-Agency themed audits. The audit of these was either undertaken by the Safeguarding in Education Consultant or an ADSL.</p> <p>The auditor is required to participate in the Multi-Agency analysis of the case, which is a minimum of a half day discussion per themed audit.</p>
Participating in the planning of services for children in the area of the authority.	The NCSCP continue to coordinate surveys and other engagement activity across the partnership, which informs developments in local practice.	The DSL network contributes significantly in this area.
Undertaking reviews of serious cases and advising the authority and their Board partners on lessons to be learned	The NCSCP are responsible for the coordination of individual learning reviews, Rapid Reviews and serious case reviews to ensure that partners learn from serious events and to inform developments in safeguarding practice in the City.	No SCR 's were commissioned in 2019/20 but 2 were completed. 4 rapid

	<p>The two Serious Case Reviews commissioned in the previous year were concluded in the summer of 2019. Learning and improvement work has focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adherence to Private Fostering regulations • Effective and improved use of chronologies • Compliance with Section 47 procedures, with a specific focus on older young people, strategy discussions and arrangements for child protection medicals • Child Criminal Exploitation and the challenges this presents, particularly where young people have additional needs and learning disabilities <p>Four rapid reviews were completed in 2019/2020 – in line with the previous year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All submitted within the fifteen days' statutory timeframe. • In all cases no recommendations made for a CSPR. • Agreement with all recommendations by the National CSPR Panel. • Positive feedback from the National CSPR Panel in relation to quality of reviews. <p>The NCSCP continue to use a 'cascade model' whereby each of the Safeguarding Partners nominate people from their agency to attend two learning events. The premise of the</p>	<p>reviews have taken place this year. This is a new requirement under WT 2018. The learning has already been disseminated.</p> <p>Learning disseminated through DSL networks and NCSCP newsletter.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>cascade model was that nominees would participate in workshops to share learning and develop an understanding of the practice issues highlighted in the SCR and then disseminate the learning back in agency.</p> <p>The workshop model has received consistently positive feedback with 98%+ of participants rating the workshop model as either 'excellent' or 'good' which clearly demonstrates that attendees welcomed this model as a way to share learning and explore practice issues</p>	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

In addition to the above functions of the NCSCP this contribution also enables Nottingham City Council to continue to deliver a high standard of support to schools and other partners from the Designated Officer (D.O).

In our inter-agency safeguarding procedures we have maintained the following criteria for a case to be discussed with the D.O

- Behaved in a way that indicates he / she is unsuitable to work with children

This is an additional criterion that may appear to be minor but it actually has significant implications in that it enables agencies to discuss a wider range of concerns with the LADO. This would include for example concerns regarding conduct or professional boundary issues where the issue of harm is not immediately obvious. In our experience this type of concern is often more difficult to resolve.

Referrals to the LADO for the last year are largely in-line with the previous year. Exact figures are being confirmed and will follow as an update to this report.

Report to Schools Forum
Nottingham City Virtual School
November 2020

1. **Context**

1.1. The Children and Families Act 2014 required all local authorities in England to appoint at least one person for the purpose of discharging the local authority's duty to promote the educational achievement of its looked after children, wherever they live or are educated. That person, the Virtual School Head (VSH) must be an officer employed by the authority or another local authority in England.

1.2. The Children and Social Work Act 2017 expands the remit of VSHs to include the promotion of educational achievement of adopted children in England and children subject to Special Guardianship Orders.

2. **Nottingham City Virtual School**

2.1. The Nottingham City Virtual School staffing consists of:

Virtual School Head- responsible and accountable for providing leadership, management and development for all aspects of the Virtual School. Ensuring fulfilment of the local authority's statutory duties regarding the education of children in care and previously looked after children.

Virtual School Team Manager- supports the Virtual School Head to provide effective leadership, management and development of the Virtual School. The Team Manager has oversight of cases and provides case supervision to the Education Support Officers within the Virtual School, advising on educational interventions and targeted casework as appropriate.

Education Support Officers x 5.5 fte equivalent- provides advice, support and training to key stakeholders in respect to the education of children care and previously looked after children. They have an allocation of children in care cases and are responsible for monitoring and tracking their educational outcomes. Education Support Officers attend and

contribute to PEP meetings, re-integration meetings and exclusion meetings in respect to children in care.

Business Support administrators x2- responsible for all administrative tasks relating to the Virtual School, including maintenance of the virtual school information management systems and support with monitoring and reporting on attendance and attainment information and Personal Education Plans.

Data support officer- responsible for developing and maintaining the Virtual School's information management systems, as well as tracking and reporting on attendance, achievement and progress of the authority's children in care.

3. **Expenditure 2019-20 (DSG grant):**

Virtual School income and expenditure 2019-20				
Detail	£m	£m	£m	Description
<u>Income</u>				
DSG Income		-0.470		Government grant for duties associated with previously looked after children
PLAC Grant		-0.049		
Total Income			-0.519	
Staff costs			0.413	
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, CPD and Conferences	0.003			Tuition and AP costs
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.002			
Designated Teacher Training, network and support costs	0.003			
Children intervention funding			0.120	
Total non-pay costs			0.128	
Total expenditure			0.543	

Recouped from PPP		-0.022	
Net surplus			0.000

4. **Projected expenditure 2020-21:**

Virtual School projected income and expenditure 2020-21				
Detail	£m	£m	£m	Description
<u>Income</u>				
DSG Income		-0.470		
PLAC Grant		-0.049		
Total Income			-0.519	
Staff costs			0.415	
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, CPD and Conferences	0.003			
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.002			
Children intervention funding		0.080		Tuition and AP costs- any further expenditure funded through PPP.
In year saving requirement		0.094		
Total non-pay costs			0.179	
Total expenditure			0.594	
Recoup funding from PPP			- 0.075	Contribution from PPP budget for costs of intervention for children
Net Position			0.000	

5. **Projected expenditure 2021-22**

Virtual School projected income and expenditure 2021-22				
Detail	£m	£m	£m	Description
<u>Income</u>				
DSG Income			-0.376	
PLAC Grant		-0.049		
Total Income			-0.425	
Staffing costs			0.436	
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, CPD and Conferences	0.003			
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.002			
Designated Teacher Training, network and support costs	0.003			
Children intervention funding		0.070		Tuition and AP costs.
Total non-pay costs		0.078		
Total expenditure			0.514	
Recoup funding from PPP		0.089		Contribution from PPP budget for costs of intervention for children and staffing.
Net Position			0.000	

6. **Pupil Premium Plus Funding**

- 6.1. The Pupil Premium Plus grant is funding provided by the Department for Education to the Virtual School to manage, and must be used for the benefit of the looked after child's educational needs.
- 6.2. The Virtual School receives an allocation of £2,300 per child looked after for at least one day, as recorded in the previous March children looked-after data return.
- 6.3. In the 2019-20 financial year the Virtual School managed the Pupil Premium Plus through an application process; schools were required to apply for the funding termly using an online form. If funding over and above the termly allocation was required schools could apply for additional funds through a brief online form, approval was subject to the amount of funding remaining.
- 6.4. Following consultation with schools at the end of the 2019-20 financial year, the process for managing and allocating PPP changed; from April 2020 all schools with a Nottingham City child in care on their role would automatically receive £500 per term to support the costs of educational interventions for individual children in care. The opportunity for schools to apply for additional funding remains.
- 6.5. The new PPP allocation arrangements from April 2020 constitutes a 'top slice' from the Virtual School of £800 per child in care. The top sliced funding will be used to fund requests from schools for additional funding, direct educational interventions (tuition, AP costs etc), the ePEP portal and attendance collection service and a contribution towards the Virtual School staffing costs.
- 6.6. The table below provides detail of the Pupil Premium Plus expenditure in the 2019-20 financial year:

Annual Pupil Premium Plus budget for financial year 2019/2020	£1,030,400
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

Breakdown of Expenditure	Amount £
Pupil Premium Plus applications (includes summer, autumn and spring term requests, plus applications for extra funding)	716,072
Attendance at Alternative Providers - costs met by Virtual School	167,291
Laptops for children in care	4,950
Chrome Books for children in care	2,400
Nottingham City Education Psychology Service support	3,855
Virtual School Staff training costs	325
National Association of Virtual School Heads - annual subscription	500
Welfare Call Ltd annual contract (attainment, attendance data collection)	27,300
Welfare Call Ltd annual contract (ePEP)	18,191
SIMS annual contract	5,019
Unlock	29,712
Big It Up Virtual School's contribution	10,000
DSG budget contribution - various children in care interventions	22,468
Virtual School Team premises rental	5,057
Contribution to Fair Access for the provision of education for children in care	17,260
Total	1,030,400

Home to school travel assistance
for children and young people
with SEND

Legislation

- S508B of the Act deals with the duty on local authorities to make such travel arrangements as they consider necessary to facilitate attendance at school for eligible children – children of compulsory school age (5-16) in an authority's area for whom free travel arrangements will be required
- The Council has a statutory duty under Section 10 of the Education and Skills Act to exercise its functions so as to promote the effective participation in education or training of persons belonging to its area with a view to ensuring that those persons participate in appropriate full-time education or training or an apprenticeship
- The Council also has a statutory duty to publish a Post 16 Transport Policy statement every year. This statement sets out the arrangements for the provision of transport or otherwise that the authority considers it necessary to make for facilitating the attendance of persons of sixth form age

Criteria for travel assistance

There are four main factors which may determine if children and young people are eligible for travel assistance:

- Statutory walking distance eligibility
- SEND or significant mobility difficulties eligibility
- Unsafe walking route eligibility
- Extended rights eligibility

In addition for exceptional cases the Council can consider a decision outside of it's policy e.g. child with disabilities whose family have fled domestic violence but child continues to attend the same school for a period of time

Nottingham City Context

During the 19/20 financial year 442 young people were provided with travel assistance to schools and post 16 settings

345 to special schools

42 to mainstream schools and focus provision

53 to colleges of further education

9 to specialist independent college settings

£2.8 million spend in 19/20 financial year

Actions being taken to drive down costs

- Continuation of drive to cost reduction/maintenance using the Dynamic Purchasing System for procurement of minibuses and taxis
- New policy in place – where possible children and vulnerable adults travelling together
- Contribution from parents towards cost of post 16 transport
- Sustained work around Independent Travel Training
- Optimisation and review of routes – business as usual
- Robust travel assistance assessment for new applicants
- New appeals process in development

VFM – comparison with statistical Neighbours

Nottingham has the 3rd lowest spend per head of population for 5-16 transport

Nottingham £48

Highest £101

Median £60

Nottingham has the 4th lowest spend per head of population for post 16 transport

Nottingham £11

Highest £58

Median £28

VFM – continued

The provision of SEND home to school transport significantly drives down additional costs to the school budget through ensuring we meet the needs of young people with SEND in the City and avoids placing in costly non maintained and Independent provision. Benchmarking 19/20 data in relation to our expenditure per head of the 2-19 population on non maintained/independent provision shows:

- Nottingham spend per head at £23 is the lowest of all statistical neighbours
- Compares to a national average of £91 per head
- Compares to an average for our 10 statistical neighbours of £76.50 per head
- Compares very favourably with geographical neighbours – Nottinghamshire £67, Leicestershire £171 and £153

Impact of Covid 19

- Shortage of drivers and escorts as people are asked to self-isolate
- Significant numbers of drivers and escorts in clinically vulnerable groups
- Companies not taking on additional work due to staffing capacity issues
- Schools and parents anxious about young people undertaking independent travel training and using public transport resulting in fewer young people being trained
- Fewer young people travelling on vehicles to try to keep them in 'bubbles' wherever possible – this has resulted in more vehicles being commissioned at additional cost

APPENDIX F

Analysis of Historic Commitments 2019/20 to 2021/22

HISTORIC COMMITMENTS	2019/20				2020/21				2021/22
	Budget Approved by Schools Forum/Included in School Budget Report £m	Budget Latest £m	Outturn £m	Variance - Over/ (Under) budget £m	Budget Approved by Schools Forum/Included in School Budget Report £m	Budget Latest £m	Forecast £m	Variance - Over/ (Under) budget £m	Proposed Budget
Termination of Employment Costs	1.609	1.609	1.609	0.000	1.609	1.609	1.609	0.000	1.609
Capital Expenditure from Revenue Accounts	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.000	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.000	0.173
Prudential borrowing costs	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.000	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.000	0.238
Combined Services - Family Support	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.000	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.000	
Combined Services - Integrated placements	1.327	1.327	1.327	0.000	1.327	1.327	1.327	0.000	1.127
Combined Services - Serving Vulnerable Groups - Looked After Children	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.000	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.000	0.376
Combined Services - Safeguarding Training	0.109	0.109	0.109	0.000	0.109	0.109	0.109	0.000	0.109

SEN Transport	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000
TOTAL	6.579	6.579	6.579	0.000	6.571*	6.571	6.571	0.000	4.632

* Budget approved by Schools Forum before the reduction in historical commitments funding was announced by the Education, Skills Funding Agency. The shortfall in funding £1.060m funded from the Statutory School Reserve in 2020/21 only.