

## Schools Forum – 6 December 2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Title of paper:</b>   | Central Expenditure Budget 2023/24 – Historic Commitments   |
| <b>Corporate Directors:</b>  | Catherine Underwood - People<br>Clive Heaphy - Finance and Resources  |
| <b>Report author and contact details:</b>  | Paul Stevenson, Interim Strategic Business Partner – Children’s Services and Education<br>01158 764 874<br><a href="mailto:paul.stevenson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk">paul.stevenson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</a>   |
| <b>Other colleagues who have provided input:</b>   | Sam Morris, Head of Children’s Strategy and Improvement<br>Jasmin Howell, Service Manager - Virtual School<br>Janine Walker, Head of SEND & vulnerable pupils<br>Julia Holmes, Senior Commercial Business Partner<br>Majid Iqbal, Senior Solicitor, Legal Services<br>Rachael Morris, HR Business Lead (People’s) |
| <b>Summary</b>   |   |
| <p>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.</p> <p>This report requests approval of the historic commitments within the CSSB for the financial year 2023/24.</p> <p>The central expenditure for “Ongoing Commitments” proposals are included in a separate report to Schools Forum (SF) on 6 December 2022.</p> <p>Approval is also being sought for the allocation of funding for SEN Transport in the financial year 2023/24. 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.</p> <p>The supporting documentation is included in Appendices A to D.</p> |   |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>   |   |
| <b>1</b>   | To approve the historic commitments set out in Table 4 totalling £3.324m for the financial year 2023/24, noting the additional historical detail set out in Appendices A to D.  |

### 1. Reasons for recommendations

- 1.1 Under the Schools & Early Years Financial Regulations 2022 and the Schools Operational Guide issued in July 2022, SF approval is required for individual central expenditure items in the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB).
- 1.2 On 19 July 2022 the ESFA released the illustrative funding allocations for the financial year 2023/24.

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 2023/24 which also happened in the financial years 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23. **Table 1** shows the total funding reduction to date is £3.275m.

| <b>TABLE 1: MOVEMENT IN HISTORICAL COMMITMENTS FUNDING</b> |                                   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Financial Year</b>                                      | <b>Funding allocated to LA £m</b> | <b>Movement in funding year on year £m</b> |
| 2019/20  | £5.571                            |  |
| 2020/21  | £4.539                            | -£1.060                                    |
| 2021/22  | £3.631                            | -£0.907                                    |
| 2022/23  | £2.905                            | -£0.727                                    |
| 2023/24  | £2.324                            | -£0.581                                    |
| <b>TOTAL REDUCTION TO DATE</b>                             |                                   | <b>-£3.275</b>                             |

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

| <b>Table 2: Comparison of 2022/23 historic commitments to proposed commitments for 2023/24</b>           |                          |                          |                    |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
|  | <b>Budget 2022/23 £m</b> | <b>Budget 2023/24 £m</b> | <b>Variance £m</b> |
| <b>Historic commitments in the CSSB</b>  |                          |                          |                    |
| Integrated placements – <b>Appendix A</b>  | 0.667                    | 0.247                    | -0.420             |
| Virtual School – <b>Appendix B</b>   | 0.301                    | 0.241                    | -0.060             |
| 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   | 0.155                    | 0.054                    | -0.101             |

|   |              |              |               |
|---|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| <b>Historic commitments in the CSSB Total</b>       | <b>2.905</b> | <b>2.324</b> | <b>-0.581</b> |
| <b>Historic commitments in the High Needs Block</b> |              |              |               |
| SEN Transport – <b>Appendix C</b>                   | 1.000        | 1.000        | -             |
| <b>Total Historic Commitments</b>                   | <b>3.905</b> | <b>3.324</b> | <b>-0.581</b> |

In order to be able to set a balanced budget within the historic commitments funding envelope in 2023/24 the LA has adjusted the integrated placements contribution £0.667m to £0.247m, however, the costs will not disappear and this shortfall in funding presents a budget pressure for the LA to mitigate.

The Virtual School has also had its funding reduced by 20% from £0.301m to £0.241m. 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.

The prudential borrowing payments fall in 2023/24 to £0.054m from £0.155m in 2022/23. This funding requirement will remain at £0.054m until 2052/53 when the repayments will end.

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 2023/24 Schools Budget, enabling updated schools budgets to be issued to schools within the statutory deadline of the 28 February 2023.

### 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 2022/23 and the Schools operational guide 2023 to 2024 – 13 October 2022 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.

| <b>Table 3 : Central Schools Services Block Budgets</b> |                       |                   |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Commitment</b>                                       | <b>Classification</b> | <b>2023/24 £m</b> |
| CERA  | Historic commitment   | 0.173             |
| Prudential borrowing                                    | Historic commitment   | 0.054             |
| Termination of employment costs                         | Historic commitment   | 1.609             |
| Contribution to combined budgets                        | Historic commitment   | 0.488             |
| 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 the historic commitments in the financial year 2023/24. **Table 3** summaries the historic commitments in the CSSB and these total £2.324m. In addition, the SEN Transport budget of £1m is also classed as a historic commitment but this has to be funded from the High Needs Block. As this budget is also classed as a historic commitment it also requires Schools Forums approval. As per **recommendation 1** of this report the Authority is seeking approval of £3.324m for historical commitments in the financial year 2023/24. The detail supporting the values are shown in **Table 4**.

**TABLE 4: CENTRAL EXPENDITURE - APPROVALS REQUIRED**

| Service Description  | 2023/24<br>£m | Narrative  |
|--|---------------|--|
| <b>HISTORIC COMMITMENTS – CENTRAL SCHOOLS SERVICES BLOCK</b> |               |  |
| <b>1. Contribution to combined budgets</b>                   | 0.488         | Family support<br><br>No longer applicable                   |
|  |               | £0.247m – Integrated placements<br><br>See <b>Appendix A</b> |
|  |               | Safeguarding Training<br><br>No longer applicable            |
|  |               | £0.241m – Virtual School<br><br>See <b>Appendix B</b>        |
|  |               | <b>2. Termination of Employment Costs</b>                    |

| <b>3. Prudential Borrowing</b>   | 0.054        | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Scheme</b></th> <th><b>Loan Value<br/>£m</b></th> <th><b>2019/20<br/>£m</b></th> <th><b>2020/21<br/>£m</b></th> <th><b>2021/22<br/>£m</b></th> <th><b>2022/23<br/>£m</b></th> <th><b>2023/24<br/>to<br/>2052/53<br/>£m</b></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><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>4.113</b></td> <td><b>0.283</b></td> <td><b>0.274</b></td> <td><b>0.238</b></td> <td><b>0.155</b></td> <td><b>0.054</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Scheme</b>            | <b>Loan Value<br/>£m</b> | <b>2019/20<br/>£m</b> | <b>2020/21<br/>£m</b> | <b>2021/22<br/>£m</b> | <b>2022/23<br/>£m</b>                    | <b>2023/24<br/>to<br/>2052/53<br/>£m</b> | 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 | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>4.113</b> | <b>0.283</b> | <b>0.274</b> | <b>0.238</b> | <b>0.155</b> | <b>0.054</b> |
|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---------------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|---|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|  |              | <b>Scheme</b>  | <b>Loan Value<br/>£m</b> | <b>2019/20<br/>£m</b>    | <b>2020/21<br/>£m</b> | <b>2021/22<br/>£m</b> | <b>2022/23<br/>£m</b> | <b>2023/24<br/>to<br/>2052/53<br/>£m</b> |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
|  |              | 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                                    |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>4.113</b> | <b>0.283</b>   | <b>0.274</b>             | <b>0.238</b>             | <b>0.155</b>          | <b>0.054</b>          |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <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> |              |  |                          |                          |                       |                       |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <b>4. Capital Expenditure from Revenue Accounts</b>  | 0.173        | 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.  |                          |                          |                       |                       |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>   | <b>2.324</b> |  |                          |                          |                       |                       |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <b>HISTORIC COMMITMENTS – HIGH NEEDS BLOCK</b>   |              |  |                          |                          |                       |                       |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| <b>1. SEN Transport</b>  | 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.   |                          |                          |                       |                       |                       |  |  |               |       |       |       |   |   |   |           |       |       |       |       |   |   |               |       |       |       |       |       |   |                   |       |       |       |       |       |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |   |                |       |       |       |       |       |   |                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |

|   |              |  |
|---|--------------|--|
| <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>                                    | <b>1.000</b> |  |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL<br/>FOR HISTORIC<br/>COMMITMENTS</b> | <b>3.324</b> |  |

- 6.4 **Appendix D** 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 2023/24 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 2022. These Regulations make provision for local authorities' financial arrangements in relation to the funding of maintained schools and providers of funded early years provision in England, for the financial year 2022-2023.
- 7.2 These Regulations define the non-schools education budget (regulation 4 and Schedule 1), the schools budget (regulation 6 and Schedule 2), central expenditure and the individual schools budget (regulation 8 and Schedule 2). They require local authorities to determine budget shares for schools maintained by them and amounts to be allocated in respect of early years provision in their areas, in accordance with the appropriate formulae (regulations 10 and 11). They impose a minimum per pupil amount (regulation 22) and a minimum funding guarantee for schools (regulation 23 and Schedule 4). There is a requirement to pass 95 per cent of funding to early years providers (regulation 24) and a ten per cent limit on the amount of funding that may be attributable to the discretionary (supplementary) part of the early years formulae (regulation 25). There are also requirements in relation to local authorities' schemes (regulation 32 and Schedule 5). Regulation 19 makes provision in the event that a school enters into a Risk Protection Arrangement.
- 7.3 The LA must ensure that it complies with its obligations in accordance with these regulations.

Majid Iqbal, Team Leader and Solicitor for Litigation - 21 November 2022.

## 8. **Other relevant comments**

### 8.1 **Human Resources**

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 resources perspective 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 are employment termination costs factored into this report.

Rachael Morris, HR Business Lead, People – 17 November 2022

## 9. **Crime and Disorder Implications (If Applicable)**

9.1 N/A

**10. Social value considerations (If Applicable)**

10.1 N/A

**11. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

11.1 An EIA is not required.

**12. Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)**

12.1 A DPIA is not required.

**13. Carbon Impact Assessment (CIA)**

13.1 A CIA is not required.

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

14.1 None.

**15. Published documents referred to in this report**

15.1 ESFA – Schools operational guide October 2022

15.2 DfE Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2022

## Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Contribution Impact Statement September 2022

Schools Forum contribution underpins placement for children in care (CiC). Current numbers of CiC are 738 (head count as of 03.11.2022).

### Overview of the Services: CiC Placements

|   | Sept 2021  | Sept 2022  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Total Budget:</b>                      | £44.088m   | £52.906m   |
| <b>Other Contributions Excluding DSG:</b> | <b>Forecast @ Pd6 21/22</b><br>£2.013m USAC under 18s / Care Leavers Grant<br>£1.191m Health Income<br>£0.205m SEN Contribution<br>£0.220m Staying Put<br>£0.098m New Burdens<br>£0.420m Remand Grant<br>£0.693m Priority Families<br><br><b>Total £4.840m</b> | <b>Forecast @ Pd6 22/23</b><br>£2.240m USAC under 18s / Care Leavers Grant<br>£1.384m Health Income<br>£0.266m SEN Contribution<br>£0.242m Staying Put<br><br>£0.452m Remand Grant<br><br><b>Total £4.584m</b> |
| <b>Number of Children Supported:</b>      | 689 as at 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2021  | 733 as at 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2022  |

### Funding Allocation:

| Area                               | Intervention/Support   | Reach                                |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Placements (Internal and External) | Internal Placements – Foster Care or Internal Residential Provision<br><br>External Placements – External Residential or Independent Fostering Association.<br><br>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"> <li>• Encouraging and enabling children and young people to achieve their academic potential and promote study and learning, in line with national guidance</li> <li>• Working in line with individual care plans, education health care plans, personal education plans, pathway plan and attend and contribute at all reviews</li> <li>• Supporting the education provision of the child, including all home to school transport, encouragement and clear expectations in relation to attendance</li> </ul> | 738 (Nov 2022) versus 699 (Nov 2021) |

|                                   |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting with homework assignments and extra-curricular activities</li> <li>• Providing school books and educational equipment where required, to supplement learning, for example through home tuition</li> <li>• Supporting and funding day school outings and visits and overnight trips</li> <li>• Attendance at Personal Education Plan (PEP) meetings</li> <li>• Attendance at parents evening, sports days, etc</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Providing access to a computer in the home that is principally for education and homework.</li> <li>• Providing equipment for a disabled child or young person</li> <li>• Maintain all health checks and appointments (dental, opticians, statutory LAC health reviews), which may ultimately reduce the instances of absence due to sickness</li> <li>• Collect and return absconding child or young person to care placement</li> <li>• Take all reasonable steps to avoid the criminalisation of the child and young person</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p>Edge of Care Interventions</p> | <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). 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.</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</p>   | <p>Capacity to work 75 families per year (multiple children)</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>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 2022/23 gross budget for MST, MST-CAN and Edge of care services is £0.897m</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.

#### **Children looked after at 31 March**

|                            | England | SNs     | East Midlands | Good is | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Numerator |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                            | 2020-21 | 2020-21 | 2020-21       |         | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 |           |
| LAC at 31 March            |         |         |               |         | 656     | 685     | 718     |           |
| LAC at 31 March per 10,000 | 67.0    | 96.9    | 64.0          |         | 95.0    | 99.2    | 103.6   | 718       |

## Care Leavers - status on their 19th to 21st birthday

|   | England | SNs | East | Good is | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 |   | Numerator | Denominator |
|---|---------|-----|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|-----------|-------------|
| Having a birthday in the year (excludes those who have subsequently died or returned home for 6 months) |         |     |      |         | 246     | 284     | 289     | ↑ |           |             |
| <b>In education, employment or training</b>   | 52%     | 50% | 55%  | High    | 63.0%   | 63.0%   | 64.4%   | ↑ | 186       | 289         |
| Care Leavers in suitable accommodation (excluding 'gone abroad', 'deported' and 'residence not known')  | 88%     | 85% | 90%  | High    | 90.0%   | 90.0%   | 94.3%   | ↑ | 264       | 280         |

## Outcomes for children looked after

### Offending

|   |    |    |    |     |      |      |      |  |
|---|----|----|----|-----|------|------|------|--|
| Convicted or subject to a final warning or reprimand during the year (10 and above) | 2% | 3% | 3% | Low | 4.0% | 2.0% | 1.1% |  |
|---|----|----|----|-----|------|------|------|--|

### Substance misuse

|   |    |    |    |  |      |      |      |  |
|---|----|----|----|--|------|------|------|--|
| Identified as having a substance misuse problem during the year | 3% | 3% | 3% |  | 4.0% | 6.0% | 1.6% |  |
|---|----|----|----|--|------|------|------|--|

### Healthcare (for those in care 12 months on 31 March)

|   |     |     |     |  |        |       |       |  |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--------|-------|-------|--|
| Number of children whose immunisations were up to date  | 86% | 81% | 86% |  | 96.0%  | 94.0% | 94.0% |  |
| Number of children who had their teeth checked by a dentist   | 40% | 37% | 38% |  | 93.0%  | 53.0% | 82.5% |  |
| Number of children who had their annual health assessment   | 91% | 90% | 85% |  | 94.0%  | 88.0% | 85.1% |  |
| Number of these children whose development assessments were up to date (LAC 12+ months and aged 5 or younger at 31 March) | 89% | 98% | 88% |  | 100.0% | 92.0% | 93.4% |  |

### Strengths and difficulties questionnaire

|   |     |     |     |      |       |       |       |   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Children looked after for at least 12 months aged 4 to 16 with an SDQ score | 80% | 78% | 85% | High | 85.0% | 77.0% | 80.5% | ↑ |
| Average score per child   | 14  | 13  | 14  | Low  | 15.0  | 14.8  | 14.8  |   |
| Banded "Normal"   | 51% | 53% | 47% |      | 43.0% | 46.0% | 41.2% | ↓ |
| Banded "Borderline"   | 12% | 13% | 12% |      | 14.0% | 11.0% | 12.9% | ↑ |
| Banded "Cause for Concern"  | 37% | 34% | 41% | Low  | 43.0% | 43.0% | 45.9% | ↑ |



### Case Study 1

#### Background information (names changed to protect anonymity)

- Martha - an 11-year-old female living with her mother.
- Diagnosis for ADHD and ASD and was on medication for ADHD
- Limited contact with dad, who had previously imprisoned for Actual Bodily Harm against the older sibling. He had also been physically abusive towards Martha.
- Long history of social care and early help involvement. Ongoing concerns that mother struggled to implement and maintain change. Professionals viewed that Martha continued to live in a long-term neglectful environment, where her basic needs were often not met and her additional needs were not met by mum.

#### Problem behaviours:

- School attendance – *arriving late almost every day, often not arriving until 10-11am*  
*She would sit around at home and want to watch TV and refuse to get dressed,*  
*This morning routine could lead to conflict in the home*
- Family conflict – *shouting and swearing at mum.*  
*Physical violence towards mum from hitting and mum hitting back*

#### Engagement / treatment intensity

MST is an intensive intervention; with the therapist visiting the family around 3 or 4 times each week, though contact can be daily during times of need. The team also provides a 24 hour, 7 days a week telephone support for the family.

The therapist was able to engage the family continuously throughout treatment. Over a 16-week treatment period, we completed 45 hours of treatment with sessions in the home and further contact via Microsoft Teams.

#### Summary of work done

- Immediate **safety planning around physical aggression.**  
Practised with mum via role play and included mum using breathing techniques and meditation to help with her regulate her reactions. Mum utilised the telephone on call system to get further support from the team and help her follow the plan.  
Given the safeguarding concerns around mum hitting Martha we worked closely with Social care throughout treatment, sharing updates and safety plans.
- Interventions within MST are based on **collaboration with the parent** or carer, recognising them as the expert on their children, on their family.  
Used sequencing of the stages of physical aggression and identifying early stages where mum was able to intervene breaking the cycle of stubborn refusal and aggression.  
Developed a picture of all the contributing factors to Martha attending school late. Including deficits in the evening and morning routines in the house as well as inconsistency in mum's approaches to challenge the behaviour.
- Therapist and their work supported by **weekly clinical supervision and consultation** with MST expert, supporting development of the conceptualisation of the concerns and planning of interventions in line with the evidenced based MST model

- Use a **strength-based approach** – identifying strengths within the family and the systems around them that can be used as levers for change  
 Planning evening and bedtime routine to promote better sleep throughout the night to minimise impact in the morning.  
 Worked on rule making and the use of incentives to encourage Martha to attend on time. Extensive work to keep these expectations and routines clear and consistent
- The team use a **multi systemic approach**, working across the immediate family, wider family, school, community systems.  
 Work with **wider family**, including Martha’s father as contact was increasing. Looking at his role in changing these behaviours and supporting mum  
**Home-School link**, the working relationship between Marta’s mum and key school personnel was central to the success of the intervention. Identifying the right people in the school system, working through the barriers for the family working with school, looking for common ground, reframing any blaming perspectives and developing plans together

### Outcomes

- Martha was attending school with increasing punctuality, working towards an 8:45am arrival time, saw a significant decrease in unauthorised absences and late marks
- Plans for Martha to progress to mainstream secondary school
- Reduced aggression and conflict at home, mum not using any violence towards Martha
- Mum and dad working together on boundary setting, providing consistent message
- Consistency in approach from mum
- Closure to Social care, stepping down from Child in Need plan within 3 months from end of treatment

### What the therapist had to say:

*“It has been an absolute pleasure to work with this family and see them go through leaps and bounds with intervention ideas and creating more structure and consistent boundaries with Martha. She continues to get into school earlier each week, interactions in the house have significantly improved and there seems to be a better environment at the family home that feels more relaxed.”*

### What mum had to say:

*“I’d like to say that MST have been the best thing for my family as I was really struggling with my daughter and her behaviour to point I’d kinda given up hope so without MST help I don’t know where we would be now.*

*I feel all the help and support and work we have done with MST has made me a better person and a better parent to my daughter and it will help me in the years to come. All the tools and resources I now know and have will make mine and my daughters lives better in the future. Leanne (our therapist) has been the best support and gave me the strength and confidence now to be the best parent and person I can be. I have overcome so much throughout this process and for that, I’ll be forever grateful.*

*I can now see the light at the end of the tunnel. Also now I feel am back in control again.”*

## Case study 2

### Background Information

- Family of 8 with 6 children living in 2-bedroom property
- History of repeated Child Protection concerns over 14 years
- Children were frequently out of school
- Ongoing overcrowding in the property they were residing in.
- The home conditions had been a significant concern that had built up over a period of time, creating unsafe space for children to play out.
- Children had a range of medical needs that required appointments which were frequently missed
- The significant incident that led to the referral to MST CAN was related to young children being home unsupervised in and out of the home, and there being many risks associated with this that could have escalated to injuries and children being around unsafe adults.

### MST CAN Referrals Behaviours that were identified by Social Care

1. Low supervision of the children in the home/ and when outside
2. Missed Medical Appointments, not attending follow up appointments or routine appoints as well as not seeking medical advice, for children with a range of health needs.
3. Children having poor school attendance
4. Unsafe/unclean/cluttered/unacceptable home conditions

### MST CAN Treatment Engagement / treatment intensity involved

MST CAN intensive intervention: with the therapist & Family Resource Specialist in the team were visiting the family 3 to 5 times each week, contact is planned around the clinical needs of the family each week. The team also provides a 24 hour, 7 days a week telephone support for the family.

The therapist was able to engage the family continuously throughout treatment. Over a 36-week treatment period this was a combination of Home Visits, MS Teams sessions, phone calls as well as meetings with all the professional network.

### Areas of work that were covered within MST CAN intervention

#### Supervision Intervention :

- Immediate safety planning for Safe Supervision.
- Supported parents to make a plan for supervising the children having a identified safe lead adult with eyes on when home and out on the street.
- Parents had more understanding of the impact their mental health can have on daily functioning & parenting, as well as behaviours when drinking and using substances.
- Both parents had new goals for themselves reducing use.

#### Medical Appointment intervention

- Supporting Parent's to create a plan to record appointments in order to remember what they had to attend, introducing calendar and use of a diary at each appointment attended is now part of the family's routine.
- Parents increasing their working together to plan and attend health appointments.
- Mum was able to reflect on how her actions have led to some of children's health needs and how appointments are for keeping ahead of issues, rather than letting them escalate.
- There were physical health and mental health appointments needs in the family, which sometimes made appointments overwhelming. If something couldn't be attended the importance of rescheduling straight away was taken on as a strategy not to miss anything.

#### School Attendance intervention

- School attendance work required parents to reflect on their role to improve the children's access to education, understanding and working on the belief it was easier to keep the children home when sick or tired. Parents now see it is not easier for them to keep all the children off together and they have clear insight into how this impacts on the children's expectations and behaviours with attendance.

- Parents also have the drive for the children to achieve more than they were able, supporting one of the children to go to college.
- Worked on relationship building with all education providers for the children and a clear plan for communication when there were difficulties.

#### **Home conditions Intervention**

- Home conditions were supported and starting point was supporting parents to relook at prioritising their time.
- Joint working with Social Care and Enabled family to have support to clear bulky waste that had built up.
- Family were supported to access a grant to assist clearing rent arrears.
- Parents were able to reflect and have increased understanding of how home conditions impacted on their own mental health as well as their children.
- All steps to keep the home better was motivated by the family's goal to be able to live in a larger property that suited their needs.

#### **Treatment Outcomes**

- Parents engaged in a meaningful way throughout MST CAN Treatment, we had spent the time to understand the barriers that had come up in previous interventions to maximise success of treatment.
- No supervision concerns were being raised, the children had safe space to play at home and in their garden and if out an identified safe adult would be supervising them
- All health appointments were being attended
- School attendance improved and there was increased communication with home and school.
- Home conditions had been addressed and there was increased awareness and motivation to wanting to move to enable adequate space for the family, which would also assist with increased sleep for everyone.
- Parents wrote and read out a letter to the children in a family session about their responsibility in why they were all on a Child Protection Plan, with MST CAN therapist and on this occasion the Social Worker attended. A specific piece of work supported by MST CAN team to enable parents to reflect and take responsibility which can be a powerful piece of work to enable sustainability.
- Children were removed off Child Protection Plan during intervention and at the end of MST CAN the case was closed from being a Child In Need case and continue to be closed.
- Family have an active sustainability plan that was circulated with the professional network, so this will be the reference point to review behaviours and address promptly to reduce risks of deterioration going forward.

#### **Post closure with MST CAN :**

- the family speak highly of MST CAN and the Social Worker, recognised how the right support enabled them to make the progress the family needed.
- the family maintained the property and were applying for new properties due to maintaining payments of arrears this led to them accessing a property they could move to giving them the space they all needed.
- Dad was linked with a service to support him in getting into training and on completion will be offered a job, something at one point he felt he would not achieve. His goal was to be able to provide for his family in a legitimate way.

#### **Family Feedback 7/8-month post closure**

- Family have remained doing well 8 months post closure and continue to be fully closed to Social Care.
- Parents reported everyone is doing well, family secured a larger property, have maintained school attendance and health appointments for everyone. Mum shared 'we all have the space we needed, thank you for moving supporting us to get here'
- Young person received her exam results and earned her place at college, which was a huge celebration for the family and something the family wanted to share with the team post closure.

**Report to Schools Forum**  
**Nottingham City Virtual School**  
**November 2022**

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 Service Manager (interim until March 2023)-** This interim position is currently being undertaken by the Virtual School Team Manager, and has arisen to free some capacity of the Virtual School Head to work on the programme of work arising from the additional duties. (A portion of the grant received for the additional duties is being used to fund the salary difference for this interim position).

**Team Manager (Acting)** Supports the Virtual School Head and the Virtual School Service Manager (interim) to provide effective leadership, management and development of the

Virtual School. The Team Manager have oversight of the children in care cohort 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 6 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 2021-22 (DSG grant):

| Virtual School income and expenditure 2021-22  |       |        |               |   |
|--|-------|--------|---------------|---|
| Detail   | £m    | £m     | £m            | Description   |
| <b><u>Income</u></b>   |       |        |               |   |
| DSG Income   |       | -0.376 |               | Government grant for duties associated with previously looked after children. |
| PLAC Grant   |       | -0.049 |               |   |
| PLAC Grant 2021/22 brought forward   |       | -0.015 |               |   |
| **PPP Contribution   |       | -0.317 |               |   |
| SLT Grant  |       | -0.022 |               |   |
| Student Bursary  |       | -0.001 |               |   |
| <b>Total Income</b>  |       |        | <b>-0.780</b> |   |
| <b><u>Staff costs</u></b>  |       |        |               |   |
| Salaries   |       | 0.490  |               | Contribution from PPPG to cover costs for tuition, AP provision and staffing. |
| Pension Deficit  |       | 0.022  |               |   |
| <b>Total Staff costs</b>   |       |        | <b>0.512</b>  |   |
| <b><u>Non-pay costs</u></b>  |       |        |               |   |
| Staff Travel, mobile phone costs, recruitment expenses, occupational health and CPD. | 0.003 |        |               | Tuition and AP costs  |
| Office equipment, stationary and IT.   | 0.002 |        |               |   |
| Children intervention funding  |       | 0.051  |               |   |
| PLAC carry forward 2022/23   | 0.049 |        |               |   |
| <b>Total non-pay costs</b>   |       |        | <b>0.105</b>  |   |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>   |       |        | <b>0.617</b>  |   |
| <b>*Net surplus</b>  |       |        | <b>-0.163</b> |   |

\*Schools Forum approved the allocation of £0.376m to the Virtual School for the financial year 2021/22. 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 £0.163m. This underspend was returned to the Statutory School Reserve

4. **DSG Projected income and expenditure 2022-23:**

| Virtual School projected income and expenditure 2022-23                              |       |        |               |  |
|--|-------|--------|---------------|--|
| Detail   | £m    | £m     | £m            | Description  |
| <b><u>Income</u></b>   |       |        |               |  |
| DSG Income   |       | -0.301 |               |  |
| PLAC Grant   |       | -0.049 |               | Government grant for duties associated with previously looked after children   |
| PLAC Grant 2021/22 Carry Forward   |       | -0.049 |               |  |
| PPP Contribution   |       | -0.252 |               |  |
| School Led Tutoring Grant  |       | -0.015 |               |  |
| Additional Duties Grant Contribution   |       | -0.020 |               |  |
| <b>Total Income</b>  |       |        | <b>-0.686</b> |  |
| <b><u>Staff costs</u></b>  |       |        |               |  |
| Salaries   |       |        | 0.550         | Includes increased salaries, recruitment to an additional ESO role, uplift of Team Manager to Service Manager and continued acting up of ESO to Team Manager post. |
| Pension deficit  |       | 0.025  |               |  |
| <b>Total staff costs</b>   |       |        | <b>0.575</b>  |  |
| <b><u>Non-pay costs</u></b>  |       |        |               |  |
| Staff Travel, mobile phone costs, recruitment expenses, occupational health and CPD. | 0.002 |        |               | Tuition and AP costs- any further expenditure funded through PPP.  |
| Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.                                   | 0.001 |        |               |  |
| Children intervention funding  |       | 0.076  |               |  |
| Loxley House Rent  |       | 0.032  |               |  |
| <b>Total non-pay costs</b>   |       |        | <b>0.111</b>  |  |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>   |       |        | <b>0.686</b>  |  |
| <b>Net Position</b>  |       |        | <b>0.000</b>  |  |

5. **DSG Projected income and expenditure 2023-24:**

| Virtual School projected income and expenditure 2022-23                             |       |        |               |   |
|---|-------|--------|---------------|---|
| Detail  | £m    | £m     | £m            | Description   |
| <b><u>Income</u></b>  |       |        |               |   |
| DSG Income  |       | -0.241 |               | A reduction of £0.060m from the previous year.  |
| PLAC Grant  |       | -0.049 |               |   |
| PPP Contribution  |       | -0.325 |               | The PPP contribution will need to increase to cover the reduced DSG budget, resulting in us limiting the PPP allocation to schools. |
| <b>Total Income</b>   |       |        | <b>-0.615</b> |   |
| <b><u>Staff costs</u></b>   |       |        |               |   |
| Salaries  |       |        | 0.555*        | Staffing is calculated based on the current staffing structure detailed in section 2.   |
| Pension deficit   |       | 0.025  |               |   |
| <b>Total staff costs</b>  |       |        | <b>0.580</b>  |   |
| <b><u>Non-pay costs</u></b>   |       |        |               |   |
| Staff Travel, mobile phone costs, recruitment expenses, occupational health and CPD | 0.002 |        |               |   |
| Office equipment, mobile phone, stationary and IT.                                  | 0.001 |        |               |   |
| Children intervention funding   |       | 0.000  |               | All children intervention funding will need to be funded direct from PPP. See PPP forecasts below.                                  |
| Loxley House Rent   |       | 0.032  |               |   |
| <b>Total non-pay costs</b>  |       |        | <b>0.035</b>  |   |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>  |       |        | <b>0.615</b>  |   |
| <b>Net Position</b>   |       |        | <b>0.000</b>  |   |

## 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 **2021-22** financial year:

| <u>Expenditure description</u>                      | <u>Expenditure</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Termly PPP and AFR to schools                       | £492,194.25        |  |
| Education provision including Alternative Provision | £114,860.77        | This is a combined cost, which includes tuition for young people and funding/contributing to the costs of AP and independent specialist provision. |
| Laptops for pupils                                  | £42,540.96         | Digital Inclusion Project for children in years 10 and 11.   |
| Education Psychology and Behaviour Support          | £5,605             |  |
| Interventions and rewards                           | £78,651.60         | Reward vouchers, Unlock project, Mentoring programmes, digital learning apps, goodie bags.   |
| NAVSH subscription                                  | £500               |  |
| Welfare Call and SIMS contract                      | £56,154.06         |  |
| Staff training                                      | £3,629.72          | Includes training, attendance conferences, webinars and all associated costs (i.e. travel)   |
| DSG contribution                                    | £317,393.64        |  |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>                            | <b>£1,111,530</b>  |  |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                                 | <b>£1,111,530</b>  |  |
| <b>Net Position</b>                                 | <b>0</b>           |  |

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

| <b>PPP planned expenditure</b>                        | <b>Cost</b>       | <b>Comments</b>   |
|---|-------------------|---|
| 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                       | £30,000           | Significantly reduced expenditure this year- access to the SLT Grant and RP Grant enables us to still contribute to the costs of tuition and education provision for CiC. |
| Laptops for pupils                                    | £5,000            |   |
| Reward Vouchers                                       | £1,500            | Termly recognition for achievement  |
| Education Psychology                                  | £4,740            | Targeted Intervention   |
| Mentoring Projects x 2                                | £42,000           | Targeted Intervention- Creative Mentors and Trent Bridge Community Trust  |
| Unlock Project  | £15,000           | Targeted Intervention- raising motivation and aspiration  |
| NAVSH subscription                                    | £500              |   |
| Welfare Call and SIMs                                 | £72,000           | Attendance monitoring and ePEP- an increase due to commissioning ePEP for post-16 CiC and analytics.  |
| Staff training, CPD                                   | £2,290            |   |
| Staff travel costs                                    | £1,000            |   |
| DSG contribution                                      | £252,000          |   |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>                              | <b>£1,111,530</b> |   |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                                   | <b>£1,111,530</b> |   |
| <b>Net Position</b>                                   | <b>0</b>          |   |

6.6. Forecasted expenditure of Pupil Premium Plus in the **2023-24** financial year:

| <b>PPP planned expenditure</b>                        | <b>Cost</b>       | <b>Comments</b>  |
|---|-------------------|--|
| Termly allocation to schools Core £450 per pupil/term | £576,000          | Based on 437 pupils. This is a reduction of £60 per term per school. Expenditure in the previous years have always been less than the amount we make available for schools- therefore no significant impact. |
| Additional Funding Requests                           | £30,000           |  |
| Education provision and tuition                       | £36,500           |  |
| Laptops for pupils                                    | £5,000            |  |
| Reward Vouchers                                       | £1,500            | Termly recognition for achievement   |
| Education Psychology                                  | £4,740            | Targeted Intervention  |
| Mentoring Projects x 2                                | £42,000           | Targeted Intervention- Creative Mentors and Trent Bridge Community Trust   |
| Unlock Project  | £15,000           | Targeted Intervention- raising motivation and aspiration   |
| NAVSH subscription                                    | £500              |  |
| Welfare Call and SIMs                                 | £72,000           | Attendance monitoring and ePEP.  |
| Staff training, CPD & travel                          | £3,290            |  |
| DSG contribution                                      | £325,000          | An increase of £73k on the previous year to mitigate the reduction in DSG this year  |
| <b>Total expenditure</b>                              | <b>£1,111,530</b> |  |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                                   | <b>£1,111,530</b> |  |
| <b>Net Position</b>                                   | <b>0</b>          |  |

# 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 21/22 financial year 517 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 backlog of learners awaiting travel training which could not be delivered during the Covid period.

This is a pattern being seen nationally and has been raised as a concern by Core Cities Finance Group. The City numbers of young people are not rising at the same rate as other councils due to robust assessment and the travel training offer.

£3.00m spend in 21/22 financial year

## **Actions being taken to drive down costs**

- New Dynamic Purchasing System developed and due for implementation in March 2023
- Market development to attract more providers to the market with a focus on third sector and community providers
- New policy in place – where possible children and vulnerable adults travelling together
- Contribution from parents towards cost of post 16 transport
- Independent Travel Training Service increasing from 1 fte to 4fte
- Optimisation and review of routes – business as usual
- Robust digitised travel assistance assessment for new applicants now embedded
- New appeals process developed and implemented
- Cost profiling work being undertaken (make or buy)
- Service redesign for young people with complex health needs

## **Value for money:**

- Nottingham city is in the lowest 3<sup>rd</sup> of spend nationally and lowest in the East Midlands on most recent national benchmarking data

## 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 £20 is the lowest of all statistical neighbours
- Compares to a national average of £119 per head
- Compares to an average for our 10 statistical neighbours of £81 per head
- Compares very favourably with geographical neighbours – Nottinghamshire £104, Derby £155, Leicester £91 and Leicestershire £167

## **Pressures and other cost drivers**

- Shortage of drivers and escorts, and drivers leaving the sector to retrain as HGV drivers
- Companies not taking on additional work due to staffing capacity issues
- Significant increase in inflationary costs including staffing and fuel
- 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 2020/21 to 2023/24

| HISTORIC COMMITMENTS  | 2020/21  |                  |              |                                    | 2021/22  |                  |              |                                    | 2022/23  |                  |              |                                    | 2023/24            |
|---|--|------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
|   | 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 £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 £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                              | 0.173  | 0.173            | 0.173        | 0.000                              | 0.173  | 0.173            | 0.173        | 0.000                              | 0.173              |
| Prudential borrowing costs  | 0.274  | 0.274            | 0.274        | 0.000                              | 0.238  | 0.238            | 0.238        | 0.000                              | 0.155  | 0.155            | 0.155        | 0.000                              | 0.054              |
| Combined Services - Family Support                                    | 0.981  | 0.981            | 0.981        | 0.000                              |  |                  |              |                                    |  |                  |              |                                    |                    |
| Combined Services - Integrated placements                             | 1.327  | 1.327            | 1.327        | 0.000                              | 1.127  | 1.127            | 1.127        | 0.000                              | 0.667  | 0.667            | 0.667        | 0.000                              | 0.247              |
| Combined Services - Serving Vulnerable Groups - Looked After Children | 0.470  | 0.470            | 0.470        | 0.000                              | 0.376  | 0.376            | 0.376        | 0.000                              | 0.301  | 0.301            | 0.301        | 0.000                              | 0.241              |
| Combined Services - Safeguarding Training                             | 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              |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>6.571*</b>  | <b>6.571</b>     | <b>6.571</b> | <b>0.000</b>                       | <b>4.632</b>   | <b>4.632</b>     | <b>4.632</b> | <b>0.000</b>                       | <b>3.905</b>   | <b>3.905</b>     | <b>3.905</b> | <b>0.000</b>                       | <b>3.324</b>       |

\* 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.