

Schools Forum - 7 December 2021

Title of paper:	Central Expenditure Budget 2022/23 – Historic Commitments
Corporate Directors:	Catherine Underwood, Corporate Director for People Clive Heaphy, Corporate Director for Finance and Resources
Report author and contact details:	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance, 01158 764 128 ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Sophie Russell, Head of Strategy and Improvement, Children's Integrated Services, 0115 8763423 sophie.russell@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, 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 report requests approval of the historic commitments within the CSSB for the financial year 2022/23.

The central expenditure for “Ongoing Commitments” proposals are included in a separate report to Schools Forum (SF) on 7 December 2021.

Approval is also being sought for the allocation of funding for SEN Transport in the financial year 2022/23. 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.

The supporting documentation is included in **Appendix A to D**.

Recommendation:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | Approve historic commitments set out in Table 3 totalling £3.905m for the financial year 2022/23, noting the additional historical detail set out in Appendices A to D . |
|----------|--|

1. Reasons for recommendation

- 1.1 Under the Schools & Early Years Financial Regulations 2021 and the Schools Revenue Funding Guidance Operational Guide issued in July 2021, SF approval is required for individual central expenditure items in the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB).
- 1.2 On 19 July 2021 the ESFA released the illustrative funding allocations for the financial year 2022/23.

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 2022/23 which also happened in the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22. **Table 1 shows the total funding reduction to date is £2.694m.**

TABLE 1: MOVEMENT IN HISTORICAL COMMITMENTS FUNDING		
Financial Year	Funding allocated to LA £m	Movement in funding year on year £m
2019/20	5.571	
2020/21	4.539	-£1.060
2021/22	3.631	-£0.907
2022/23	2.905	-£0.727
TOTAL REDUCTION TO DATE		-£2.694

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.

- 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 attached **appendices A to C** provide a financial overview of the service, how the funding is allocated to the service and areas of delivery.

2. Background (including outcomes of consultation)

- 2.1 **Table 2** shows the movement in funding allocations within the new values issued. The changes have been based on:
 - 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

	Budget 2021/22 £m	Budget 2022/23 £m	Variance £m
Historic commitments in the CSSB			
Integrated placements – Appendix A	1.127	0.667	-0.460
Safeguarding Training	0.109	-	-0.109
Virtual School – Appendix B	0.376	0.301	-0.075
Termination of employment costs – costs exceed budget but unable to increase in accordance with guidance	1.609	1.609	-
Capital expenditure in revenue accounts	0.173	0.173	-
Prudential borrowing	0.238	0.155	-0.083
Historic commitments in the CSSB Total	3.632	2.905	-0.727
Historic commitments in the High Needs Block			
SEN Transport – Appendix C	1.000	1.000	-
Total Historic Commitments	4.632	3.905	-0.727

In order to be able to set a balanced budget within the historic commitments funding envelope in 2022/23 the LA has adjusted the integrated placements contribution £1.127m to £0.667m, however, the costs will not disappear and this **shortfall in funding presents a budget pressure for the LA to mitigate.**

The Safeguarding training budget has been removed in 2022/23. This loss of income is forecast to be met by income generated by the service. **If the income target is not achieved the shortfall is a risk to the LA.**

The Virtual School has also had its funding reduced by 20% from £0.376m to £0.301m. 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 termination of employment costs and the capital expenditure in revenue accounts has also remained the same.

- 2.2 The supporting information in relation to the above budgets in **Table 2** are shown in appendices A to C.

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 2022/23 Schools Budget, enabling updated schools budgets to be issued to schools within the statutory deadline of the 28 February 2022.

5. Consideration of Risk

- 5.1 The forecast reduction in historical commitments has been built into the LA's Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). If the DfE were to increase the cuts placed on LA's who are in receipt of historical commitments funding from the current 20%, the MTFP would need to be updated to reflect this change. The additional budget pressure would remain with the LA.

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

- 6.1 This report has been prepared in accordance with the financial regulations issued by the DfE for the financial year 2021/22 and the Schools revenue and funding 2022/23 - operational guidance – July 2021 issued by the ESFA and forms part of the DSG budget.
- 6.2 The Central School Services Block (CSSB) is made up of two categories of funding:
- Historic commitments and
 - Ongoing commitments

Noted in Table 3 are the budgets which are funded from the CSSB.

Table 3 : 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

- 6.3 The items seeking approval in this report are for Historic commitments in the financial year 2022/23 and the detail supporting the values are shown in **Table 3**.

TABLE 4: CENTRAL EXPENDITURE - APPROVALS REQUIRED

Service Description	2022/23 £m	Narrative
HISTORIC COMMITMENTS – CENTRAL SCHOOLS SERVICES BLOCK		
1. Contribution to combined budgets	0.968	Family support No longer applicable
		£0.667m – Integrated placements See Appendix A
		Safeguarding Training No longer applicable
		£0.301m – Virtual School See Appendix B
2.Termination of Employment Costs	1.609	This budget is used to pay for ongoing pension and redundancy from historic restructures pre 1st April 2013. 2021/22 commitments are estimated at c.£1.702m. It is anticipated that these costs will reduce over time. Detailed information on the termination of employment costs cannot be included due to data protection confidentiality.

SUB-TOTAL	1.000	
GRAND TOTAL FOR HISTORIC COMMITMENTS	3.905	

- 6.4 **Appendix E** shows the values of these items compared to previous years' budgets and actuals.
- 6.5 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).

7. Legal colleague comments

- 7.1 The current law in force in this area is the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2021. However, these regulations apply for the financial year starting 1 April 2021 only and are updated annually. However, it will be necessary to review these proposals once 2022 regulations have been produced.

Aman Patel, Solicitor
Email: aman.patel@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
8 November 2021

8. Other relevant comments

- 8.1 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. It is to be noted that there is a termination of employment costs factored into this report.

Rachael Morris, HR Business Lead, People
Email: rachael.morris@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
9 November 2021

9. Crime and Disorder Implications (If Applicable)

9.1

10. Social value considerations (If Applicable)

10.1

11. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

11.1 No

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

Yes

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

12. Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)

12.1 Has the data protection impact of the proposals in this report been assessed?

No

A DPIA is not required because:

(Please explain why a DPIA is not necessary)

Yes

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

13. Carbon Impact Assessment (CIA)

13.1 Has the Carbon impact of the proposals in this report been assessed?

No

A CPIA is not required because:

(Please explain why a CPIA is not necessary)

Yes

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

14. List of background papers relied upon in writing this report (not including published documents or confidential or exempt information)

15. Published documents referred to in this report

15.1 ESFA – Schools Revenue Funding 2022/23 Operational guide July 2021

15.2 DfE Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2021

APPENDIX A

Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Contribution Impact Statement September 2021

Schools Forum contribution underpins placement for children in care (CiC). Current numbers of CiC are 699 (as of 15.11.21).

Overview of the Services: CiC Placements

	Sept 2020	Sept 2021
Total Budget:	£33.421m	£44.088m
Other Contributions Excluding DSG:	Forecast @ Pd6 2020/21 £2.170m UASC under 18s / Care Leavers Grant £1.485m Health Contribution £0.205m SEN Contribution £0.220m Staying Put £0.073m New Burdens £0.353m Remand Grant £0.693m Priority Families Total £5.199m	Forecast @ Pd6 21/22 £2.013m USAC under 18s / Care Leavers Grant £1.191m Health Income £0.205m SEN Contribution £0.220m Staying Put £0.098m New Burdens £0.420m Remand Grant £0.693m Priority Families Total £4.840m
Number of Children Supported:	676 (as at 30th September 2020)	689 as at 30 th September 2021

Funding Allocation:

Area	Intervention/Support	Reach
Placements (Internal and External)	Internal Placements – Foster Care or Internal Residential Provision External Placements – External Residential or Independent Fostering Association. All carers are commissioned to support the educational outcomes for children in their care including but not limited to: <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 	699 (Nov 2021) versus 676 (Sept 2020)

	<p>attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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	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). These services	Capacity to work 75 families per year (multiple children)

	<p>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.</p> <p>We also have an Edge of Care Hub, which 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>The approved 2021/22 gross budget for MST, MST-CAN and Edge of care services is £0.895m</p>	
--	---	--

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.

For attainment, attendance and exclusion data for CiC, please see the more detailed report from the Virtual School.

In relation to broader outcomes, see detailed measures and comparator information below.

SSDA903 Children looked after return results

	England	SNs	East Midlands					SNG Comparison	
			2019-20		Good is	2018-19	2019-20		
			2019-20	2019-20	2019-20	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	
Children looked after at 31 March									
	England	SNs	East Midlands						
	2019-20	2019-20	2019-20	Good is	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		
LAC at 31 March	80,080	849	6,010	Lower	629	656	685	↑	
LAC at 31 March per 10,000	67	98	61	Lower	92.0	95.0	99.2	↑	
Care Leavers - status on their 19th to 21st birthday									
	England	SNs	East	Good is	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		
	2019-20	2019-20	2019-20	2018-19	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		
Having a birthday in the year (excludes those who have subsequently died or returned home for 6 months)					239	246	284	↑	
In education, employment or training	53%	54%	50%	High	54.0%	63.0%	63.0%	—	
Care Leavers in suitable accommodation (excluding 'gone abroad', 'deported' and 'residence not known')	85%	85%	87%	High	89.0%	90.0%	90.3%	↑	
Outcomes for children looked after									
Offending									
Convicted or subject to a final warning or reprimand during the year (10 and above)	3%	4%	3%	Low	3.0%	4.0%	2.0%	↓	
Substance misuse									
Identified as having a substance misuse problem during the year	3%	3%	2%	Low	4.0%	4.0%	5.6%	↑	
Healthcare (for those in care 12 months on 31 March)									
Number of children whose immunisations were up to date	88%	87%	92%	High	96.0%	96.0%	93.8%	↓	
Number of children who had their teeth checked by a dentist	86%	85%	88%	High	93.0%	93.0%	52.9%	↓	
Number of children who had their annual health assessment	90%	92%	92%	High	94.0%	94.0%	87.6%	↓	
Number of these children whose development assessments were up to date (LAC 12+ months and aged 5 or younger at 31 March)	88%	85%	94%	High	100.0%	100.0%	91.8%	↓	
Strengths and difficulties questionnaire									
Children looked after for at least 12 months aged 4 to 16 with an SDQ score	81%	79%	88%	High	79.0%	85.0%	76.8%	↓	
Average score per child	14	14	15	Low	15.5	15.0	14.4	↓	
Banded "Normal"	49%	51%	49%		40.0%	43.0%	46.3%	↑	
Banded "Borderline"	13%	13%	12%	Lower	12.0%	14.0%	10.7%	↓	
Banded "Cause for Concern"	38%	35%	40%	Low	48.0%	43.0%	43.1%	↑	



Case Study

- Jaydon, male 14 years old (name changed to protect anonymity)
- Living with his Grandmother under an Special Guardianship Order for the last four years, along with his 10 year old brother
- Historical exposure to Domestic violence and Neglect
- Problems started just Jaydon learnt that his father had been deported from the country
- Estimated care costs at Edge of Care panel of £2500 a week for Internal Residential placement
(total of £55 000 over 22 week intervention)



Referral Behaviours

- Several fixed term **exclusions from school** for disruptive behaviour, bringing in cannabis, fighting, internal truancy. Reported to be on his last chance before permanent exclusion
- **Aggressive outbursts at home**, shouting, swearing, and hitting his grandmother, smashing doors and door frames, with episodes ending with Jaydon getting into a cupboard curled up and rocking
- **Staying out late** in the evening with his friends, including presenting at hospital with a broken collar bone after reportedly fighting with friends
- **Smoking cannabis daily**

The Intervention

- The therapist worked with Jaydon and his grandmother in the home, via telephone calls and Microsoft teams as well as contact with school
- The work focused on improving communication between grandmother and Jaydon
- Recognising triggers that led to aggressive outbursts
- Building on both their strengths; they shared a similar sense of humour and wanted to get along
- Jaydon was responsive to incentives, such as money and food and grandmother liked doing things such as cooking for him
- Started some work towards abstinence from cannabis, introducing the use of drug testing. This opened conversation up between grandmother and Jaydon about drug use, and they ultimately agreed he would work towards a reduction plan.

Feedback from the family

What changes have you seen?

- He turned things around at school, attending throughout lockdown and earned a 'Student of the Year' award
- He is more willing to do his tasks before going out
- He engages in conversation with me
- He is smoking cannabis less
- He has now got a place at college for next year

APPENDIX B

Report to Schools Forum **Nottingham City Virtual School** **November 2021**

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.
- 1.3. From September 2021 all Virtual School Heads received additional duties as a strategic leader for children who currently and previously had a social worker. This new duty is currently non-statutory and is in addition to the existing statutory duties of Virtual School Heads.

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 x2- supports the Virtual School Head to provide effective leadership, management and development of the Virtual School. The Team Managers have 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. In September 2021 an additional Team Manager (on a temporary fixed term contract until March 2022) was appointed to ensure capacity in meeting the additional duties relating to children with a social worker.

Education Support Officers x 5.5 fte equivalent- provide 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. Income and Expenditure 2020-21 (DSG grant):

Virtual School income and expenditure 2020-21				
Detail	£m	£m	£m	Description
Income				
DSG Income		-0.470		
PLAC Grant		-0.049		
PLAC Grant 2019/20 brought forward		-0.026		Government grant for duties associated with previously looked after children.
PLAC Grant 2020/21 to be carried forward		0.015		
*PPP Contribution		-0.345		Contribution from PPPG to cover costs for tuition, AP provision and staffing.
Total Income			-0.875	
Staff costs			0.464	
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, recruitment expenses, CPD and Conferences	0.001			
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.003			
Children intervention funding		0.113		Tuition and AP costs
Loxley House Rent	0.033			
Total non-pay costs			0.150	
Total expenditure			0.614	
*Net surplus			-0.261	

On the 8th October 2019 Schools Forum approved the allocation of £0.470m to the Virtual School for the financial year 2020/21. By maximising the Pupil Premium Plus Grant (PPPG) in year to fund legitimate costs, those noted above*, resulted in the Virtual School being underspent by £0.261m. This underspend was returned to the Statutory School Reserve.

4. **DSG Projected income and 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		
PLAC Grant 2020/21 brought forward		-0.015		Government grant for duties associated with previously looked after children
PPP Contribution		-0.150		Reduced this year, as children return anticipate higher number of requests for PPP.
Total Income		-0.590		
Staff costs		0.498		
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, recruitment expenses, CPD and Conferences	0.003			
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.004			
Children intervention funding		0.052		Tuition and AP costs- any further expenditure funded through PPP.
Loxley House Rent		0.033		
Total non-pay costs		0.092		
Total expenditure		0.590		
Net Position		0.000		

5. DSG Projected income and expenditure 2022-23:

Virtual School projected income and expenditure 2022-23				
Detail	£m	£m	£m	Description
Income				
DSG Income		-0.301		
PLAC Grant		-0.049		
PPP Contribution		-0.181		
Total Income			-0.531	
Staff costs			0.507	This increase is due to the previous ESO remaining in role as the Team Manager for the 2022-23 financial year
Non-pay costs				
Staff Travel, recruitment expenses, CPD and Conferences	0.002			
Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.	0.002			This expense reduced by 2k this year; most equipment and resources to support staff working from home has been purchased.
Children intervention funding		0.020		This expense is forecasted to be reduced this year. Most funding for AP provision and tuition to come directly from PPP.
Loxley House Rent		0.000		We are currently querying the contribution we make to Loxley House rent now the majority of the team are working from home. Costs agreed may need to come from PPP.
Total non-pay costs			0.024	
Total expenditure			0.531	
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 £2,345 per child looked after for at least one day, as recorded in the previous March children looked-after data return.
- 6.3. The Virtual School manage the Pupil Premium Plus through the ePEP portal; schools submit requests for funding each term at the same time as reviewing and updating the children's individual Personal Education Plan (PEP).
- 6.4. The table below provides detail of the Pupil Premium Plus expenditure in the **2020-21** financial year:

<u>Pupil Premium Budget</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Termly PPP and AFRs	487,857
Education provision including Alternative Provision	66,511
Laptops for pupils	25,301
Big It Up Contribution	0
Education Psychology	3,675
Evolve mentoring project	21,000
Peer Review	2,500
NAVSH subscription	500
Welfare Call contract (statutory school age cic attendance data collection and ePEP portal)	47,113
SIMS	5,850
Staff training	1,968
Staff travel costs	46
Staffing training - other costs	0
Staff conferences	0
DSG contribution	345,454
Contribution to cost of Alternative Provision	35,325
Contribution to cost of Independent Specialist provision	82,500
Expenditure Total	1,125,600
PPP Income	1,125,600

- 6.5. The table below provides forecasted expenditure of the Pupil Premium Plus budget in the **2022-23** financial year:

PPP planned expenditure	Cost	Comments
Termly allocation to schools Core £500 per pupil/term	£655,500	Based on 437 pupils
Additional Funding Requests	£30,000	Based on requests of £10k per term.
Education provision and tuition	£113,000	Increased by £46k to mitigate the reduction in the DSG budget to contribute to this provision.
Laptops for pupils	£3,000	
Big It Up Contribution	£5,000	(Achievement Ceremony) reduced by £5k.
Reward Vouchers	£1,500	(Termly recognition for achievement)
Education Psychology	£3,675	(Targeted Intervention)
Behaviour Support	£1,900	(Targeted Intervention)
Evolve mentoring	£21,000	(Targeted Intervention)
Therapeutic Mentoring	£8,450	(Targeted Intervention)
Flash Academy	£2,000	(Targeted Intervention)
NIMBL project	£2,000	(Targeted Intervention)
Creative Mentor	£6,000	(Targeted Intervention)
Unlock Project	£15,000	(Targeted Intervention)
NAVSH subscription	£500	
Welfare Call (statutory school age)	47,200	(Attendance monitoring and ePEP)
Welfare Call (Post-16 and Early Years)	£15,000	(Attendance monitoring and ePEP)
SIMS	5,850	
Staff training, CPD	£2,000	
Staff travel costs	£1,000	
DSG contribution	£181,000	
Virtual School Conference	£5,025	
Total expenditure	£1,125,600	
Total Budget	£1,125,600	
Net Position	0	

APPENDIX C

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 are 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 20/21 financial year 501 young people were provided with travel assistance to schools and post 16 settings. This figure is an increase on the previous year as a result of the increasing number of young people with complex SEND, the impact of Covid on children's special educational needs and the inability to deliver travel training during the Covid period.

This is a pattern being seen nationally and has been raised as a concern by Core Cities Finance Group.

£2.720m spend in 2020/21 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
- Proposals to increase the capacity for Independent Travel Training
- Optimisation and review of routes – business as usual
- Robust travel assistance assessment for new applicants
- New appeals process developed and implemented
- Commissioning review with a focus on third sector and community providers

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 and other cost drivers

- Shortage of drivers and escorts as people are asked to self-isolate and a significant number of drivers leaving the sector to retrain as HGV drivers
- Companies not taking on additional work due to staffing capacity issues
- Increase in inflationary costs including staffing and fuel
- Parents and young people continue to be anxious about undertaking independent travel training as a result of Covid
- 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
- More young people are meeting Extended Rights Eligibility as a result of the financial impact on families since the pandemic

APPENDIX D

Analysis of Historic Commitments 2019/20 to 2022/23

HISTORIC COMMITMENTS	2019/20				2020/21				2021/22				2022/23
	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	Outturn	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	
Termination of Employment Costs	1.609	1.609	1.609	0.000	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	0.173	0.173	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	0.238	0.238	0.000	0.155
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	1.127	1.127	0.000	0.667
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	0.376	0.376	0.000	0.301
Combined Services - Safeguarding Training	0.109	0.109	0.109	0.000	0.109	0.109	0.109	0.000	0.109	0.109	0.109	0.000	
SEN Transport	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	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	4.632	4.632	0.000	3.905

* Budget approved by Schools Forum before the reduction in historical commitments funding was announced by the Education, Skills Funding Agency. The shortfall in funding £1.059m funded from the Statutory School Reserve in 2020/21 only.