

Public Document Pack

North Yorkshire County Council Children and Young Peoples Service - Executive Members & Corporate Director Meetings - Department

Tuesday, 7 March 2023 / 1.00 pm

A G E N D A

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Declarations of Interest

Items for Executive Member decision

- 3 Nuffield Foundation research Project: Care leavers (Pages 3 - 22) (Pages 3 - 22)

To accept the £135,00 grant funding from the Department for Education for delivery of this digital and data grant programme.

- 4 Consultation on closure of Children's Centres (Children & Families Hubs) (Pages 23 - 44) (Pages 23 - 44)

To seek approval to commence a public consultation on the de-commissioning and closure of five designated Children's Centres.

- 5 Special Free School Programme – Acceptance of conditions (Pages 45 - 54) (Pages 45 - 54)

To seek Executive Member approval, following a successful application to the Department for Education, to accept the conditions offered to establish a new Special Free School in Northallerton at the Grammar School Lane site, This matter is being considered by the Executive Member for Education and Skills, after consultation with the Corporate Director Children and Young people's Services under the Executive Member's urgency powers in paragraph 14 of the Executive Members' Delegation Scheme.

Items for Corporate Director decision

- 6 Music Service Fees 2023/24 (Pages 55 - 58) (Pages 55 - 58)

To seek approval for the scale of fees for parents and schools for financial year 2023/24

- 7 Early Years Provider Funding Rates 2023/24 (Pages 59 - 92) (Pages 59 - 92)

To agree recommendations to change the funding rates paid to early years' providers for the funded entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds and disadvantaged 2 year olds for the 2023/24 financial year.

- 8 High Needs Budget 2023-24 (Pages 93 - 106) (Pages 93 - 106)

To approve the proposed high needs block budget

Any Other Business

9 Date of future formal meetings

Circulation:**Executive Members**

Janet Sanderson
Annabel Wilkinson

Officer attendees

Stuart Carlton
Howard Emmett
M Sadler

Presenting Officers

North Yorkshire County Council

Children and Young People's Service

Corporate Directors Meeting with Executive Members

7 March 2023

Request to accept grant funding for the Information use Project Care leavers: Nuffield Foundation Research Project

1.0 Purpose of report

This report is to request that the executive members for Children and Young People, in consultation with the Corporate Director of Children and Young People's Service, the Corporate Director Strategic Resources and the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) authorise the Corporate Director Strategic Resources to accept the grant offer from the Nuffield Foundation facilitated/managed by Oxford University, which will be used to explore the benefits of an enhanced data set in respect to Care leavers, 'The Information Use project'. This is a five-year research project concluding in 2026 (commenced October 2021).

Children and Young People's Service were approached by Dr Lisa Holmes of the Rees Centre to become a site partner for this research focusing on care leavers and improving their outcomes. NYCC is a site partner as is Hampshire County Council, focusing on data science, Greater Manchester focusing on 0–5-year-olds health outcomes.

We have been successful in becoming a site partner and this was confirmed in 2021. Year one focused on scoping for the research and ethical approval from Oxford University being granted, (this is pending and hoping to be secured by October 2023 the end of year two). The research cannot commence until ethical approval is secured

Executive Summary

This report is to request that the executive members for Children and Young People, in consultation with the Corporate Director of Children and Young People's Service, the Corporate Director Strategic Resources and the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) authorise the Corporate Director Strategic Resources to accept the grant offer from the Nuffield Foundation facilitated/managed by Oxford University, which will be used to explore the benefits of an enhanced data set in respect to Care leavers, 'The Information Use project'. This is a five-year research project concluding in 2026 (commenced October 2021).

Children and Young People's Service were approached by Dr Lisa Holmes of the Rees Centre to become a site partner for this research focusing on care leavers and improving their outcomes. NYCC is a site partner as is Hampshire County Council, focusing on data science, Greater Manchester focusing on 0–5-year-olds health outcomes.

We have been successful in becoming a site partner and this was confirmed in 2021. Year one focused on scoping for the research and ethical approval from Oxford University being granted, (this is pending and hoping to be secured by October 2023 the end of year two). The research cannot commence until ethical approval is secured.

The amount awarded is £135,000 To be used to fund a part time data person for year two to five of the project and this grant can be released once the ethical approval has been granted and the data aspects of the research can commence

2.0 Issues

The primary aim of the research is to improve the outcomes and experience of children and families through the integration progress on 5 practices

The supplementary aims of the research are to:

1. Increase public acceptance of ethical uses of data, reduce the use of unethical approaches and support improvements to national datasets and use of data and evidence.
2. Make impactful recommendations for national policy and practice in child and family social policy by sharing learning from bottom up policy development.
3. Improve academic theory and evidence on implementation and policy issues in child and family social policy.

Objectives

- Set up a high-quality information use project in each Local Site
- Iteratively improve and integrate activity in the 5 practices in each information use project
- Work with a Learning Network of 20 LAs, using an action learning approach structured around the 5 practices, in a Community of Practice, grouped by local priority. 'Stress-test' knowledge, materials and approaches developed by the Local Sites. Co-produce new knowledge and solutions.
- Produce resources for wider impact. Define and develop a set of transferable approaches that are adopted much more widely
- Evaluative learning. Develop and apply inter-disciplinary mixed methods of research and analysis to evaluate, review and monitor our own practices and the impacts, methods, costs and potential benefits of information use.
- Provide opportunities for other LAs, charities, academics and national policy makers to share and apply lessons learned.

Aims for evaluative learning

- Primary Hypothesis: to test whether by improving interaction, dialogue and common understanding across the 5 practices we can support local authorities to reduce inequalities, improve outcomes and experiences, and improve cost effectiveness.

- Test and Learn: to assess the value for money of Information Use Projects in the 3 Learning Sites at each of 3 stages of development from Pilot to Full Implementation and of Learning Network participation
- Wider impact: to test whether we have been successful in meeting our aims to:
 - Increase public acceptance of ethical uses of data, reduce the use of unethical approaches and support improvements to national datasets and use of data and evidence
 - Make impactful recommendations for national policy and practice in child and family social policy by sharing learning from bottom up policy development
 - Improve academic theory and evidence on implementation and policy issues in child and family social policy.

3.0 Performance Implications

- 3.1 We are not anticipating any negative performance issues, this area of work is light on established research. The budget included funding to increase capacity in the data team to assist with the development of the data work.
- 3.2 If the work is successful, which we anticipate it will be, we expect that we will see an increase in performance and outcomes for children and families and care leavers.
- 3.3 To be successful this work will require input from Children and Young People's service, Technology and Change, Data and Intelligence, Data Governance and Finance who have all been part of preparing this bid and understand the scope for the research.

4.0 Options

- 4.1 We could accept the grant and contribute to this national research, access learning for our staff and build the case for change/develop practice.
- 4.2 We could reject the grant with no impact except the loss of this opportunity for our care leavers to contribute to this national research and share their views, and influence changes.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 The funding available for this bid is £135k. This funding has been confirmed, subject to the authority accepting it.
- 5.2 There are no matching requirements to the funding so there will be no financial risk to the council. The grant will fund a part time data person from existing resource.
- 5.3 We will be responsible for meeting the agreed outcomes from the grant which are achievable.
- 5.4 If we were to fail to meet the requirements of the research bid the Nuffield foundation would have the right to withhold the grant payments.

6.0 Impact on Other Services/Organisations

- 6.1 This project will require cross departmental support to deliver. The bid was put together with the support of members from Children and Young People's Service, Data governance, technology and change and Strategic Services.
- 6.2 The bid contains remuneration for the supply of a part time data person.
- 6.3 There is an equality impact assessment screening form attached as an appendix to this report.
- 6.4 There is a Climate Change impact assessment attached as an appendix to this report.

7.0 Risk Management Implications

- 7.1 There are no anticipated risk management issues with the project. No data will be leaving our secure network and all existing security protocols will continue to apply. There is also the reassurance of ethical approval processes.

8.0 Human Resources Implications

- 8.1 There will be no new posts created as a result of this project but we expect that these will be internal posts which the funding will recredit for.

9.0 Reasons For Recommendations

- 9.1 Accepting this grant will provide us with an opportunity to contribute to the development and improvement of national data sets in respect of care leavers.
- 9.2 By doing this we can position ourselves as sector lead improvements leaders in the area of care leavers and children in care voice and data.
- 9.3 By accepting this grant we will be able to develop all of this at no cost to the authority and be involved in a developing research area, nationally.

10.0 Recommendation(s)

- 10.1 It is my recommendation that the Executive Member for Children and Young People's Service in consultation with the Corporate Director for Children and Young People's Service, Corporate Director, Strategic Resources and the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) authorises the Corporate Director Strategic Resources to accept the £135,00 grant funding from the Department for Education for delivery of this digital and data grant programme.

Stuart Carlton

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

County Hall
Northallerton

31st January 2023

Author of report – Sam Clayton
Presenter of report – Stuart Carlton

Appendix 1 - 2.0 Phase One Plan
Appendix 2 Climate Impact
Appendix 3 – EIA Screening

Appendix 1

2.0 Phase One Plan

2.1 Overview

Phase One, from October 2022 until September 2023, will be broken down into two sub-parts, detailed below.

The first part, from October 2022 to March 2023, will be an extension of the mapping undertaken in the initial Discovery Phase. It will focus on understanding more information collection/collation in order to design revisions to the information system. This includes:

Maximising the role of youth voice in the IUP

- Explore in more depth how young people's (and staff's) voices are integrated into case notes and other information mechanisms within the LC team.
- Facilitate sharing of practices across NYCC teams to enhance youth voice in information systems.
- Identify ways to integrate young people's voices into the analysis, use and review of information.

Bringing together meaningful information from different sources

- Examine existing information items and measures used by different teams to see what can be integrated into the LC Team and avoid duplication.
- Identify gaps in existing measures.

Capturing meaningful aggregate outcomes for care leavers

- Where gaps exist, find appropriate new measures and decide the mechanisms to integrate these.
- Identify means to aggregate individual level data.

The second stage, from April to September 2023, will implement the new design to the information system and explore voice in the latter stages of the pathway (analysis/use/review):

Maximising the role of youth voice in the IUP

- Support the inclusion of young people and staff voices in the analysis, use and review of information.

Bringing together meaningful information from different sources & Capturing meaningful aggregate outcomes for care leavers

- Support the collection, analysis, use and review of meaningful information.

During this time, a recording mechanism will also be agreed and introduced to keep track of potential suggestions and areas of focus for the subsequent iterations of the IUP.

2.2 Research methods

The following outline plan will be finalised in discussion with the NYCC team, in line with the researcher resource allocated to NY.

2.2.1 'Day in the life' shadowing of PAs

The plan is to shadow two PAs from different teams, for one day each, from the time they arrive at work until the end of their working day. The researcher will shadow PAs as they interact with young people – whether in person, by phone or online – and

document their work in case notes or other information systems. The focus will be on understanding what information is recorded and how this incorporates young people's voices, as well as staff voices and those of other stakeholders (e.g. wider professionals, family, friends, etc.). This will involve informal conversational interviews with the PAs, as well as the young people that they work with, plus team colleagues (other PAs, administrative staff, etc.) who might support the PA in the recording of information.

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Capturing meaningful outcomes for care leavers;*
- *Maximising voice in information use.*

2.2.2 PA focus group

Focus groups with PAs from two teams, to discuss:

- The relationship between the guidance and practice of recording case notes;
- How PAs record information, including interactions with young people, and what they hope to achieve in their writing;
- How PAs record information on the LCS system;
- How PAs receive information from other teams (e.g. NWD and Housing) and how well this works.

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Bringing together information from different sources;*
- *Maximising voice in information use.*

2.2.3 Case notes analysis

In-depth analysis of the case notes young people in two teams, selected randomly.

This will be to identify:

- The range of information collected from young people.
- Range of information shared by other teams.
- Relationship between the guidance and practice of recording case notes.
- Styles of writing 'to' the young person.
- Possibilities for follow-up 'scrapping' by data analyst.¹

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Capturing meaningful outcomes for care leavers;*
- *Bringing together information from different sources;*
- *Maximising voice in information use.*

2.2.4 Multi-agency focus groups

A focus group including members from teams across NYCC (e.g. LC team, housing, data teams, NWD, virtual school) will be invited to examine the range of information topics/items/measures used for care leavers across NYCC. This will be to identify priority meaningful measures and to explore the possibility of avoiding duplication across different teams. They will be asked to:

- Share guidance and practices on writing case notes and documenting young people's voices;
- Share experiences of different information mechanisms/measures;
- Prioritise 'meaningful' outcomes items and measures;
- Identify possible gaps in existing items/measures;

¹ – NB. see paper by Kratky.

- Explore possibilities to share/merge data from different sources to avoid replication;
- Explore ethical considerations of sharing data.

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Capturing meaningful outcomes for care leavers;*
- *Bringing together information from different sources;*

2.2.5 Young people's focus groups (October conference)

- Process of voicing and recording their ideas/thoughts/concerns/experiences to LC and other teams.
- Meaningfulness of existing and possible new measures.
- Views on sharing of information across teams.
- Views on young people's input on analysis, use and review of information

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Capturing meaningful outcomes for care leavers;*
- *Bringing together information from different sources;*
- *Maximising voice in information use.*

2.2.6 Focus group with data teams

This focus group would include members of the Strategy and Performance Team and Data Intelligence Team, and possibly the No Wrong Door (NWD) data team. It would focus on discussing:

- Interactions between the teams, including the steps involved in accessing and analysing data;
- Where there are good data flows and limitations;
- Possibilities to do further analysis with existing data within LC and across different teams.

This supports the following IUP activities:

- *Capturing meaningful outcomes for care leavers;*
- *Bringing together information from different sources;*

2.2.7 Exploratory aggregate data analysis

A new four-year part-time data analyst will be in post in the autumn 2022. Their role requires further internal discussion and will span different teams within NYCC.

Possible areas for their focus include:

- Exploratory analysis of available data;
- Identify how to code free text in LCS to create a regular aggregate analysis;
- Link the IUP with NYCC's proposed algorithmic semantic searches of the LCS.

The research team will support this work by integrating it into the focus on ensuring information analysis, use and review includes different voices.

In the last two years, the analyst will focus on translating the work from NYCC to the wider Learning Network.

2.3 Evaluation

The focus on the IUP evaluation will begin in Phase One, with a focus on establishing a baseline of meaningful measures. As these measures will not have been identified at the start of Phase One, it is suggested that there is an initial proxy baseline in the

autumn 2022, and a subsequent enhanced baseline using the newly identified measures in the spring 2023.

Autumn 2022

- Identify existing evaluation measures and collect baseline data.

Spring 2023

- Use finalised measures for enhanced second baseline.

3.0 NYCC Relational-based practice

NYCC emphasises relational-based practice, underpinned by their 'Strength in relationship' Practice Model (see Figure 4 below) that defines its core purpose for those in care and leaving care as 'To support positive change that continues after we no longer need to be involved. We will create conditions that allow relationships to flourish'. Those who were interviewed in the Discovery Phase identified good relationships between leaving care staff and young people. There is reportedly a low staff turnover of frontline workers, which helps to ensure that the staff and young people know each other well over many years: 'it's all about relationships' (staff member).

Appendix 2



Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk

Version 2: amended 11 August 2021

Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:

Planning Permission
Environmental Impact Assessment
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk for advice.

Title of proposal	Information use project, care leavers: Nuffield research Project
Brief description of proposal	Research to review what data we collect currently about care leavers, how this can be enhanced and use to space the future of the system to improve care leaver outcomes
Directorate	CYPS

Service area	Children and Families
Lead officer	Sam Clayton
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment	Sam Clayton
Date impact assessment started	31/1/2023

Options appraisal

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

The project will be undertaken alongside our existing teams. It is anticipated that it will offer research to guide future practice improvement and improve outcomes for future care leavers.

What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

The project will be fully funded by a grant from the Nuffield Foundation and managed via Oxford University and a consortium of academic institutions involved in the research.

How will this proposal impact on the environment?		Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where)	No impact (Place a X in the box below where)	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where)	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Minimise greenhouse gas emissions e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.	Emissions from travel		x		All meetings are held virtually so travel is minimal		
	Emissions from construction		X				

How will this proposal impact on the environment?		Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.					Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 		
Page 15	Emissions from running of buildings		X		This project won't involve additional time working from buildings.		
	Emissions from data storage		X		The data from this project will be stored in the azure cloud based system which is an existing part of our network and all DIPA completed with the research partner and ethical approval.		
	Other						
	Minimise waste : Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic		X				
Reduce water consumption			X				

How will this proposal impact on the environment? N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.	Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Minimise pollution (including air, land, water, light and noise)	X			This may improve outcomes for care leavers in the future and therefore mean they require less interventions in their lives across a range of activities		
Ensure resilience to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers		X				
Enhance conservation and wildlife		X				

How will this proposal impact on the environment? N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.	Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where)	No impact (Place a X in the box below where)	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where)	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape		X				
Other (please state below)						

<p>Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal? If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.</p>
<p>This project will work alongside our existing Children and Young People's environmental standards.</p>


Page 18

Summary Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

This project will work to enhance our existing services ability to improve practice to support care leavers lead productive and positive lifes

Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:


Name	Sam Clayton
Job title	Strategic Lead: Research
Service area	CYPS
Directorate	Children and families
Signature	
Completion date	21/1/2023

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Date: 31/01/2023

Appendix 3

Initial equality impact assessment screening form This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate		CYPS	
Service area		CSC	
Proposal being screened		Information use project: Nuffield Foundation research	
Officer(s) carrying out screening		Sam Clayton	
What are you proposing to do?		Working with care leavers to understand what information would be useful to them in their adult lives and also develop a better data set for earlier in their care experience	
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?		To improve outcomes for care leavers now and in the future.	
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.		The data person will be expected to supply the data for the project and work with Dr Lisa Holmes our research lead. There will be a small project group to facilitate the research and enable the learning to come back into the development of the service.	
Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? • Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? • Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? <p>If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.</p>			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age		X	
Disability		X	
Sex		X	
Race		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
Gender reassignment		X	
Religion or belief		X	
Pregnancy or maternity		X	
Marriage or civil partnership		X	
People in rural areas		X	
People on a low income		X	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		X	
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	This project won't involve new work with any groups of people. Instead, it will enhance the work we are already undertaking with our care leavers to improve future service delivery.		

Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	This project is to improve the outcomes for care leavers, this is considered a protected characteristic and there have been some representation about this to government.			
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continue to full EIA:	
Reason for decision	This project will not have additional impacts upon care leavers it should in the future help us to provide a more enhanced service that meets their needs, based on their feedback and the date collected.			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)				
Date	31 st January 2023			

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE
EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

7TH MARCH 2023

Proposed De-designation of Children's Centres (now known as Children & Families Hubs)

Report of the Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek approval to commence a public consultation on the de-commissioning and closure of five designated Children's Centres.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Children and Families Early Help Service delivered sessions from a range of premises for a number of years; however, since 2015, the use of some of these buildings has significantly reduced. This further reduced following the Children and Families restructure and service review in March 2019.
- 2.1 In March 2019, the Children and Families Service committed to co-locating Early Help and Safeguarding teams where possible, in order to improve communications, share best practice and provide joined-up services for families. Over this period, there has been a review of all North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) properties (including leased spaces) across the county enabling greater co-location of staff including Early Help and Safeguarding teams.
- 2.2 Over the last two years - during and following the pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises.
- 2.3 This model of delivery is supported by a recent government publication "*The Framework for Family Hubs*". The primary focus is not about 'buildings'; it is about 'place' and 'community'; having a sense of belonging; accessing support in the community, and; in many cases being delivered by people in the local community. The framework identified that family hubs come in all shapes and sizes: libraries, faith buildings, schools, early year's settings, youth & community centres and, community halls.
- 2.4 The local authority's Property Services team have a rolling programme to ensure efficient use of properties and where service operating models change, to identify opportunities for property rationalisation whilst continuing to support effective service delivery. For example, to facilitate co-location, the Property Service has invested funds to improve office and delivery spaces in Richmond, Selby and Ryedale.

3.0 ISSUES

PROPOSED DE-DESIGNATION OF CHILDREN'S CENTRES

3.1 The following section outlines the proposed de-designation of Children's Centres.

a) Kirkbymoorside Children's Centre

- DfE Designated Children's Centre
- £0 Sure Start funding therefore no potential funding clawback
- Potential annual saving of £10,800

From March 2020, Kirkbymoorside Children's Centre was unused at the point of the lockdown, due to the covid-19 pandemic. The building is situated in the grounds of Kirkbymoorside community primary school. Prior to lockdown in March 2020, there was limited use of the building, with only two weekly sessions.

There are two other buildings where service delivery takes place in Ryedale; Norton Children's Centre, and Atmosphere in Pickering, both which remained open during the pandemic. Following a refurbishment of Atmosphere in April 2022, the intention is to transfer the Kirkbymoorside Children's Centre property to the primary school to increase the capacity for early years delivery. Should a venue be required in Kirkbymoorside for sessional delivery by the Children and Families Service, there are a number of accessible community venues, including the library, where these could take place.

b) Eastfield Children's Centre

- DfE Designated Children's Centre
- £0 Sure Start funding therefore no potential funding clawback.
- Potential annual revenue saving of £49,800

Eastfield Children's Centre was previously used to deliver 'Family Time' and a small number of one-to-one activities. The building is leased from Sanctuary Housing, with the lease expiring in September 2022. A private day nursery runs from part of the leased accommodation. However, NYCC have been unable to sublet the accommodation to generate income. The private nursery opened up discussions with Sanctuary Housing to lease directly from the organisation. Alternative accommodation is available at Ourspace, within five minutes of Eastfield Children's Centre. Although Ourspace was unused during the pandemic, a substantial refurbishment was undertaken prior to re-opening in September 2022 to enable delivery of 0-19 services within the building, alongside touch-down spaces for Children and Families staff. Ourspace generates an income from the Healthy Child team - delivered by Harrogate District Foundation Trust (HDFT) - and Compass who are co-located in the building.

c) South Craven Children's Centre (Glusburn)

- DfE Designated Children's Centre
- Sure Start Funding £676,431
- Opened April 2011 with a potential 25-year clawback up to 2036
- Potential annual revenue saving of £12,600 with potential annual rental income of £6,000

The South Craven Children's Centre building was predominately used by HDFT for office accommodation for Healthy Child Practitioners. This building was unused during the pandemic and has not re-opened. There has only been occasional use for Family Time and this offer has subsequently transferred to Skipton and North

Craven Children's Centres, and is working well. A private provider has approached NYCC in relation to the use of the building for the delivery of an Early Years Day care provision. Discussions are currently underway and costs are being negotiated with a view to leasing the premises to the Private Day Nursery with a possible rental income of £6,000.

Although there was Sure Start funding of £676,431 invested in the building, as the property will continue to deliver Early Years provision through the private provider, it is not anticipated there will be any clawback.

d) Nidderdale Children's Centre (Pateley Bridge)

- Designated Children's Centre
- Sure Start funding of £590,715
- Opened September 2010 with a potential 25-year clawback period up to 2035
- Revenue costs of the property are estimated at £13,400

Previously used on an occasional basis for service delivery, the Nidderdale Children's Centre building was unused during the pandemic and has not re-opened. There has not previously been any partner use of the building which connected to the school. The proposal is to release the space back to St Cuthbert's Church of England Primary School, with an agreement that the premises would be used for direct work with children attending the school.

Although there was Sure Start funding of £590,715 invested in the building, as the transfer to the school will continue to provide Early Years provision, it is not anticipated there will be any clawback.

e) Wensleydale Children's Centre (Askrigg)

- DfE Designated Children's Centre
- Sure Start funding £50,000
- Opened c.2009 with a potential 25-year clawback period up to 2034
- Potential annual saving of £14,800

The building at Wensleydale Children's Centre (Askrigg) has only had occasional use, was unused during the covid-19 pandemic and has not subsequently re-opened. Service delivery has moved to Colburn and Carnagill Children's Centres. This building is leased to NYCC and the proposal will be to give three months' notice on the lease to the landlord (Yorebridge Educational Foundation).

Although there was Sure Start funding of £50,000 invested in the property, it is anticipated that as the Early Help service will continue to deliver support to children 0-5 years and their families in the locality, then it is expected that the DfE will not request this clawback funding.

OTHER PROPERTY ISSUES

- 3.2 Other buildings which have historically been used by the Children and Families service but which have been unused during and following the pandemic are also considered for disposal. As non-designated Children's Centres, these are simply property transactions and are not subject to a statutory requirement to consult, but are included in this report for completeness.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The proposal to de-designate and subsequently dispose of the five children's centres outlined in section 3.1 will achieve an estimated annual revenue saving of £101,400 alongside a possible additional rental income of £6,000. Further disposal of other unused properties will achieve a further £31,200. In total, savings of £138,600 may be achieved by realising the proposals.

4.2 Table 1 outlines the potential saving:

Table 1: Financial implications of proposal to de-designate children's centres

Building	Designated Children's Centre	Potential annual revenue costs (£)	Income implications (£)	Total potential annual revenue saving (£)	Potential Clawback (£)
Kirkbymoorside Children's Centre	Yes	10,800	0	10,800	0
Eastfield CC	Yes	49,800	0	49,800	0
South Craven CC Glusburn	Yes	12,600	6,000	18,600	676,431
Wensleydale CC (Askrigg)	Yes	14,800	0	14,800	50,000
Nidderdale Children's Centre	Yes	13,400	0	13,400	590,715
Flaxley road – Brown Cabin	No	15,000	0	15,000	0
Bedale Youth Shack	No	16,200	0	16,200	0
Total Proposed Savings		132,600	6,000	138,600	-
Total Potential Funding Clawback				-	1,317,146

4.3 The proposed savings will contribute to a corporate property savings target.

4.4 A number of children's centres received Sure Start funding as a capital investment. As part of this process the DfE could request financial clawback on the Sure Start Capital funding to a maximum total of £1,317,146.

5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There is a duty to consult on any changes to Designated Children's Centres. Statutory guidance from the Department for Education means that recipients must have regard to it when carrying out duties relating to children's centres under the Childcare Act 2006. Any building currently registered as a designated children's centres will need to be de-registered with the DfE following the de-registration guidance.
- 5.2 The guidance recommends consultation with stakeholders prior to any change. Although all of the centres included in this report have been closed since the start of the covid-19 pandemic and have not re-opened subsequently, there remains a need to follow the statutory guidance. The consultation will explain how the local authority will continue to meet the needs of families with children under five as part of any reorganisation of services. It should also be clear how respondents' views can be made known and adequate time should be allowed for those wishing to respond.

6.0 IMPACT ON OTHER SERVICES/ORGANISATIONS

- 6.1 There are no identified detrimental impacts on other services or organisations.

7.0 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There is a potential risk (assessed as low) that the Department for Education may request a funding clawback on Sure Start capital investment equating to a maximum amount of £1,317,146.
- 7.2 Between 2014 and 2016, NYCC de-designated and closed 13 Children's Centres with a total Sure Start capital investment of £3,643,140. NYCC was not requested to pay back any of the Sure Start capital funding.

8.0 HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There are no identified Human Resource implications.

9.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Over the last two years, during and following the pandemic, Early Help redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of buildings. This has removed any impact on protected characteristics as the model has created greater access to the service
- 9.2 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and is attached as **Appendix 1**.

10.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The proposal identifies an overall long-term positive impact on carbon reduction through reductions to the workplace property portfolio. The size of the workplace estate means that it is an important factor in the Council's overall carbon reduction plan, as a result when sites are vacated/ disposed of there is a positive impact as the overarching carbon footprint in relation to the workplace property portfolio will be reduced. Across the seven sites that are being considered as part of this proposal it is difficult to provide an exact figure around the potential carbon saving – as we do not hold the consumption data for all

of the sites due to the Children Centres being located on school sites with a flat charge contribution paid towards energy consumption. As a result, a review has been undertaken to try to determine the possible estimated saving with this being from 16,274kg with a potential up to 22,157kg.

10.2 A Climate Change Impact Assessment has been undertaken and is attached as **Appendix 2.**

11.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 De-designating the five Children's Centres and subsequent disposal plus the disposal of two additional properties previously used by the Children and Families service will yield annual revenue savings in the order of £138,600 (including potential revenue income of £6,000). Although there is a low risk of potential DfE capital funding clawback, this has not happened in previous cases in North Yorkshire.

11.2 The buildings proposed for de-designation were not used during the pandemic due to low frequency of use and have not re-opened whilst previous levels of service delivery have continued through alternative service delivery offers including community buildings and outreach.

11.3 Rationalising the number of buildings will enable greater integration of service delivery alongside achieving savings.

11.4 There will be potential carbon savings between 16,247kg up to a potential 22,157kg.

12.0	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
9.1	To approve a public consultation on the de-designation and closure of the five centres outlined in section 3.1

Stuart Carlton
Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service
COUNTY HALL
NORTHALLERTON
7th March 2023

Report Author – Barbara Merrygold
Presenter of report – Stuart Carlton

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated April 2019)

Proposed Closure of designated Children's Centres

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	CYPS children and Families Service – Early Help
Lead Officer and contact details	Barbara Merrygold
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Early Help Group Managers
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	Working Group Karen Adamson Barbara Merrygold Paul Gumbley and Early Help Group Managers
When did the due regard process start?	January 2021

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

The change closure, including change of use and de-designation of 5 designated Children's Centres.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

It is proposed that we de-designate 5 children's centres, all of which were closed at the beginning of the pandemic and due to the change in the model of delivery to children and families have not been required to re-open. It is proposed that the 5 building will be transferred for the use of Early Year or educational provision.

The Children and Families Service Early Help delivered sessions from a significant number of premises for a number of years; however, since 2015 the use of some of these buildings had significantly reduced. This further reduced following the C&F restructure in March 2019.

As part of the service, review Children and Families Service was committed to co-locating Early Help and Safeguarding teams where possible, in order to improve communications, share best practice and provide joined-up services for families. Over this period, there has been a review of all NYCC properties and leased space across the County enabling greater co-location of staff including Children and Families Early Help Service and Safeguarding Teams.

There is a corporate property savings target and any reductions in property usage (and any costs associated with remodelling other properties either as an invest to save, mitigate property rationalisation or facilitate moves) are within the Property Service budget. However A number children's centres received Sure Start funding as a capital investment so there is a risk of clawback on the capital investment however as the change of use is to transfer use to either an educational setting or private nursery it is not envisaged that the DfE will ask for any return of funding.

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

The proposed building have been closed since March 2020.

Over the last two years - during and following the pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises. This model of delivery is now embedded so customers will not experience any change in service.

Due to a change in the way of working a blended approach of home and office working the use of these building for office accommodation is not required.

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

The proposal has been agreed in principle with CYPLT and North Yorkshire management Board. A 28 day online public consultation will take place open to stakeholders and service users

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?
There will be a long term saving to the council, unless the DfE requests any return of previous capital funding

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
Age	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Disability		x		As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Sex	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Race	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Gender reassignment	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Sexual orientation	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Religion or belief	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Pregnancy or maternity	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
Marriage or civil partnership	x			As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access

Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
...live in a rural area?		x		Workers already travel to people who live in rural communities. As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
...have a low income?		x		As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access
...are carers (unpaid family or friend)?		x		As part of the changes to our service delivery model we offer online and face to face outreach services either in the family's home or in community venues which has enhanced access

Section 8. Geographic impact – Please detail where the impact will be (please tick all that apply)	
North Yorkshire wide	x
Craven district	
Hambleton district	
Harrogate district	
Richmondshire district	
Ryedale district	
Scarborough district	
Selby district	
If you have ticked one or more districts, will specific town(s)/village(s) be particularly impacted? If so, please specify below.	

Section 9. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc. No
--

Section 10. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)	Tick option chosen
--	---------------------------

1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.	x
2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.	
3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts. Get advice from Legal Services)	
4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.	
Explanation of why option has been chosen. (Include any advice given by Legal Services.) These building have all been closed since March 2020 during this period the delivery of services have continued using a blended model of delivery which has increased access to services for families.	

Section 11. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)

Service users may not be aware of the impact, as the direct work will continue. We regularly collect and monitor service user feedback so would use this to review the effectiveness of the service.

Section 12. Action plan. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA, including post implementation review to find out how the outcomes have been achieved in practice and what impacts there have actually been on people with protected characteristics.

Action	Lead	By when	Progress	Monitoring arrangements

Section 13. Summary Summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The EIA concludes that there will be little impact on protected characteristic. Service users will experience a more enhanced service as there is increased flexibility around delivery.

Section 14. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Barbara Merrygold

Job title: Head Of Early Help

Directorate: C&YPS

Signature:



Completion date: 21/02/2023

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Date:



Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision-making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance, please email climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk

Version 2: amended 11 August 2021

Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:

Planning Permission
Environmental Impact Assessment
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk for advice.

Title of proposal	Proposed De-designation of Children's Centres (now known as Children & Families Hubs)
Brief description of proposal	<p>To progress public consultation on the de-commissioning and closure of five designated Children's Centres and disposal of two other buildings which have historically been used by the Children's and Families service which are no longer used.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of the public consultation this could result in the vacating / disposal of up to seven properties from the Property workplace portfolio.</p>

	<p>Public consultation around proposed de-designation of Children's Centres sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Ryedale Children's Centre B5523 (on Kirkbymoorside CP School E2064) • Eastfields Children's Centre B5534 • South Craven Children's Centre B5542 (on Glusburn Community Primary School E2393) • Nidderdale Children's Centre B5540 (on St Cuthbert's School, Pateley Bridge) • Wensleydale Children's Centre B5522 (on Askrigg School E3289) <p>Properties historically used by the Children and Families service, but which have been unused during and following the pandemic being progressed for disposal (which were not designated as Children's Centres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flaxley Road – Brown Cabin (on Flaxley Road campus B2251) • Bedale Youth & Children's Centre B0614 (on Bedale High School E4052)
Directorate	Children and Families Service (CYPS)
Service area	Early Help
Lead officer	Barbara Merrygold
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment	Katherine Edge (Senior Property Officer), Kristina Peat (Operations Manager, Energy and Carbon)
Date impact assessment started	21 st February 2023

Options appraisal

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

Background

Children and Families Early Help Service delivered sessions from a range of premises for a number of years; however, since 2015, the use of some of these buildings has significantly reduced. This further reduced following the Children and Families restructure and service review in March 2019.

In March 2019, the Children and Families Service committed to co-locating Early Help and Safeguarding teams where possible, in order to improve communications, share best practice and provide joined-up services for families. Over this period, there has been a review of all North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) properties (including leased spaces) across the county enabling greater co-location of staff including Early Help and Safeguarding teams.

Over the last two years - during and following the Covid-19 pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises.

This model of delivery is supported by a recent government publication “The Framework for Family Hubs”. The primary focus is not about ‘buildings’; it is about ‘place’ and ‘community’; having a sense of belonging; accessing support in the community, and; in many cases being delivered by people in the local community. The framework identified that family hubs come in all shapes and sizes: libraries, faith buildings, schools, early year’s settings, youth & community centres and, community halls.

The local authority’s Property Services team have a rolling programme to ensure efficient use of properties and where service operating models change, to identify opportunities for property rationalisation whilst continuing to support effective service delivery. For example, to facilitate co-location, the Property Service has invested funds to improve office and delivery spaces in Richmond, Selby and Ryedale.

The Property Rationalisation Programme will result in the transformation of the County Council’s property portfolio to achieve a reduction of in excess of £1.5 million in respect of revenue expenditure and to optimise the use of the property portfolio.

This will be achieved through:

- a reduction in the total floor area for the delivery and management of front-line services
- the delivery of the Beyond 2020 Modern Council Programme

The overarching objectives of the Property Rationalisation Programme, are to achieve -

- The implementation of more efficient working practices within all of the County Council’s property
- A reduction in the total floor area occupied by the County Council, resulting in a reduction in revenue expenditure and carbon emissions

Buildings which are either leased, underutilised or where service delivery could be transferred to be delivered out of another building are reviewed as part of the Programme, as this enhances usage of Property Assets, with the staff and services utilising the associated buildings moved to other locations within the Property estate. The relocation of the services to other locations will not have an impact on the delivery of front-line services or staffing structure in relation to the properties.

What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

Any changes as a result of this proposal will form part of the Property Rationalisation Programme, which will contribute towards a reduction in Property's revenue budget and the total floor space within the Corporate Workplace Property portfolio, contributing towards Property's overarching saving target. There is also consideration when developing the option analysis / reviews around running cost implications, taking into account vacating sites and increased usage of sites where there are proposals for these to be used more efficiently.

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p> <p>Page 38</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Minimise greenhouse gas emissions e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	<p>Emissions from travel</p>	<p>X</p>		<p>Where a building has enhanced usage then there is the potential for increased traffic (staff and customers); however, this traffic will have transferred from usage of the proposed site to vacate / relocate.</p> <p>However, over the last two years - during and following the Covid-19 pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which</p>		

How will this proposal impact on the environment?		Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Page 39					families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises and reducing travel.		
	Emissions from construction		X				
	Emissions from running of buildings	X			<p>When a site is vacated, there will be a reduction in the Council's greenhouse gas emission as it will no longer be utilising the site, however there might be an increase in usage at sites that services are relocated to, offsetting some of the reduction that might have been achieved.</p> <p>Across the 7 sites that are being considered as part of this proposal it is difficult to provide an exact figure around the potential carbon saving – as we do not hold the consumption data for all of the sites due to the Children Centres being located on school sites with a flat charge</p>	Monitoring of usage at sites where there is increased usage of facilities.	However, over the last two years - during and following the Covid-19 pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of

How will this proposal impact on the environment?		Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.					<p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 		
Page 40					contribution paid towards energy consumption. As a result a review has been undertaken to try to determine the possible estimated saving with this been 16,274kg with a potential up to 22,157kg.		countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises and reducing travel.
	Emissions from data storage		X				
	Other						
Minimise waste : Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic			X				
Reduce water consumption		X			When a site is vacated there will be a reduction in its water usage, however there might be an increase in usage at sites that services are	Monitoring of usage at sites where there is increased usage of facilities.	

How will this proposal impact on the environment?	Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
<div>Page 41</div>				<p>relocated to, offsetting some of the reduction that might have been achieved.</p> <p>However, over the last two years - during and following the Covid-19 pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises and reducing travel.</p>		
Minimise pollution (including air, land, water, light and noise)	X			Similar to water reduction, when a site is vacated there will be a reduction in elements of pollution, however there might be an increase at the site that is relocated to, offsetting some of the reduction that might have been achieved.		

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Ensure resilience to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		X				
<p>Enhance conservation and wildlife</p>		X				
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape</p>		X				
<p>Other (please state below)</p>						

Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal? If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

Over the last two years - during and following the Covid-19 pandemic – the Early Help service has redesigned the delivery of activities to support children and their families, moving to a blended approach of virtual and face to face activities. This has enabled the delivery of countywide virtual activities which families are able to access from their home, reducing the need for the same number of premises and reducing travel.

The overarching objectives of the Property Rationalisation Programme, are to achieve -

- The implementation of more efficient working practices within all of the County Council's property
- A reduction in the total floor area occupied by the County Council, resulting in a reduction in revenue expenditure and carbon emissions

Summary Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The assessment identifies an overall long-term positive impact on carbon reduction through reductions to the workplace property portfolio.

The size of the workplace estate means that it is an important factor in the Council's overall carbon reduction plan, as a result when sites are vacated / disposed of there is a positive impact as the overarching carbon footprint in relation to the workplace property portfolio will be reduced.

Across the 7 sites that are being considered as part of this proposal it is difficult to provide an exact figure around the potential carbon saving – as we do not hold the consumption data for all of the sites due to the Children Centres being located on school sites with a flat charge contribution paid towards energy consumption. As a result a review has been undertaken to try to determine the possible estimated saving with this been 16,274kg with a potential up to 22,157kg.

Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

Name	Katherine Edge
Job title	Senior Property Officer
Service area	Property Service
Directorate	Strategic Resources
Signature	
Completion date	22 nd February 2023

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Date:

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE

CORPORATE DIRECTOR MEETING WITH EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

7 March 2023

Northallerton Special Free School

1.0 Purpose of report

- 1.1 To seek Executive Member approval, following a successful application to the Department for Education, to accept the conditions offered to establish a new Special Free School in Northallerton at the Grammar School Lane site
- 1.2 This matter is being considered by the Executive Member for Education and Skills, after consultation with the Corporate Director Children and Young people's Services under the Executive Member's urgency powers in paragraph 14 of the Executive Members' Delegation Scheme.

2.0 Background

The latest Free School wave for special schools was announced by the DfE in June 2022. Whilst this development had not been specifically signposted there has been an expectation that this would form part of the £2.6 billion programme for expanding special school provision, announced in the Autumn 2021 spending review.

- 2.2 The requirement was to complete and submit an application by 21st October 2022 which, following Executive approval, was carried out.
- 2.3 Following the competitive bidding process, the Department for Education notified the council on 2nd March 2023 that the NYCC bid had been successful.
- 2.4 Contained within the letter was a request that the council, via the Director of Children's Services, formally accept moving forwards with the process to establish the new special school and set out a series of conditions that must be accepted. The letter and conditions are set out in appendix 1.

3.0 Northallerton Special Free School Bid

Rationale for requirement for SEMH Provision

- 3.1 Previous reports set out that having identified a provision deficiency in the north of the county, specifically Hambleton and Richmondshire, the council have taken the opportunity presented by the Free School wave to apply for a special school to cater for the needs of children with Social, Emotional and Mental Health needs.
- 3.2 Key components of our rationale for further increasing our special school place capacity are:
 - An ongoing increase in the number of EHCP's and the increased demand this places on existing special schools

- The geography of North Yorkshire means that presently children living in Northallerton, Richmond and Catterick as well as surrounding areas travel significant distances to reach specialist SEMH provision
- The council has seen continued demand, and need to utilise, expensive Independent Special School provision due to insufficient SEMH special school places within a travelable distance of those communities.

3.3 We have identified a strong business case that an SEMH provision in the Hambleton / Richmond area would both enable us to support more pupils in appropriate local specialist provision and reduce the ongoing financial pressure on the high needs revenue budget.

Location / Site for Provision

3.4 Having identified that the optimal location would be between the Bedale to Northallerton, the availability of buildings and sites in this area of the County were explored prior to the bid being submitted. The only site identified with significant potential was the Grammar School Lane site in Northallerton.

3.5 Our site development work indicated that the scale of development proposed would not require the full site to be assigned to the school development. However, at this early stage it has not been fully explored what the optimal arrangement would for the layout of buildings and use of space with the DfE.

Specifics of the Scheme Proposed

3.7 The specific proposal, of which we are recommending the council accepts the conditions provided by the DfE, is to develop a 120 place special school for pupils with SEMH needs.

3.8 The Special school will form part of the specialist SEMH support and provision available across North Yorkshire alongside universal and targeted provision.

4.0 Key Conditions

4.1 A full version of the conditions set out by the DfE as a prerequisite to moving forward with the process are set out in **appendix 1**. However key conditions are highlighted below:

- LA to provide the site on a 125-year peppercorn without premium using the DfE model lease. Heads of Terms to be agreed within 3 months and exchange within 6 months of project entering pre-opening.
- LA to meet abnormal site development costs, including:
 - geochemical exceedances relative to guidelines for school use
 - (including asbestos removal)
 - geophysical conditions
 - flooding and alleviation measures
 - s278 costs
 - new road provision from the adopted highway to the site boundary
 - s106 costs
 - retaining structures required as a function of topography
 - ecological provision - reserves, species protection and relocation
 - listed building and heritage community costs
 - title consolidation and registration
 - utility provision
 - environmental conditions that may require specific mitigations such as
 - acoustics or air pollution
 - mitigation measures for constrained sites (such as roof top
 - playgrounds)
 - other site-specific issues (including demolition)

- The school must be affordable and sustainable within your local authority's high needs block funding allocations, and the high needs funding of other local authorities commissioning places. To enable prospective proposers to develop realistic applications including robust financial plans, you must be able to state clearly in the specification the number of places your authority (and any other local authorities) will be commissioning, at a cost of £10,000 per place and the top-up funding rates your authority and other authorities will agree to pay in addition to the place funding to secure the required provision.

5.0 Capital Resourcing Implications

- 5.1. Within the free school programme, the DfE assume responsibility for the procurement, management and resourcing of the building project.
- 5.2 As is the case with the Selby Free School, there is the potential that financial liabilities could fall upon NYCC in terms of Highways and Section 278 works as set out in the conditions of acceptance. Our expectation is that given that the site has previously been used as a school site, that these costs would not be of a similar magnitude to those incurred in relation to Selby Free School. However, this risk will need to be monitored closely.
- 5.3 To account for the costs of highways and abnormal costs, £500k has been allocated against the councils most recent High Needs Provision Capital Allocation from the DfE.

6.0 Risks

- 6.1 To date, we have communicated clearly – via press releases – that the new school would not require the full use of the site area, however the specific details of which part of the site are used and which, if any, of the existing buildings are used would be decisions to be taken by the DfE during the planning and design phase. There remains significant community interest in the future use of the site and we will need to continue to communicate effectively with interested parties as the programme develops.
- 6.2 Given the success of the bid, it is recognised that further engagement will be necessary with all stakeholders to develop a masterplan for the usage of the whole site.

7.0 Decision-making

- 7.1 Executive approval was given to submit the bid 20th September 2022.
- 7.2 Given the success of the bid, the conditions set out by the DfE being largely as expected and the very narrow window for acceptance (5 working days) It is proposed that the Executive Member for Education and Skills provides approval for the council to accept the conditions by the deadline set.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1 Executive Member for Education and Skills provides approval to accept the DfE conditions set in relation to proceeding with the establishment of the Northallerton Special Free School

Stuart Carlton

CORPORATE DIRECTOR – CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE. Report prepared by Chris Reynolds, Head of SEND Strategic Planning and Resources

Action AgreedExecutive Member

Date: 7 March 2023

Action RequestedCorporate Director

Date: 7 March 2023

Appendix 1 – DfE Notification letter including conditions

Jane Le Sage

North Yorkshire County Council

Letter by email to:

Jane.lesage@northyorks.gov.uk

cc.

stuart.carlton@northyorks.gov.uk

1 March 2023

Dear Ms Le Sage,

Local Authority special free schools application

Official Confidential

The information contained in this letter is embargoed until 00:01 on Thursday 2 March and must be kept strictly confidential and only shared internally with local authority officials. Under no circumstances should this be shared publicly.

I am pleased to tell you that the Secretary of State has approved your application to establish a special free school in North Yorkshire Council and that it should proceed to the next stage of the process – the trust application stage.

Approval of your application is subject to specific conditions set out in Annex A. We will need to receive written confirmation from the Director of Children's Services that you accept the conditions by **8 March 2023**. Please email your confirmation and details of your named contact to fsapplications@education.gov.uk.

Next steps

I will write a further letter setting out more guidance on the next stage of the process shortly, including details around the specification. This will include more guidance on

the assessment of trust applications. The guidance to follow will enable you to work with Regions Group in DfE, in order to put in place plans for subsequent stages.

Your Regions Group contact is **Russell White** (russell.white@education.gov.uk)

As set out in the published guidance, the final decision to open any free school depends on the Secretary of State formally entering into a funding agreement with the academy trust. If the specification does not attract applications that meet the criteria, then no application will be approved. The Secretary of State may also make the decision to re-run the competition.

Should you wish to send a press notice to your local media once the public announcement has been made, Create: Schools - the external provider the department contracts to provide support to free school proposers will be able to provide you with a template press release. You can contact Create:Schools [here](#).

I would like to thank you and your colleagues for the commitment and time that you have shown in developing your application.

Please note a copy of this letter has been sent to your DCS, Stuart Carlton.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mela Watts', with a stylized, cursive script.

MELA WATTS CBE
DIRECTOR, SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TEACHING REGULATION DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION

Annex A

The approval of your application is conditional upon:

i. Deliverability

LA to provide the site on a 125-year peppercorn without premium using the DfE model lease. Heads of Terms to be agreed within 3 months and exchange within 6 months of project entering pre-opening.

LA to meet abnormal site development costs, including:

- geochemical exceedances relative to guidelines for school use (including asbestos removal)
- geophysical conditions
- flooding and alleviation measures
- s278 costs
- new road provision from the adopted highway to the site boundary
- s106 costs
- retaining structures required as a function of topography
- ecological provision - reserves, species protection and relocation
- listed building and heritage community costs
- title consolidation and registration
- utility provision
- environmental conditions that may require specific mitigations such as acoustics or air pollution
- mitigation measures for constrained sites (such as roof top playgrounds)
- other site-specific issues (including demolition)

The LA/applicant to engage with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to arrange a meeting between the Head of Planning (or equivalent), the Director of Children's Services (DCS), other LA and LPA representatives where appropriate, and a Department for Education (DfE) official, to be held within 6 weeks of the Secretary of State's formal approval of the project. A minute of the meeting, setting out the strategy for, and prospects of, securing the necessary planning permission in a timely manner, to be circulated and agreed by all parties within two weeks of the meeting.

If the site includes playing fields, the LA/applicant to engage with relevant parties to arrange a meeting with Sport England, a representative of the LPA and a DfE official, to be held within 12 weeks of the Secretary of State's formal approval of the project. A minute of the meeting, setting out the strategy for, and prospects of, securing Sport England's support in principle for a strategy to mitigate the loss of playing fields, to be circulated and agreed by all parties within two weeks of the meeting.

The conditions detailed above will continue to apply if an alternative site is subsequently brought forward for the school.

Programme forecasts for this wave of approvals show that we expect to be starting works on main sites by summer 2025. Should it become apparent that the school will be unable to meet these timescales, the department may need to review the deliverability of the project.

ii. New provision

The process is to establish a new special free school and not to replace or expand existing provision. This is not a mechanism to close a school and re-open it as a special free school in a new building.

However, strong independent schools wishing to join the state sector may apply to become free schools on the condition that the new places that are created are all in addition to the number of existing places that they plan to convert.

iii. Financial viability

The school must be affordable and sustainable within your local authority's high needs block funding allocations, and the high needs funding of other local authorities commissioning places. To enable prospective proposers to develop realistic applications including robust financial plans, you must be able to state clearly in the specification the number of places your authority (and any other local authorities) will be commissioning, at a cost of £10,000 per place and the top-up funding rates your authority and other authorities will agree to pay in addition to the place funding to secure the required provision.

iv. Eligible places

For special schools, the provision is only for pupils with an EHC plan, or, without an EHC plan in accordance with s34 of the Children and Families Act 2014.

v. Impact assessment

As part of the planning process for new schools, local authorities must also undertake an assessment of the impact of the proposal, both on existing educational institutions locally and in terms of impact on particular groups of pupils from an equalities perspective. This is to enable the Secretary of State to meet her duties under section 9 of the Academies Act 2010 and under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

In the unlikely event that the Secretary of State has concerns about the level or quality of analysis, she may require the relevant local authority to undertake further work on the impact of the proposed new school and/or

the equalities assessment so as to ensure the effective discharge of the duties mentioned.

vi. SEND and AP Green Paper

All new special free schools approved in this wave are expected to maximise the department's commitments made in the SEND & AP Green Paper, expanding the range of good quality provision available to children and young people in line with commissioning local authorities' needs. The provision offered by this new school should not only deliver good outcomes, but will be part of a local system which both meets local needs and is financially sustainable.

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire County Council

Children & Young People's Services

Corporate Director's Meeting with Executive Members

7 March 2023

Music Service Fees 2023/24

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek approval for the scale of fees for parents and schools for financial year 2023/24.

2.0 MUSIC CENTRE FEES TO PARENTS

- 2.1 The Music Service runs six Music Centres across the county and as part of the National Plan for Music Education, they fulfil a core role for the service. Music Centres provide opportunities for pupils to perform in ensembles out of school time. Music Centres were hit particularly hard by covid and remained closed for 18 months. When they re-opened, we were only allowed to operate with reduced ensemble sizes, to prevent infection. Over the course of this academic year those restrictions were removed and although centres have started to recover, it will be a few more years before we see them restored to pre-covid levels. As a result, a considerable amount of our grant funding is being used to subsidise the smaller centres. We have looked at ways of reducing costs and had a single manager overseeing two centres last year. However, this also meant that the drive and hands on approach managers need to develop the centres was weakened. We have since appointed a new manager to Northallerton Music Centre on our new NJC contract. Our Selby Music Centre manager no longer works for the service, and we are holding that post vacant as a cost saving next year. This should save the service approximately 35K as the post was on STPC.
- 2.2 A 6% increase in Music Centre fees, in line with corporate policy, is suggested to cover increased venue hire costs and teaching costs.

3.0 TUITION FEES FOR PARENTS

- 3.1 Recovery in pupil numbers was good last academic year with over 1200 new pupils being taken on. It has stalled a little this year, as the cost of living may be affecting parents' ability to pay. Currently our pupil numbers are slightly up (by about 200) than at the same time last year, although the sign-up rate has been slower. It is unlikely we will reach our target of 3000 pupils and may not even surpass last year's high of 2026.
- 3.2 A 6% increase in tuition fees is recommended to cover the cost of the teachers pay award, which has not been covered by grant funding for the National Plan for Music Education.

OPTION The table below shows the proposed increases in fees of 6% for 2023

COUNTY MUSIC SERVICE
FEES AND CHARGES - TERMLY

Service	April 2022	April 2023	% Increase
			%
Tuition in a group	75.50	£80	6%
Individual tuition – 20 min	147.50	156.30	6%
Group of two – 30 min	147.50	156.30	6%
Individual tuition – 30 min	207.20	219.50	6%
Instrument Hire			Variable in line with value of instrument
Music Centre – 2 sessions (full morning)	64.60	68.50	6%
Music Centre – 1 session (part morning)	51.80	54.90	6%

4.0 REMISSIONS

4.1 The table below shows the total number of remissions we are currently delivering.

REMISSIONS	Spring 2023 @ 19/1/23	
Standard Group	FSMs	220
Individual 20 Minute	FSMs & School Funded Individual 20 Top-Up	12
Individual 20 Minute	FSMs & no charge to parents (Homes for Ukraine)	2
Standard Group	Working Tax Credit (Grp Tuition 30%)	6
LAC (Group Tuition)		4
LAC Indiv 30 min (LA Funded)		0
LAC Indiv20 - (LA funded)		8

Total cost of remissions currently £19,282 per term.
(See 5.7 table for types of remission we currently offer)

4.2 It is proposed remissions remain the same for pupils however it must be noted that this is costing the service potentially 57K per year. If we continue to run a deficit budget, we will have to consider our remissions offer in the future.

Table Showing Remission Types

Category	Remission Award	Proposed Change
FSM/LAC	Free group lessons	No change
Working Tax Credit	30% on standard group lesson	No change

5.0 CURRENT FINANCIAL AND ARTS COUNCIL POSITION

- 5.1 The Q3 figures for the service indicate a small loss of between 10k and 12K if nominal overheads of 69K are not charged to the service. The main reasons for this are the pay award of 5% for teachers, equating to approximately 30K (the majority of our staff are unqualified) and the cost of providing remissions, 57K per year. There was also an increase of 8K in our overheads from following a pay award for those admin. staff on NJC working in BSS, that support the service. This increased from 130K to 138K.
- 5.2 We will make a saving on a managerial post (Selby Music Centre) of approximately 35K next year. We will make a further 6K saving on the introduction of the part time Assistant Head of Music post which is now a job share. We are also proposing a 15K reduction in our administrative costs, which are currently being discussed with BSS.
- 5.3 Funding from the DfE for Music Hubs has been agreed for the 2023/24 financial year although funding will now move to academic years. Our allocation has reduced by approximately 2K as a result of the funding formula, which is based on total pupil numbers in the LA and those entitled to FSM. In September 2024 the new National Plan for Music Education will start.
- 5.4 A bidding process for the next round of Arts Council funding will take place sometime in the summer term, although details have not yet been released. Consultation on this has already begun but the DfE have stated the intention to have less hub lead organisations. A briefing put out in December 2022 stated that there will be no single LA authority hub lead organisations. All hub lead organisations will have to run multiple LA areas. The geography of this is still to be worked out but will be dictated by Arts Council England.
- 5.5 We will need to submit a new bid as soon as details of the new funding process are made known by Arts Council England.
- 5.6 Our Arts Council feedback letter for academic year 2021/22 was mostly positive. We increased activity with primary schools, particularly around whole class instrumental delivery. We continue to develop this work and have maintained numbers this academic year. Overall, our work with schools across all areas of the National Plan for Music is higher than the national average. However, we still fall below the National Average on whole class lessons despite the increase. This is mainly because we have so many schools compared to other hubs. The budgetary constraints of our small primary schools also mean they cannot afford to buy in whole class instrumental work, even with the heavily subsidised fee. We also missed out on providing for three schools as they would not accommodate lessons during the morning. This continues to be an issue across the county.
- 5.7 Arts Council rate Music Hubs using a risk register. There are three categories, and we remain in the lowest category of risk, meaning we continue to offer an excellent level of service to our learners, schools and parents.

6.0 SCHOOL CHARGES

- 6.1 The Music Service, as part of its core delivery for the National Plan for Music, trades directly with schools.
- 6.2 Whole Class instrumental lessons have to be subsidised by a third, ensuring our commitment for one term worth of free tuition.
- 6.3 Whole Class Tuition and continuation are key statistics when reporting back to Arts Council.

- 6.4 The other packages we offer to schools are to support the National Plan for Music but are not necessarily core roles of the service, so fees are set accordingly and cover the current costs.
- 6.5 The table below shows this year's proposals for fee changes.
- 6.6 Income from schools this year is expected to be

Package	Pricing	2022/23 Price Primary and Secondary	2023/24 Proposed Price Primary and Secondary	% Increase
Cluster Group	Per hour	50.00		No change
Instrumental Teaching Block	Per hour	49.90	52.80	6%
Instruments Only	Per term	154	163.20	6%
Large Group Instrumental Ensemble Sessions	Per hour	49.90	52.80	6%
Whole Class Music Curriculum Sessions	Per hour	50.00	52.80	To bring into line with other charges
Whole Class Instrumental NPME	Per Academic Year	1102	1168	6%
GCSE Tuition	Per Hour	50.00	52.80	To bring into line with other charges

7.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

- i) A 6% rise in fees across the board, in line with corporate policy
- ii) Remissions remain unchanged but will be reviewed next year.

Stuart Carlton
 Corporate Director – CYPS
 County Hall
 Northallerton
 07/03/23

Report Author - Ian Bangay
 Presenter of Report – Ian Bangay

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

7TH MARCH 2023

2023/2024 EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This report asks Executive Members to agree recommendations to change the funding rates paid to early years' providers for the funded entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds and disadvantaged 2 year olds for the 2023/24 financial year.
- 1.2 The recommendations consider the feedback by early years' providers through a county-wide consultation.
- 1.3 The report also provides an overview of the other early years funding rates for 2023/24.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Early Years National Funding Formula provides a local authority funding rate for three and four olds in North Yorkshire at the funding floor level of £4.61 per hour. This funding rate provided the calculation basis for the 2022/23 three and four year old Early Years DSG allocation. The local authority hourly funding rate covers both the costs of provider funding and any central services related to early years provision that are provided free at the point of delivery.
- 2.2 In addition to the early years funding increases announced in the Autumn 2021 Spending Review for the 2023/24 financial year, the DfE have announced that, nationally, additional funding of £20m will be provided in 2023/24 to support the early years sector with the costs associated with the increase in the National Living Wage from April 2023¹. The DfE have also provided a response to their Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) consultation undertaken in Summer 2022. The response confirmed the implementation of the following changes for the 2023/24 financial year:
 - The underlying datasets driving the early years' funding formulae will be updated to the most recently available data.
 - Teachers pay and pension grants will be mainstreamed in both the EYNFF and MNS supplementary funding. In addition, the cap on funding supplements will be increased from 10% to 12% of the total value of the planned formula funding to providers to allow, if required, additional supplement provision to be added to a local funding formula for the allocation of this funding.
 - The application of year-to-year protections of +1% and a gains cap of 4.9% and 10.0% for the EYNFF and 2-year-old formula respectively. The minimum funding floor for the EYNFF has increased to £4.87.
 - A minimum funding floor for the MNS supplementary funding hourly rate of £3.80 and a cap on the MNS supplementary funding hourly rate of £10
- 2.3 On the 16th December 2022, the DfE announced an increase in the early years' local authority funding rate for the 2023/24 financial year. The funding rate for three- and four-year olds in North Yorkshire (i.e. the amount received by the local authority) will increase by 26p per hour

¹ The National Living Wage (NLW) will rise to £10.42 from 1 April 2023, an increase of 92 pence or 9.7%.

from £4.61 per hour to £4.87 per hour (the minimum funding floor). The increase in funding for three- and four-year olds reflects the mainstreaming of the teachers' pay and pension grant equating to 5p per hour and 21p related to the funding increase outlined in the Spending Review announcements and the updating of the underlying data to the latest available datasets. The level of funding for disadvantaged two-year olds will also increase by 13p per hour from £5.57 per hour to £5.70 per hour (representing a 2.3% increase). Early years' pupil premium will increase by 2p per hour (3 & 4 year universal entitlement hours only) from 60p per hour to 62p per hour (representing a 3.3% increase) and disability access funding will increase by £28 per annum from £800 per annum to £828 per annum (representing a 3.5% increase).

- 2.4 The regulations accompanying the Early Years National Funding Formula restrict the level of three- and four-year old funding which can be retained for the delivery of centrally managed services associated with early years' provision. The level of funding allowed to be retained is 5%. There are no regulations restricting the level of two-year old funding which can be retained by the local authority.
- 2.5 In addition to the three- and four-year old funding, the Early Years DSG allocation also includes funding for disadvantaged two year olds, early years pupil premium, disability access funding and maintained nursery school supplementary funding.
- 2.6 The three- and four-year old funding rate paid to early years providers consists of a base funding rate and funding supplements. The provider base funding rate for 2022/23 is £4.31 per hour. Within North Yorkshire, funding supplements are currently paid for deprivation, which is a mandatory funding supplement, and sparsity.
- 3.0 CONSULTATION ON THE PROVIDER BASE FUNDING RATE FOR DISADVANTAGED TWO YEAR OLDS AND THREE & FOUR YEAR OLDS FOR THE 2023/24 FINANCIAL YEAR
- 3.1 A funding consultation has been held with early years' providers in order to gain views on the following proposals and options with regard to the early years provider funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year:
 - a. A proposed increase in the provider base hourly funding rate for disadvantaged two-year olds by 13p; this equates to the 13p increase received in the 2023/24 local authority funding rate for North Yorkshire. The proposal would increase the disadvantaged two year provider base rate funding from £5.51 to £5.64 per hour.
 - b. A proposed increase in the three- and four-year old provider base funding rate of 20p per hour to increase the base hourly funding rate from £4.31 to £4.51 per hour.
 - c. The discontinuation of the Sparsity funding supplement for the 2023/24 financial year, with the use of the Early Years reserve to provide any short term exceptional financial support to a provider required to secure sufficiency of early years provision within a geographical area until the availability of provision can be stabilised. The discontinuation of the Sparsity funding supplement would allow for the provider base rate funding to be increased by a further 1p per hour in addition to the 20p detailed in (a) above.
 - d. The options for the distribution of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers pay and pensions grant:

Option 1: Increase the three- and four-year old provider base funding rate by an additional 5p per hour (in addition to the 20p detailed in (a) above)

Option 2: Introduce a Quality Supplement which would be paid to those providers that employ a qualified teacher to deliver the early years provision, where the qualified teacher is employed on teachers' pay and conditions and where the employer pays into the teachers' pension scheme for the teacher delivering the early years' provision. The Quality Supplement rate would be 22p per hour for three and four year old universal and extended hours. The funding supplement would only be payable to those providers meeting the eligibility criteria.

3.2 The NYCC consultation was undertaken with early years' providers between 25th January 2023 and 22nd February 2023. A copy of the consultation document can be found at Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 2 to this report provides a copy of the Equalities Impact Assessment completed for the proposed change in early years provider funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year.

3.3 187 responses were received to the consultation, as shown below.

LA Maintained Nursery School	1
LA Maintained Schools and Academies*	38
Independent Schools	0
Full Day Care	48
Sessional Care	36
Childminders	65
Total	188

(Response rate: 31% of funded early years' providers)

(1 response did not state a provider name and 3 duplicate responses have been received; these responses have been excluded from the results analysis)

3.4 Providers were asked to indicate their agreement to the proposed funding rate increases. The consultation results are detailed in the table below:

Proposal	In Agreement With Proposed Funding Rate Increase (No. Responses)			Total Responses
	Yes	No	No Response Provided	
2023/24 disadvantaged 2 year old base funding rate increasing by 13p per hour from £5.51 to £5.64 per hour	160	23	5	188
2023/24 3 & 4 year old base funding rate increasing by 20p per hour from £4.31 to £4.51 per hour	139	48	1	188

Proposal	In Agreement With Proposed Funding Rate Increase (No. Responses)			Total Responses
	Yes	No	No Response Provided	
Discontinuation of the Sparsity Funding Supplement with an additional 1p to the 2023/24 3 & 4 year old base funding rate	162	24	2	188
Distribution of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers pay and pensions grant:	Option 1	Option 2	No Response	
Option 1 - Increase the 3 & 4 year old provider base funding rate by an additional 5p per hour Option 2 - Introduce a Quality Supplement which would be paid to those providers that employ a qualified teacher to deliver the early years provision, where the qualified teacher is employed on teachers' pay and conditions and where the employer pays into the teachers' pension scheme for the teacher delivering the early years' provision. The Quality Supplement rate would be 22p per hour for 3 and 4 year old universal and extended hours No Response provided Total Response	151	33	4	188

Appendix 3 to this report provides details of the comments received from early years' providers to the consultation questions.

- 3.5 In respect of the base provider funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds, 85% of providers submitting a response to the consultation indicated support for a base funding rate of £5.64 per hour for the 2023/24 financial year.
- 3.6 In respect of the base provider funding rate for 3 & 4 year olds, 73% of providers submitting a response to the consultation indicated support for a base funding rate of £4.51 per hour for the 2023/24 financial year.
- 3.7 In respect of the proposal to discontinue the Sparsity Funding Supplement for the 2023/24 financial year and utilise the funding to provide an additional 1p per hour on the base

provider funding rate for 3 & 4 year olds, 86% of providers submitting a consultation response supported the proposal.

- 3.8 In respect of the options presented in the consultation for the distribution of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers pay and pensions grant, 80% of providers submitting a consultation response supported Option 1 (Increase the 3 & 4 year old provider base funding rate by an additional 5p per hour) and 17% of providers submitting a consultation response supported Option 2 (The introduction of a Quality Supplement which would be paid to those providers that employ a qualified teacher to deliver the early years provision, where the qualified teacher is employed on teachers' pay and conditions and where the employer pays into the teachers' pension scheme for the teacher delivering the early years' provision. The Quality Supplement rate would be 22p per hour for 3 and 4 year old universal and extended hours). 92% (138 responses out of 149 responses) of the Private, Voluntary and Independent early years providers responding to the consultation supported Option 1. 66% (26 responses out of 39 responses) of the responses to the consultation received from Maintained Nursery Schools, Maintained Schools and Academies supported Option 2.
- 3.9 Based on the consultation responses received from early years' providers, it is recommended that the provider base funding rates for the 2022/23 financial year are increased from £5.51 to £5.64 per hour for the funded entitlement for disadvantaged 2-year olds and from £4.31 per hour to £4.57 per hour for the funded entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds.

4.0 2023/24 OTHER EARLY YEARS FUNDING ELEMENTS

- 4.1 The national funding levels received from the DfE for the other early years funding elements for 2023/24 are as follows:

Funding Element	Funding Level Received by LA & Paid To Providers
Early Years Pupil Premium	£0.62 / Per Hour (Universal Hours)
Disability Access Funding	£828 per annum per eligible child

- 4.2 The funding supplements are paid to early years' providers in addition to the 3 & 4 year old provider base rate fund. These supplements will remain unchanged for the 2023/24 financial year and are as follows:

- i. Deprivation funding supplement (mandatory)

Band	2023/24 Deprivation Hourly Funding Rate	IMD Score
Band A	54p	>34.17
Band B	7p	>20 <34.17
Band C	4p	>10 <20

4.3 The DfE have previously provided specific supplementary funding for maintained nursery schools (MNS) to enable their 2016/17 funding levels related to the delivery of universal provision to continue to be maintained. This has enabled a higher level of funding to continue to be paid to maintained nursery schools during the period which the supplementary funding is in place. In Summer 2022, the DfE announced an additional £10m investment in MNS supplementary funding from 2023-24, and they also consulted on proposals to distribute the MNS supplementary funding more evenly across all LAs with MNSs in 2023-24. In December 2022, the DfE confirmed the following developments for MNS supplementary funding for 2023/24:

- The introduction of a minimum funding floor set at £3.80 per MNS hour and a cap set at £10 per MNS hour, in order to distribute the supplementary funding more evenly between LAs with MNSs. North Yorkshire is receiving the floor level funding rate of £3.80 per MNS hour for three- and four-year old universal provision.
- The funding which MNSs currently receive through the teachers pay and pension grants will be rolled into the supplementary funding that LAs receive for their MNSs from 2023-24. The indicative funding rate rolled into the MNS supplementary funding for North Yorkshire is £0.50 per hour; this funding is included within the overall £3.80 MNS supplementary funding rate.

4.4 The indicative MNS supplementary funding value for North Yorkshire is £414k. The indicative supplementary funding allocation is subject to adjustment at the end of the financial year to reflect the actual three- and four-year old universal hours delivered within the year by the MNS. The DfE have indicated that the level at which the minimum funding floor will be set for 2024-25 along with all other MNS supplementary funding rates will be announced in Autumn 2023. They have also stated that levels of supplementary funding for MNS for the financial years after this will be subject to the outcome of the next Spending Review. Discussions will be undertaken with the three MNS in North Yorkshire in order to review and agree the methodology for the distribution of the MNS supplementary funding. The DfE have provided confirmation that authorities may continue to use 'lump sums' to distribute additional funding to MNS. The Local Authority intends to lobby DfE for a clear and sustainable funding position for MNS.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CYPs Executive Members are asked to:

- Agree the recommendation to increase the provider base funding rate for the universal and extended funded entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds from £4.31 per hour to £4.57 per hour for the 2023/24 financial year.
- Agree the recommendation to increase the provider funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds from £5.51 to £5.64 for the 2023/24 financial year
- Note the 2023/24 funding rates for the other early years funding elements

STUART CARLTON

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

Report Prepared by: Sally Dunn, Head of Finance – Schools, Early Years & High Needs



NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

EARLY YEARS FUNDING RATES

(Disadvantaged 2-year olds and 3 & 4-year olds)

A CONSULTATION PAPER

25 January 2023

Deadline for responses: 5pm, 22 February 2023

- 1.0 Background and introduction**
- 2.0 Disadvantaged two-year old proposed 2023/24 provider funding rate**
- 3.0 Three and four-year old proposed 2023/24 provider funding rate**
- 4.0 Three and four-year old funding supplements**
- 5.0 Consultation process**

1.0 Background and Introduction

- 1.1 On 16th December 2022, the Department for Education (DfE) confirmed that the early years funding rates used to distribute funding to local authorities will increase in North Yorkshire for the 2023/24 financial year. The hourly funding rate paid to the local authority for disadvantaged two-year olds will increase to £5.70 from £5.57 (representing a 2.3% increase), and the hourly funding rate for three and four-years olds paid to the local authority will increase to £4.87 from £4.61 (representing a 5.6% increase).
- 1.2 The DfE have also confirmed that the national funding rate for the early years' pupil premium will increase from 60p to 62p per eligible child per hour, and the Disability Access Fund will increase from £800 to £828 per eligible child per year.
- 1.3 The funding for maintained nursery school (MNS) supplements will continue for 2023/24 and has been confirmed at £3.80 per MNS hour.

2.0 Disadvantaged Two-Year Old Proposed 2023/24 Provider Funding Rate

- 2.1 In respect of disadvantaged two-year old funding, North Yorkshire will receive an increase in the local authority rate from £5.57 per hour to £5.70 from 1st April 2023. The local authority retains approx. 1% of this funding to support developments with regard to the early years' strategy within North Yorkshire.
- 2.2 **It is proposed to increase two-year old hourly funding rate paid to providers by 13p per hour from £5.51 to £5.64 for the 2023/24 financial year.**

3.0 Three and Four-Year Old Proposed 2023/24 Provider Funding Rate

- 3.1 In respect of the three and four-year old funding rates, North Yorkshire will receive an increase in the local authority rate from £4.61 per hour to £4.87 from 1st April 2023. 5p per hour of the increase in the funding rate for three and four-year olds relates to the inclusion in the local authority funding rate of the teachers' pay and pension grant for the 2023/24 financial year; previously this funding has been paid as a separate grant to schools and academies operating early years' provision where the early years' children are on the school roll. The remainder of the increase, equating to 21p per hour, relates to the funding increase outlined in the Government Spending Review announcements and the updating of the data used by the Government in the national early years funding formula calculation for the 2023/24 financial year. The local authority hourly funding rate covers both the costs of provider funding and any central services related to early years' provision that are provided by the Local Authority free at the point of delivery.
- 3.2 The regulations accompanying the Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) restrict the level of the three and four-year old funding rate which can be retained by the local authority for the delivery of centrally managed services associated with early years' provision. The level of funding allowed to be retained is a maximum of 5%.
- 3.3 **It is proposed to increase three and four-year old universal and extended entitlement hourly funding rate paid to providers by 20p per hour from £4.31 to £4.51 for the 2023/24 financial year.** Dependent on the decisions made for 2023/24 in relation to the provider funding supplement proposals detailed in section 4 below, the

provider base rate funding may increase by a further 1p to 6p in addition to the proposed increase of 20p per hour.

4.0 Three and Four-Year Old Funding Supplements

4.1 The three and four-year old funding rate paid to early years providers consists of a base funding rate hour and funding supplements. Within North Yorkshire, funding supplements are currently paid for:

- deprivation (mandatory funding supplement), and
- sparsity (optional supplement)

4.2 Deprivation Funding Supplement

Deprivation funding is paid at the end of each term and is based on the hours attended by the child and a banding using the postcode of the child attending the setting. The methodology used by North Yorkshire is based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The IMD combines information from seven domain indices (which measure different types or dimensions of deprivation) to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation.

The deprivation funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year will be unchanged as follows:

<i>Band</i>	<i>2023/24 Deprivation Hourly Funding Rate</i>	<i>IMD Score</i>
Band A	54p	>34.17
Band B	7p	>20 <34.17
Band C	4p	>10 <20

4.3 Sparsity Funding Supplement

Sparsity funding within North Yorkshire has been used to support providers in areas where there is limited choice of early years' provision, and in circumstances where the provider would struggle to remain viable without additional interim financial support. Providers must apply for the funding and meet the following criteria:

- There is not a similar provider within 3 miles, and where for at least 50% of children attending the setting it is their nearest similar provider within 3 miles
- The provider is projecting that they will be operating at a loss in the next 12 months
- The provider has less than 3 months operating costs within their reserves
- Any funding awarded is based on a financial assessment carried out by the local authority and the agreement of a recovery plan to return the provider to financial sustainability.
- The maximum funding award is £16,000.

Over recent years there has been very limited usage of the £50,000 funding allocation for the Sparsity supplement. **It is now considered appropriate to request the views of the sector on removing the Sparsity funding supplement for the 2023/24 financial year and to instead use the Local Authority Early Years funding reserve**

to provide any short term exceptional financial support to a provider where this is required to secure sufficiency of early years provision within a geographical area until the availability of provision can be stabilised. The removal of the Sparsity funding supplement would allow the funding previously allocated to the supplement to be added to the provider base rate funding. This would increase the three and four-year old provider base funding rate by a further 1p per hour, in addition to the 20p detailed in 3.3 above.

4.4 Additional Funding Arising from The Inclusion of the Teachers Pay & Pension Grant Funding in the Local Authority Funding Rate for Three & Four-Year Olds

For the 2023/24 financial year, the DfE have made the decision to include funding related to the teachers' pay and pension grant in the funding rate paid the local authority for three and four-year olds. In the 2022/23 financial year, this funding was paid as a separate grant to schools and academies operating early years provision where the early years' children are recorded on the school / academy roll. The grant funding was paid to support schools and academies with additional funding for higher than anticipated pay increases for teachers and increases in the employers' contribution rate for teacher's pensions. The inclusion of the grant funding equates to an additional 5p per hour on the local authority funding rate for three and four-year olds within North Yorkshire. The local authority is inviting views from the sector on two options for the distribution of this funding:

a. Option 1

To increase the three and four-year old provider base funding rate by an additional 5p per hour (in addition to the 20p detailed in section 3.3 above)

b. Option 2

To introduce a Quality Supplement which would be paid to those providers that employ a qualified teacher to deliver the early years provision, where the qualified teacher is employed on teachers' pay and conditions and where the employer pays into the teachers' pension scheme for the teacher delivering the early years' provision.

The Quality Supplement rate would be 22p per hour for three and four-year old universal and extended hours.

The funding supplement would only be payable to those providers meeting the eligibility criteria, with providers being required to provide evidence of meeting the eligibility criteria

5.0 Consultation Process

Providers are asked to complete the online survey at:

<https://consult.northyorks.gov.uk/snapwebhost/s.asp?k=167412116690> to tell us your views on the proposals for early years funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year detailed in sections 2, 3 and 4 above. The survey will be open until 5.00pm on Wednesday, 22nd February 2023.

The responses received to this consultation will be considered by the NYCC Executive Members for the Children & Young People's Service in their decision-making process in relation to early years' funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year.

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated April 2019)

Early Years Funding 2023-24 (Early Years Block Funding)

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	North Yorkshire County Council: Central Services
Lead Officer and contact details	Howard Emmett - Assistant Director – Strategic Services
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Sally Dunn – Head of Finance (Schools & Early Years)
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	The proposal will be subject to an early years' sector wide consultation process from 25 th January 2023 ending 22 nd February 2023 and

	<p>this EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses.</p> <p>The item will be discussed at the North Yorkshire School Forum meeting on 19th January 2023</p>
When did the due regard process start?	<p>In setting Early Years Budget each year, it is necessary to consider the level of the funding rates paid to early years providers in respect of the funded entitlements for 3 & 4 year olds and disadvantaged 2 year olds within the parameters determined by the DfE.</p> <p>This EIA considers this issue in respect of 2023-24 Early Years provider rates.</p>

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

The EIA considers the review of early years provider funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year.

The local authority determines the provider funding rates to be paid to early years providers for the delivery of funded entitlements for 3 & 4-year old children and disadvantaged 2 year old children. The funding consists of the provider base funding rates and provider funding supplements.

The determination of the of the early years provider funding rates is undertaken within the parameters of the funding levels provided by the DfE through the Early Years Dedicated Schools Grant and the associated grant conditions.

In addition to setting the base provider funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year, the EIA also considers:

- The removal of the Sparsity funding supplement for the 2023/24 financial year and to instead use the Local Authority Early Years funding reserve to provide any short term exceptional financial support to a provider where required to secure sufficiency of early years provision within a geographical area until the availability of provision can be stabilised. The removal of the Sparsity funding supplement would allow the funding previously allocated to the supplement to be added to the provider base rate funding for three and four-year olds. This would increase the three and four-year old provider base funding rate by a further 1p per hour in addition to the proposed inflationary increase and benefit all early years providers (rural and urban) delivering funded provision.
- Options for the distribution of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers' pay and pensions grant and now included in the local authority funding rate for 3 & 4 years olds. The options to be consulted on are:
Option 1: Increase the three and four-year old provider base funding rate by an additional 5p per hour
Option 2: Introduce a Quality Supplement which would be paid to those providers that employ a qualified teacher to deliver the early years provision, where the qualified teacher is employed on teachers' pay and conditions and where the employer pays into the teachers' pension scheme for the teacher delivering the early years' provision. The funding supplement would only be payable to those providers meeting the eligibility criteria, with providers being required to provide evidence of meeting the eligibility criteria.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

The DfE require each local authority to determine the level of the provider funding rates to be used within their local early years funding formula each financial year.

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

The impact on individual early years providers may vary in relation to the proposed level of early years funding rates and the operating profiles of the settings. Whilst the wider early years sector would see increased funding benefit if the option to include the funding previously allocated to schools and academies was included with the provider base funding rate, schools and academies would experience some reduction in the funding received.

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

The DfE released their 2023/24 funding announcement and the associated detailed funding information for the Early Years DSG on 16th December 2022. The North Yorkshire Schools Forum will be updated on the 2023/24 funding arrangements and notified on the intention to consult with the early years sector at its meeting the 19th January 2023

A consultation will be undertaken with the early years will be undertaken between 25th January 2023 and 22nd February 2023.

The responses and results from the consultation exercise will be presented at the Schools Forum on 16th March 2023. This EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses. Early years providers will be notified of the outcome of this process before the end of March 2023.

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result.

The specific proposal in the EIA is cost neutral as all costs will be contained within the ring-fence of the 2023/24 Early Years Block DSG

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.

Age	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic. The proposal will be applied to all years providers.
Disability	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic.
Sex	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic.
Race	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Gender reassignment	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Sexual orientation	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Religion or belief	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Pregnancy or maternity	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Marriage or civil partnership	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic

Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
..live in a rural area?	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic.
...have a low income?	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
...are carers (unpaid family or friend)?	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic

Section 8. Geographic impact – Please detail where the impact will be (please tick all that apply)	
North Yorkshire wide	✓
Craven district	
Hambleton district	
Harrogate district	

Richmondshire district	
Ryedale district	
Scarborough district	
Selby district	
If you have ticked one or more districts, will specific town(s)/village(s) be particularly impacted? If so, please specify below.	

<p>Section 9. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.</p> <p>None identified</p>

<p>Section 10. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)</p>	<p>Tick option chosen</p>
<p>1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.</p>	
<p>3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts. Get advice from Legal Services)</p>	
<p>4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.</p>	
<p>Explanation of why option has been chosen. (Include any advice given by Legal Services.)</p> <p>No significant adverse impacts have been identified from the EIA affecting one or more protected characteristic.</p> <p>The consultation with early years' providers will conclude on the 22nd February 2023. This EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses should this be required.</p>	

Section 11. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)

The processes operating in the LA with regard to monitoring the sufficiency or early years provision and the monitoring of the termly early years headcount claims used to calculate payments to early years providers allow the LA to monitor the impact of funding rate changes on the early years sector within North Yorkshire.

Section 12. Action plan. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA, including post implementation review to find out how the outcomes have been achieved in practice and what impacts there have actually been on people with protected characteristics.

Action	Lead	By when	Progress	Monitoring arrangements
1. To undertake a formal consultation with early years providers	Howard Emmett – Asst. Director	22nd February 2023		
2. To obtain approval for any changes to the early years funding rates for the 2023/24 financial year from CYPS Executive Members	Howard Emmett – Asst. Director	7th March 2023		
3. To report outcomes to School Forum	Howard Emmett – Asst. Director	16 th March 2023		

Section 13. Summary Summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The Equality Impact Assessment has assessed the impact of the proposal namely

- To consider the early years provider base funding rates for three and four-year olds and disadvantaged two-year olds for the 2023/24 financial year.
- To consider the removal of the Sparsity funding supplement for the 2023/24 financial year and to instead use the Local Authority Early Years funding reserve to provide any short term exceptional financial support to a provider where required to secure sufficiency of early years provision within a geographical area until the availability of provision can be stabilised. The removal of the Sparsity funding supplement would allow the funding

previously allocated to the supplement to be added to the provider base rate funding for three and four-year olds

- To consider options for the distribution to early years' providers of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers' pay and pensions grant and now included in the local authority funding rate for 3 & 4-year olds.
- To hold consultation with all early years providers in North Yorkshire over these proposals
- To report findings, conclusions and recommendations to CYPS Executive Members (for decision) and to the Schools Forum (for information).

At this stage of the EIA there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal made will significantly disadvantage one or more protected characteristics

Section 14. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Sally Dunn

Job title: Head of Finance – Schools, Early Years & High Needs

Directorate: Central Services

Signature: *Sally Dunn*

Completion date: 16th January 2023

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Date:

Provider comments received on the proposals related to the provider base funding rate for disadvantaged 2 years	
Provider Type	Comment
Full Day Care	I didn't think the LA were allowed to top slice the 2 year funding
Sessional Care	With cost of living crisis needs to be more
Sessional Care	the percentage taken by nycc seems excessive
Sessional Care	We simply can not afford to take on any more funded 2 year olds due to high staff wages and the ratio of 1:4 on low wages.
Sessional Care	This is still low when you calculate the ratios and cost of provision
Full Day Care	I'd like more ideally.
Full Day Care	It is not enough
Full Day Care	We dont have any other choices it is what the government think we are worth!
Full Day Care	It still is not enough to cover the increases in salaries and utilities
Sessional Care	This is to low to cover the staffing costs and also the increase in the cost of living. Snack and food costs have increased and the low increase does not cover increase in setting rises
Full Day Care	Early Years is completely underfunded, with minimum wage increasing on an annual basis. Government hourly funding needs to always rise at the same rate as the minimum wage.
Sessional Care	I feel many settings are facing huge increases and this is not enough to help towards this, however I also recognise this is not NYCC and its a country wide issue.
Sessional Care	It is not clear where the money that is sliced off the top is being spent. I believe that settings would benefit from receiving the full funding given by the government.

Full Day Care	It doesn't cover the costs of running a nursery especially during the current situation of cost of living and paying staff at a lower ratio amount
Full Day Care	Personally don't think it's enough.
Full Day Care	These increases are less then the 10% staff wage increase- don't cover costs and we currently run at a loss each year because of funding
Sessional Care	To be financially viable, this needs to increase further.
Sessional Care	Ideally it would be more as once children access funding all settings lose money .
Childminder	This is a doable funding rate.
Full Day Care	I agree with the increase, Just feel like the rate is not enough
Full Day Care	This is not enough to cover increases placed upon us
Sessional Care	insufficient funding to make running a nursery viable
Full Day Care	Due to the increased costs of electricity, food and the forthcoming wage increase, I do not feel it is adequate.
Full Day Care	This does not support the rising costs we are being forced to meet but at least is some improvement
Sessional Care	These children often come with extra social or development needs the money accompanying these children is not sufficient to give them the support they very often need.
Full Day Care	not enough
Sessional Care	PLEASE NOTE - This will not cover the increase in the National Minimum Wage with effect from April 2023

Provider comments received on the proposed increase in the provider base funding rate for 3 & 4 year olds	
Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	too low
Childminder	I have been working far below my standard charged rate for years providing funding. It's not sustainable anymore and will not be accepting funding next year if the rate isn't increased.
Childminder	We have increased our hourly rate to £5.00 per hour because of the current cost of living, if we take the funded children we and a lot of childminder are actually losing money. We would just be happy if it was a flat £5.00 per hour rate.
Childminder	My current hourly rate is £6 so obviously I'd like the funding rate to be higher!
Full Day Care	It isn't a high enough increase to cover the increase in minimum wage and other increases in overheads
Childminder	Much higher than it was but still isn't the same level as my hourly rate
Sessional Care	With cost of living crisis needs to be more
Sessional Care	YES indeed, this would be a MUCH better option for many settings.
Sessional Care	the percentage taken by nycc seems excessive
Sessional Care	NLW and wages have risen sharply this year and again in April. We are struggling to pay new wage increase to the cost of funded children per hour. It isn't sustainable and many settings will close
Childminder	It is still 49p per hour less than my hour rate but it is better than £4.31 so I do agree with the increase.
Full Day Care	I'd like more. My costs are rising.
Childminder	It's still not enough.....would you work for £4.51
Full Day Care	I feel it should be in line with inflation and wage increases which this increase is not.
Full Day Care	Sadly not enough and in honestly I am concerned about our sustainability on the long term.

Childminder	Does not match my hourly rate
Full Day Care	it is not enough to cover costs and provide quality care and education
Childminder	You need to bring this to above £5 otherwise it is unsustainable for childcare providers.
Childminder	This is still well below inflation & cost of living rises
Childminder	This is too low and doesn't cover the hourly rate
Full Day Care	Given the increase in the minimum wage and the staffing shortages in this sector both of which are driving up staff cost massively the increase to £4.51 per hour is not adequate. It is impossible to provide high quality resources and keep motivated and highly trained staff with this level of funding.
Full Day Care	We don't have any other choices it is what the government think we are worth! Even though we are setting a firm foundation for learning for children and setting them up for their life journey into school and beyond
Childminder	It is nowhere near the rate it needs to be!! I charge £4.80 an hour.
Childminder	It's still too low, at the moment I charge £5 per hour so I am working at a loss
Sessional Care	Still isn't enough to purchase new equipment, resources, consumables. We continue to have to fundraise and beg for donations.
Childminder	Doesn't meet hourly rate that I charge
Full Day Care	I think this should be in line with our hourly rate.
Sessional Care	As above. The sector is in a recruitment crisis because the funding does not cover costs and wages for staffing have to be so low. It is under valued and under paid due to Government restrictions on increases.
Childminder	Although any increase is welcome. The hourly rate should in my opinion be higher than it is.
Childminder	It still isn't enough!
Full Day Care	Early Years is completely underfunded, with minimum wage increasing on an annual basis. Government hourly funding needs to always rise at the same rate as the minimum wage.

Sessional Care	I feel many settings are facing huge increases and this is not enough to help towards this, however I also recognise this is not NYCC and its a country wide issue.
Sessional Care	It is not clear where the money that is sliced off the top is being spent. I believe that settings would benefit from receiving the full funding given by the government.
Full Day Care	Although an increase of just 4.64% further contributes to the wilful destruction of the early years sector by central government. Our wages bill will increase by 10% in April and our energy costs will treble when our fixed rate runs out in June. I appreciate that NYCC can only pass on what central government grants to them.
Sessional Care	Early Years Providers are struggling with rising cost ie minimum wage, utilities bills it could have been more.
Full Day Care	Again isn't enough to cover the cost of running a nursery especially in the current situation of rising cost and cover the staff on top
Childminder	This would hardly cover costs - would have to ask parents to pay additional for consumables
Childminder	I'm losing 99p per hour on this rate - its not sustainable
Full Day Care	Absolutely not. Far too low!
Full Day Care	Same reason as above- we are considering closing the setting due to the lack of financial support for funding by the government and local authorities because of the huge loss we make per year especially after staff wages have dramatically increased and costs of running a nursery and business is increasing
Full Day Care	It does not cover our costs and staff wages will be going up in April 2023.
Sessional Care	Again, this does not cover the costs. Fee paying parents are having to pay 60p more any hour.
Childminder	Does not cover costs
Full Day Care	It is good increase but still not enough to cover the cost to the parent and a popup fee is needed from the parent.
Sessional Care	Again once children access funding settings lose money .
Sessional Care	We would prefer a slightly larger increase in recognition of the increase in minimum wage and cost of living. 10% possibly?

Childminder	As a childminder with restricted numbers this funding amount doesn't cover the real cost of delivering the child's place per hour. I cannot work with an assistant for that amount of funding. As wages and bills increase it is getting harder to deliver funded places. The rate needs to be equal to 2 year old funding especially for childminders where our numbers are low
Full Day Care	Have I misunderstood? it says £4.61 on the previous page
Sessional Care	Although this proposal is closing the gap between the hourly funding rate and our current hourly running cost, there will still be a deficit of 20%
Full Day Care	No need to be increases for private sector in line with school we all have to do the same jobs and have similar overheads, but we don't have extra budgets of money injected by the government.
Full Day Care	I agree with the increase, Just feel like the rate is not enough
Full Day Care	It is a poor increase and does not cover the rise in staff pay and outgoing expenses
Full Day Care	This is not enough to cover increases placed upon us
Sessional Care	I disagree with this amount I feel it should be much higher, as we have the staff wages going up, electric, maintenance of the building, rent etc. It is shocking that everything is going up so much including food everything. Yet we are expected to survive on this hourly rate. This is why so many companies are going under because of the lack of support from the government with these hourly rates.
Sessional Care	Not enough to ensure provision staffing
Sessional Care	insufficient funding to make running a nursery viable
Academy	This is only a 4.6% increase in funding in a time when general inflation is circa 10%, minimum wage is increasing 10% and utility costs are up 350%. This will put more pressure on providers and is not sustainable long-term.
Full Day Care	Again the rate is not high enough as per my comment regarding the increase in the question above
Full Day Care	It still doesn't fall in line with the cost of an early years place especially with the cost of living and staff salaries increases. We continue to find it incredibly disappointing that the government do not fund early years even close to sufficiently
Full Day Care	This does not support the rising costs we are being forced to meet but at least is some improvement
Sessional Care	We are voluntary setting and try to keep the cost of childcare down if we can and still this funding increase is below what our non-funded children would pay. Staff are not paid what they are worth. All my staff are qualified and have key children

	responsibilities/ safeguarding etc yet they are on the minimum wage or just above as we cannot pay them what they are worth!
Full Day Care	not enough
Sessional Care	PLEASE NOTE - This will not cover the increase in the National Minimum Wage with effect from April 2023
Sessional Care	although settings are suffering financially, funding has never been enough and never will be with the cost settings have to pay, a higher rate would be nice

Provider comments received on the proposed discontinuation of the Sparsity Funding Supplement with an additional 1p to the 2023/24 3 & 4 year old base funding rate	
Provider Type	Comment
Sessional Care	As long as the "Funding reserve" could be used to help subsidise settings where necessary
Maintained School	A difficult choice to make - as the only provider within 3 miles I was unaware of the sparsity funding available and whether or not my setting would have qualified. To suggest an alternative I can only assume it will assist those most in need. Circulation of clear guidance and the criteria for the financial support available would be useful.
Full Day Care	I think a lot of settings of all kinds will need support so yes, however I'm not sure its fundamentally correct to collect that money from the industry you want to support!
Full Day Care	I feel that 1p per hours is meaningless.
Full Day Care	For setting to approach for this funding reserve makes more sense as each setting is unique and has its own challenges depending on where they are located
Full Day Care	It's removing money from the childcare sector which is already running below the amounts needed to cover the bills
Sessional Care	At times settings may need support especially in the economic crisis we all find ourselves in.
Sessional Care	Not that 1p helps very much, much more is needed.
Sessional Care	as pupil number have been low this has helped us in the past and again would have in 23/24
Maintained School	As a small rural school, sparsity funding is crucial to being able to provide a high quality of education to all of our pupils.

Provider comments received on the proposed options for the distribution of the funding previously allocated to schools and academies via the teachers' pay and pensions grant	
Provider Type	Comment
Sessional Care	I am a Level 7 qualified Early Years Teacher, so I do agree with option 2 that there should be a Quality Supplement as I think there is a problem with the quality of provision in some settings. However, we do not pay into teachers pension scheme, nor do I receive 'teachers pay' as I have chosen to be employed in a private Preschool. I think the issue is the criteria here of Option 2, and instead the extra 22p per hour should be provided to providers who can prove an EYT or other qualified teacher works at the setting for over 30 hours a week.
Sessional Care	Option 1 please! To be perfectly honest we think that the majority of settings will go for option 1 as most settings do not employ a "Qualified Teacher" and especially can not afford to do so under the terms and conditions "MUST be paid a teacher's pay and MUST pay into a "Teacher's pension" IF option 2 is cast as the majority of the votes a lot of settings like ourselves will certainly suffer immensely getting NO increase in the funding rates at all and due to the rising costs of running a business. This is where quality and efficiency will well and truly suffer if Option 2 is chosen in an already struggling industry where we are left to our own devices most of the time due to "No funding available or lack of funding" IF option 2 is chosen we would like statistics circulated please in line with the decision. Thank you though to ALL the EYFT you do an amazing job and always a pleasure chatting to you all and being there whenever we need you!
Sessional Care	I am a qualified teacher but do not hold a EYTS certificate, but a PGCE Level 7. I do not feel we should be paying for teachers, when there are plenty out there and still on min wages due to not being able to afford proper wages with such low funding
Sessional Care	We have x2 qualified teachers, pay them accordingly but we dont have access to the teachers pensions scheme. We think it is fairer for all providers to get the same increase and pay staff accordingly
Maintained School	As a maintained nursery we have to employ a teacher which has always put us an a disadvantage for staffing costs.
Childminder	There is no way childminders would be able to employ a teacher so I have to agree to option 1
Full Day Care	A qualification doesn't mean anything; just because you have a qualification doesn't mean you're any good at the job? My apprentice is absolutely brilliant so saying you'll pay more if you have QTS is rather offensive even to me who does actually employ a QTS member of staff.
Full Day Care	Everybody needs the 5p increase, I employ teachers and qualified early years professionals and its not the bit of paper that brings the magic its the quality of teaching they are capable of. The "quality Supplement " should be based on standards met not on if they have a teaching degree there are a huge amount of terrible teachers out there and conversely some truly fabulous early years educators you cant make the funding distinction on qualifications alone that's wrong and dangerous

Full Day Care	The proposed additional 5 pence will go some way to helping with increased costs across the board where everything has or is set to increase close to 10% and business rates looking like they will increase by almost 50% from April. I do think that Early Years setting are going to struggle as we advance into 2023.
Full Day Care	it still isnt enough
Childminder	Definitely not number 2. What an insult to any childcare provider who doesn't have a qualified teacher. I know many teachers that are not as good as level 2 or 3 providers.
Full Day Care	Although we have 3 qualified teachers employed at our setting they aren't employed on teachers' pay and conditions so it would not benefit the individual or the setting but more importantly it wouldn't add anything to the children's experience.
Full Day Care	This feels like discrimination for those settings unable to afford or even recruit an early years teacher, quality needs to be across all settings and is not necessarily dependant on an early years teacher, its more dependant on a sustainable setting that is funded correctly and at market rates and therefore can afford to employ quality staff invest in staff training and equipment enabling them to deliver high quality care and education. A two tier system would develop very rapidly with the introduction of option one and i say that having 2 qualified teachers at my setting!
Full Day Care	I highly train and support my staff to a very high standard costing my both time and money. My staff teach the children as good as any qualified teacher
Childminder	very unfair on childminders who are self employed and dont employ anybody let alone a qualified teacher
Sessional Care	Early Years settings that can fund a qualified teacher are in the minority. Graduate training for early years practitioners was given high priority and I took advantage of this. I can only speak for myself but I know many other colleagues who trained as level 6 practitioners and the fact that early years is being left off the 'qualified teacher' criteria does not go down well. Many KS1 teachers do not have an early years specialism what was the point of LA funding used to raise the status of quality practitioners and provide high quality provision if we are passed over yet again. I feel very strongly about this option ... where will this leave the early years sector and the places that are needed for our younger children. I could say much more about this but I think you get the gist of how I regard Option 2 I 6 practitioner I am well qualified to attract a quality supplement and riority in the past and, as one who took advantage of this, not being regarded as providing quality provision and therefore not qualifying for a quality supplement is insulting. My record as a leading practitioner for the local authority and delivering training to other early years settings (as many other setting managers/Level 6 practitioners have done, appears to count for nothing. We were rated outstanding in our last inspection ... not every qualified KS1 teacher has early years experience early years is a specialised area and, as such, needs early years teachers.
Childminder	As much as I would love to be a qualified early years teacher being a childminder the job doesn't allow it. The early years teacher route needs a placement in a classroom and it's just not viable as a childminder. I think it would be unfair to childminders to go down route 2 however I can see why this would improve the quality of nurseries.

Sessional Care	I think Option 2 is very discriminating and not inclusive. A setting could have an amazing Manager, with years of experience, that can provide the same 'Teaching' environment as a qualified teacher, but just not hold the 'status'. As a setting, we have an Outstanding Ofsted Rating, without a 'Qualified Teacher Status' within our team.
Sessional Care	Option 2 does not appear to apply to early years' settings, as we would never be eligible to claim the Quality Supplement. Employing a teacher on teachers' level pay and conditions would never be financially viable and we are not able to pay into the teachers' pension scheme as we are not a school establishment. We do not understand why this option is included in the consultation.
Full Day Care	I am soon to become an Early Years Teacher, but feel that money at the moment needs to be shared equally in Early Years.
Sessional Care	It would be amazing to employ a qualified teacher and I myself have an EYPS and Level 6 degree but still nowhere near a teachers wage even though this is what was promised many years ago.
Sessional Care	Please can you justify how a qualified teacher can provide more quality care than other members of staff without teacher status. It is insulting to the quality of care provided by less qualified staff.
Full Day Care	Option two seems to be an artificial construct in order to specifically fund maintained settings. Whilst these play a vital part in our North Yorkshire early years infrastructure they are only attended by a very small minority of children. A supplement of this nature seems discriminatory to children not attending maintained settings. Surely all supplements should be potentially attainable by any setting and for the benefit of any child, regardless of the type of setting ? - a quality supplement based on OFSTED grading would be less discriminatory.
Full Day Care	The costs of running a nursery stay the same either way and staff levels are lower ratio for non teacher qualified so costs more to cover wages to ratios
Childminder	Not applicable for childminders...however a lot of childminders are ex teachers
Sessional Care	Although qualified teachers are often employed in PVI settings, the settings will not be able to afford to employ them on teachers pay and conditions and pay into the teachers' pension scheme. Therefore, if the money goes to the quality supplement, it will end up going to school based provisions rather than PVI, thus pushing independent providers out of business. Just because an early years provision employs a teacher, it does not necessarily mean the quality is better!
Maintained School	If Option 2 were to be about quality and recognising those schools that have a teacher, then the rate ought to be SIGNIFICANTLY higher than that proposed FOR ME TO SUPPORT THIS OPTION
Maintained School	The proposed amount would need to be significantly higher to fully recognise the costs to the service provided by a teacher.
Full Day Care	we have qualified teachers working in the setting but option 2 would make budgets difficult to forecast due to recruitment issues in the sector. Staff can leave giving 1 months notice. We never use the ratio for QTS within the setting because of holiday illness and potential notice

Childminder	Again no mention of childminders providing quality. Why are we not able to claim this?
Sessional Care	We are not in a financial position even with the increase in option 2 to employ a a qualified teacher at qualified teacher pay and conditions
Full Day Care	This would be an advantage to us as the funding rate does not cover our costs and the children receive the same education and care as paying children on our full paid hourly rate.
Full Day Care	We are having problems recruiting qualified staff, as I am sure many providers are. We stretch the funding so there is no value in a term time only teacher and we couldn't afford one. As with many other businesses, we are struggling to remain viable with increasing costs so there is no value in Option 2 for us.
Full Day Care	Trying to employ staff with level 3 is hard enough
Sessional Care	would not get enough pupils on roll to employ a teacher
Sessional Care	The PVI sector is vastly under funded and it all becomes about School and teachers. We deliver high quality care and education to our children just like teachers. we also have pensions to pay into. the majority of PVI workers are on the minimum wage or just above. All we ask for is fair funding for all of us.
Academy	This specific grant should only be paid to those with a qualified teacher who are incurring the cost and not used to hide underfunding in the general funding rates.
Academy	As this additional funding is intended to cover the significant cost attached to teachers pensions, you could argue it feels right that it is targeted at those providers who employ qualified teachers. However, this then fails to recognise the significant cost of LGPS pension contributions. Two out of our three nurseries are not teacher led but the staff that work in the provision are all in the LGPS pension scheme and the employer contribution rates for this scheme are just as high as the teachers pension scheme. I therefore don't think you should link the additional funding to just those settings who employ a teacher. I also think it is unfair on early years professionals to assume that employing a teacher = quality and that by default any provision not led by a teacher is of inferior quality..
Full Day Care	This would not be affordable for a private day nursery setting
Full Day Care	We would not look to employ and early years teacher, the rates would not cover the cost and it wouldn't work in our type of setting. As a day nursery the amount of level 3 qualified, experienced practitioners on the floor, as such, is incredibly important to be able to support the children's needs in the type of setting we are. Having one member who is more highly qualified would don't offer the flexibility of working with the under 3's where ratios are so much higher, regardless of their qualification. Option 1 supports a broader spectrum of types of settling where the funding can be applied straight into covering the cost of a place.

Sessional Care	Currently we offer a governor led unit that employs a full time teacher to provide quality provision. How would you collect the evidence of meeting the eligibility criteria?
Academy	As this was through the teachers' pay and pensions grant then it should be directed to settings who are using this. Particularly in the maintained nursery sector settings are unable to charge the high prices per day, or make the additional charges for food, early drop-off etc that the PVI settings can add.
Maintained School	All our EYFS pupils are taught by a fully qualified teacher on the teacher pay scale.
Sessional Care	I am a qualified teacher so I would welcome a supplement to my pay and it would encourage others to move forward with they career progression , however our pre-school could never afford to pay me a teachers wage that's a joke on the funding levels we are currently awarded!
Full Day Care	if settings relied on qualified teachers and had to follow their pay scales you would ned to 4x the hourly rate

Any other provider comments received on the funding consultation	
Provider Type	Comment
Childminder	I wish you would allow Childminders to claim for grandchildren...the system is SO unfair in England, compared to Wales where Childminders CAN claim for related children.
Sessional Care	No, see the previous comments
Sessional Care	the percentage taken by nycc from 2 Yr and 3-4 Yr funding seems excessive. How much is raised through this by nycc yearly and where precisely is it spent?
Sessional Care	The DfE MUST and NEED to recognise our qualifications and struggles financially. The cost of living and wages etc have all risen hence so many sectors going on striking across the nation. Yet, the Early Years are offered peanuts yet again and with all the high cost of everything, many settings we fear, will close.
Sessional Care	These funding rates are still barely manageable based on the increases staff require to maintain their standard of living, pension contributions etc
Full Day Care	The funding rate has to come up and I would like to know what is being done to push this with central government
Childminder	You need to level the amount between 2 and 3/4 yr olds to be the same. They should all go to £5
Full Day Care	Every year we say the same the government need to understand the early years and give it the status it deserves and pay providers realistically (particularly private providers)
Childminder	The low funding rate is killing the childcare sector. My parents have to pay the difference. I charged £4.50 an hour several years ago. Costs have gone up hugely!
Full Day Care	My energy cost, rise of living has gone up dramatically, although i can employ 16-21 year olds they are expecting the higher price pay. With the line of "they do the same job as me, why shouldnt i get the same pay?" This forces either the nursery to pay that cost or lose them to a fish and chip shop down the road. The funding rate dictates how much my day rate is
Full Day Care	I do not think schools who provide early years provision should receive more funding than private providers, Parents should be given a voucher for their funded entitlement to take to which ever provision they choose then for it to be taken off the cost of the hours. The increase in funding which is appreciated however does not cover our increased costs, staff costs, business rates, utilities have all increased, how are providers suppose to continue to operate on these figures?
Sessional Care	Many Earlys Years Providers have closed in the last few years due to insufficient funding.
Full Day Care	The increase in funding should cover the increase in the cost of living crisis the funding is way below the normal charge for non funded children and should be brought up to match to provide better opportunities for the children

Childminder	I think the proposed increase is an insult to providers & with our ratios and overhead costs, it is way below the minimum wage
Sessional Care	Although I have agreed to the funding rate increases, I feel the sector is really struggling at the moment and these increases do not match the increases in the national living wage.
Full Day Care	remake the funding work - its a very good contribution that is tax free to those who receive it. It is only the exception from parents that is still difficult to deal with. Thank you for all that your department does to support us.
Childminder	Still poorly funded. The increases and the whole funding payment structure, doesn't reflect increases to setting running costs or the extra work funding causes. Childminders once again will struggle as we cannot offer the numbers require to make a viable business on funded children.
Sessional Care	Although the proposed funding rates still do not match the hourly running costs, it is closing the gap , we are hopeful that future increases will reduce the gap further to enable us to maintain a high quality provision
Full Day Care	Thank you for this information
Full Day Care	The NMW is going up and the fees given by the LA are not enough to cover a place at nursery.
Sessional Care	sadly despite everyone agreeing that nursery education is vital and important the funding does not reflect this
Academy	Just to confirm this return covers all Ebor Academy Trusts Nursery provisions at Staynor Hall, Camblesforth, Brotherton & Byram, Tadcaster, Braeburn & Filey Infant schools <i>Response recorded as 6 academy responses in the consultation results analysis</i>
Sessional Care	As ever undervalued and underpaid in the current economic climate prices and utilities are soaring for settings and practitioners alike but who is supporting us? We are professionals delivering outstanding provision yet the funding does not reflect this.
Full Day Care	our provision will remain outstanding despite financial restrictions
Sessional Care	PLEASE NOTE - The National Living Wage is set to increase by approx. 9% in April 2023 and the increase in funding rates will still leave the setting circa £4,000 per annum worse off. To the point we may have to consider closing in circa 5 years if this situation does not change
Full Day Care	Obviously we realise you are working within the parameters that are been given to you, but with the increase in NLMW by over 9%, energy costs over 50%, the new business rate formula for nurseries from 1st April on maximum numbers (even though not at capacity due to staffing crisis), consumables and overall running costs of the setting (cleaning accountancy fees, insurance following Covid). We have encouraged our staff to go for highest qualifications going, 2 EYT 1 EYP, degrees, and other staff working towards these qualifications, there is no way these staff can be paid fairly for their qualifications and experience on the funding rates. The rate does not even cover the very lowest qualified member of staff's hourly rate. If we

	had taken on a qualified teacher and paid with teachers pay and conditions, this would be unsubstantial and not covered by any funding costs. In addition we would then be having to find cover for them to fit ratios when they go on strike. As many settings have already done we have written to local MP's and Members of parliament .but to no avail. Many nursery owners are planning to march in March for this to be highlighted, but as many are private setting this is not feasible to do as we need to stay at the settings to cover ratios. As teachers are going on strike it is also nurseries that are taking up the slack to take in the children who should be at school to enable parents to go to work. If you can give any more information or guidance or sign post us elsewhere for a voice that would be much appreciated.
Sessional Care	funding really needs to be looked at as settings are closely due to lack of funding and the rising costs. We are great educators and feel the sector gets put on the back burner

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE

CORPORATE DIRECTOR'S MEETING WITH EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

7 MARCH 2023

THE HIGH NEEDS BLOCK 2023-24

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This report summarises the expected budget for the High Needs Block in 2023-24 and outlines the extent of the anticipated financial pressure.

2.0 HIGH NEEDS BLOCK FUNDING

- 2.1 The anticipated overall High Needs Block allocation available for North Yorkshire in 2023-24 is £77.86m, this includes £3.23m of additional funding announced in the Government Autumn 2022 Spending Review to support increased financial pressures within High Needs. This figure is reduced by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) in relation to funding provided directly to academies and for some post-16 provision. It also includes an anticipated import/export adjustment (adjustments made to reflect cross-border movement of pupils living in one local authority who attend provision in another; adjustments for 2023/24 will be finalised by the DfE in early Summer 2022). The total deductions amount to an estimated £6.366m resulting in a net funding allocation to the local authority of £71.49m. This provides an estimated overall cash increase of £6.78m compared to 2022/23. The final High Needs Block figure will not be known until June 2023 following confirmation of the import/export adjustment. Table 1 summarises the anticipated funding position.

Table 1: HNB Funding Position

	2022-23**	2023-24	Variance
	£m	£m	£m
High Needs Block allocation	67.809	77.859	10.050
Supplementary Allocation	2.630	N/A	-2.630
	70.439	77.859	7.420
ESFA Deductions	(5.726)	(6.393)*	0.640
North Yorkshire LA allocation	64.713	71.466	6.780

* These figures are the LA's latest prediction as at 27/02/2023.

**Latest High Needs DSG funding position provided by DfE

- 2.2 Changes in government regulations since January 2020 prohibit the local authority from using its general resources to fund any overspend in the High Needs Block (and any other DSG blocks). However, the local authority has chosen to set aside a provision to mirror any projected in-year 2023-24 High Needs Block deficit in order to adhere to its sound and prudent financial management principles. This provision will continue to be held in place until such a time that the overall cumulative High Needs Budget deficit has been fully recovered.

- 2.3 Nationally, the High Needs Block of the DSG will benefit from an additional £400 million in 2023/24, through a top up to the DSG allocations. The allocation for North Yorkshire is £3.23m. In respect of the additional High Needs funding, the DfE require local authorities to pass on a 3.4% funding increase to maintained special and alternative provision (AP) schools, and special and AP academies (including free schools), based on the number of places being funded in 2022/23. This requirement is a condition of grant attached to the additional DSG high needs funding allocated to local authorities.

3.0 HIGH NEEDS BUDGETS

- 3.1 The proposed budget for High Needs has been prepared building in provisional estimates for increased numbers of children and young people assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans. This reflects recent trends, known planned movements and best estimates of future demand. The proposed High Needs Budget for 2023-24 is outlined in Table 2 below:

Table 2: High Needs Budget

	2023-24
	£k
High Needs Commissioning	67,692
Alternative Provision	1,729
Inclusion	1,579
Hubs & SEN Provision	2,947
AD - Inclusion	75
Financial Support	54
DSG Overheads	420
Estimated Spending	74,496
Estimated Funding	71,466
Estimated In-year Deficit	3,030
Projected In-year Deficit	3,030
Projected Accumulated Deficit B/f	10,007
Projected Accumulated Deficit C/f	13,037

- 3.2 In total, anticipated expenditure in 2023/24 amounts to £74.5m with a provisional projected shortfall of £3m. It should be noted that c.90% of anticipated spend is within High Needs Commissioning. This principally funds special school commissioned places and top-up funding, mainstream Element 3 top-up funding, independent and non-maintained special school commissioned places and special provision institution (SPI) commissioned places. The figures included in section 3.1 reflect the latest estimates and will be closely monitored throughout the year.
- 3.3 For financial planning purposes, the 2023-24 High Needs Commissioning budget supports approximately 4,432 FTE children and young people assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). In reality, the number of children currently supported is in excess of this. The financial planning assumptions indicate that there will be an increase of approximately 584 children and young people financially

supported through EHCPs in 2023-24 in different types of provision. This represents an expected increase in demand of 13% in the next year alone.

- 3.4 The High Needs Commissioning Budget of £67,692k represents the single largest area of spending; most of the financial pressure in the last three years has been in this area. The budget comprises:

Table 3: High Needs Commissioning Budget 2023-24

	£k	%
North Yorkshire Special Schools	23,775	35.1
Independent and Non-maintained Special Schools	13,012	19.2
North Yorkshire Mainstream School E3 Top-up Funding	11,235	16.6
Pooled Budget	3,834	5.7
PRU's	3,203	4.7
Other Local Authority provision	3,147	4.6
Special Provision Institutions	2,337	3.5
Personalised Learning Pathways	2,071	3.1
FE Colleges	1,728	2.6
Early Years	1,048	1.5
Targeted Mainstream Provision	753	1.1
Independent Learning Providers (ILP's)	604	0.9
Education Other Than At School (EOTAS)	720	1.1
Other	225	0.3
Total	67,692	100

- 3.5 57.5% of the High Needs Commissioning is spent directly with schools and academies in North Yorkshire, with 35% targeted at supporting the ten special schools in North Yorkshire to develop and deliver provision to meet the needs of children and young people locally. However, £13,012k is spent on approximately 220 places in independent and non-maintained special schools. This represents just over 19% of the High Needs Commissioning Budget and represents an increase in absolute cost and an increase in overall share of the total spend compared with 2022-23. This continues to represent a high per pupil cost to the overall budget.

4.0 SPECIAL SCHOOLS

- 4.1 The Special schools funding formula for 2023-24 was agreed by Executive on 10 January 2023, taking into account the following specific aspects of the budget allocations :-
- The specific operation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) in the Special school sector
 - The requirements placed on Local Authorities by the DfE for the allocation of the additional High Needs funding in 2023/24
 - The inflationary uplift factors applied to banding allocations (for top-up funding) and Contextual funding
- 4.2 The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) is a protection for special schools against seeing a reduction in funding from year to year assuming that the number and type of places remain the same. The DfE have prescribed the level of the Special School MFG

for 2023/24 through the DSG conditions of grant at 3% compared to the 2021/22 funding baseline for a special school. NYCC has implemented this increase.

- 4.3 The County Council Executive confirmed approval for Banded Funding allocations to increase in line with an assumed rate of inflation of 3% in the 2023/24 financial year. The banded funding allocation reflects costs incurred beyond the Element 2 funding allocation of £6,000. Due to this figure remaining constant for a number of years, the allocations for each banding will actually increase by greater than 3% with the highest percentage increases applying to the lower banding allocations. The new rates of funding are detailed below; these rates will apply across all settings in receipt of top-up funding.

	Funding Rates 2022-23	Funding Rates 2023-24 (including 3% inflationary increase)
Band 3	£0	£0
Band 4	£1,580	£1,810
Band 5	£3,690	£3,990
Band 6	£5,420	£5,770
Band 7	£8,380	£8,820
Band 8	£10,040	£10,530
Band 9	£14,010	£14,620
Band 10	£20,000*	£20,000*

*actual allocations dependent on Band 10 panel evaluation

- 4.4 Executive approval was also provided to increase the factor elements within the Special Schools Contextual Funding by the assumed inflationary increase of 3% for the 2023/24 financial year.
- 4.5 Special school funding statements have been prepared and shared with North Yorkshire special schools on the basis of the adoption of the proposals above, alongside accompanying guidance on how the formula allocations have been determined, and incorporating the assessment of the commissioned places for the 2023-24 academic year.

5.0 PUPIL REFERRAL SERVICE

- 5.1 The Pupil Referral Service / Alternative Provision budget for 2023-24 has been constructed on the basis that planned commissioned places at all settings will be at the same level of local authority commissioned places in the 2023-24 academic year as in the 2022-23 academic year (i.e. 168 places). Top-up funding allocations (Element 3 funding) and preventative place funding allocations will be increased in line with the inflationary uplift described in Section 4 above.
- 5.2 The Local Authority has maintained the number of preventative places for the 2023/24 academic year at the same level as in the 2022/23 academic year. The uptake of these preventative places does vary between establishments and whilst some establishments have made significant positive progress in increasing the number of young people through this route, that position is not universal. Therefore, the Inclusion Team will be undertaking a review of the position during the Summer term to inform the commissioning of these places for the 2024/25 academic year.

6.0 FURTHER DEVELOPMENT WORK

- 6.1 The overall financial position on the High Needs budget is such that the local authority needs to continue to work to identify potential efficiency improvements and opportunities to support young people more cost effectively, which will compliment the initiatives already in place within the SEN Strategic Plan. The local authority is committed to working collaboratively with school leaders to both identify and research such opportunities, as evidenced in the support for locality boards as a vehicle to explore local solutions to issues forming a barrier to improving outcomes, and through the work of the Schools Forum High Needs Sub-Group.
- 6.2 The local authority has been invited to participate in the Delivering Better Value (DBV) programme being co-ordinated by the DfE. The local authority is actively engaging with the opportunity to work towards developing a sustainable high needs budget, with the benefit of DfE delivery partners. North Yorkshire has been assigned to Tranche 3 (the latest tranche to start) of the 55 authorities in the DBV programme. Whilst it is expected that the work with the DfE will commence in earnest in Summer 2023, the local authority is already seeking to utilise the research findings from other local authorities and DfE guidance material in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the high needs system in North Yorkshire

7.0 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Consultation was undertaken as part of the Council's budget setting process resulting in the approval of the Budget and MTFs on 22 February 2023. Feedback was given due consideration and informed the recommendations which were approved by Executive on 24 January 2023. Detailed reports and appendices outlining the detailed consultation feedback can be found here:
[Agenda for Executive on Tuesday, 24th January, 2023, 11.00 am | North Yorkshire County Council](#)
- 7.2 NYCC considered that there was no requirement to undertake a consultation with special schools and academies within North Yorkshire on the level of the Special School MFG for 2023/24 as the DfE have prescribed the level of the Special School MFG for 2023/24 through the DSG conditions of grant. Any local deviation from the prescribed value requires Secretary of State approval. NYCC has implemented the prescribed increase. Specific recommendations relating to the Special School MFG were agreed by Executive on 10 January 2023. The report and appendices can be found here:
[Agenda for Executive on Tuesday, 10th January, 2023, 11.00 am | North Yorkshire County Council](#)

8.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATION

- 8.1 An equality impact assessment form is attached in **Appendix 1**.
- 8.2 The local authority will continue to meet its statutory obligations in respect of its duties to make arrangements for children with Education, Health and Care Plans.

9.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Climate Change Impact Assessments (CCIA) have been completed in respect of the proposals contained within this report. There are no specific climate change implications identified with the proposals.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 The Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service in conjunction with Executive Members are asked to:
- (i) note the contents of this report;
 - (ii) note the financial position;
 - (iii) to approve the proposed high needs block budget outlined at section 3.1

STUART CARLTON

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

Report Prepared by Howard Emmett, Assistant Director, Strategic Resources

Background Documents:

- Appendix 1 Equality Impact Assessment Form

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated May 2015)

High Needs Block Budget 2023-24

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	North Yorkshire County Council: Central Services
Lead Officer and contact details	Howard Emmett - Assistant Director – Strategic Services
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Jane Le Sage, Assistant Director – Inclusion Howard Emmett – Assistant Director – Strategic Resources Sally Dunn – Head of Schools, High Needs and Early Years Finance Martin Surtees – Senior Finance – Projects Leanne Stables – Senior Accountant Melissa Hird - Accountant

<p>How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer</p>	<p>This work has been overseen by the High Needs Funding Officer Group. Monitoring takes place via the Children and Young People's Leadership Team.</p> <p>The High Needs Funding Subgroup of the Schools Forum and the Schools Forum itself have advisory roles.</p> <p>Changes in budget are informed by anticipated demand pressures and known changes and DfE High Needs funding policy.</p> <p>The decision on the allocation of the High Needs Block Budget has been delegated to the Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service in consultation with the Corporate Director, Strategic Resources and Executive Members for CYPS on 7th March 2023.</p>
<p>When did the due regard process start?</p>	<p>Work on the High Needs Budget has been ongoing since Autumn 2022.</p>

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

Under the Children and Families Act 2014, the Council has a statutory responsibility to support the assessed needs of the children & young people with special education needs & disabilities (SEND). Under the School Standards & Framework Act 1998 and School Early Years Finance England Regulations 2020 the Council has statutory duties to set the non-schools education budget (including the High Needs Budget). This EIA considers the cumulative impact of changes in High Needs Budget informed by the wider budget setting by County Council members on 22nd February 2023 where the decision to set the High Needs Budget was delegated to the Corporate Director Children & Young Peoples Service.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

High Needs Funding provided by central government to local authorities has remained insufficient to meet the increase in the number of children and young people assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans as a result of changes in the Council's statutory duty introduced through the Children and Families Act 2014. This means the Council is now facing difficult decisions on how to ensure sufficient funding is allocated to meet the needs of every child and young person with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), while at the same time setting a balanced budget.

Following continued unprecedented increases in the number of financially supported Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), financial pressure on SEND and High Needs has continued to increase in 2022-23 with a projected underlying overspend of c.£0.5m and an accumulated deficit

of £10.007m as at 31 March 2023. In 2023-24, the financial pressure is expected to continue. Following regulation changes in early 2020, the local authority is effectively prohibited from using core council funding towards costs which should be properly funded from Dedicated Schools Grant. However, the local authority has made provision within the LA budget to mirror any High Needs deficit as part of prudent budget setting arrangements. The High Needs Block Budget reflects the SEND Strategic Plan which aims to improve the service offer for children & young people with SEND.

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

There are currently no new savings plans for the High Needs Block Budget for 2023-24 although reviews or developments consistent with the Strategic Plan for SEND may commence during the year. Where that is the case, any savings proposal will be accompanied by an individual Equalities Impact Assessment and changes reflected in future year budgets.

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

This assessment is based on a process of consultation and equality impact assessment built into the Council's overall High Needs Block budget development process. This has included:

- Equality impact assessments (EIAs) for previous specific budget proposals where a potential equality impact has been identified;
- On-going discussions between colleagues, the High Needs Funding subgroup of North Yorkshire Schools Forum, and special school headteachers meetings;
- Additional consideration of cumulative equality and wider community impact of proposals;
- Responses to public consultation through our website, through public meetings

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

The proposed High Needs Block Budget results in planned spending of £74.5m which is c.£3m in excess of available funding. Local authority provision will be established to mirror this deficit. It is the intention that the high needs deficit will be repaid and any local authority provision can be released back into the council's General Fund in due course.

The Council expects to receive £71.5m million in High Needs Block cash funding to deliver provision for children and young people with SEND and to fulfil our statutory duty under the Children and Families Act 2014.

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
Age	✓	✓		<p>Things will improve as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised continuum of special education provision and a wider AP offer for North Yorkshire for secondary aged pupils will in the longer term mean a strengthened offer with improved early identification and intervention. This should result in a reduction in the numbers of pupils being excluded. • Lower numbers of permanent exclusion and negative impact of such in terms of attainment and life chances • The development of targeted mainstream provision will increase provision for secondary pupils with SEMH and capacity of schools to support children with SEMH • Local approaches and funding will allow for tailored approaches to meet needs for the secondary age group. <p>There may be an impact on secondary schools as provision models are changed and as other aspects of the Strategic Plan are introduced. This will be mitigated by clear communication.</p> <p>There will be further mitigation in that for young people with an EHCP, the LA have a statutory duty to make the provision contained in that plan and for those young people who are permanently excluded it is statutory duty upon the LA to provide education.</p> <p>Age is not a factor in determining needs in the banded approach to top-up funding. The statutory obligations only apply to children aged 0-25. However, age is not a factor in this budget as all children aged 0-25 with SEND will be able to access the funding equally according to assessed need.</p> <p>A further mitigation for age, disability and gender is that for those with an EHCP, the LA have a statutory duty to meet the needs contained within the plan and this over-rides any other considerations, policies or resources</p>
Disability		✓		<p>For children and young people with a disability and special educational needs there will be a strengthened offer of special education provision which will increase the number of children and young people educated in North Yorkshire and improve their outcomes.</p>

	✓			<p>Requests for assessment will be accompanied by clear evidence of need, interventions and provision, making it more clear what provision is required to meet needs. This will ensure that the young person receives exactly the provision they require.</p> <p>A further mitigation for age, disability and gender is that for those with an EHCP, the LA have a statutory duty to meet the needs contained within the plan and this over-rides any other considerations, policies or resources.</p>
Sex (Gender)	✓	✓		<p>A revised continuum of special education provision and a wider AP offer for North Yorkshire for secondary aged pupils of both genders will in the longer term mean a strengthened offer with improved early identification and intervention. This should reduce the numbers of pupils that are excluded.</p> <p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on gender as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.</p> <p>The SEND population of young people with EHCPs is higher among boys however as the LA have a statutory duty to meet the needs contained within the plan, this over-rides any other considerations, policies or resources</p>
Race	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific ethnic groups as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.
Gender reassignment	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact in relation to gender reassignment as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.
Sexual orientation	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact in relation to sexual orientation as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.
Religion or belief	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific religious groups or beliefs as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.
Pregnancy or maternity	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.
Marriage or civil partnership	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of setting the High Needs Budget.

Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
--	-----------	--------------------	-------------------	---

..live in a rural area?	✓	✓		<p>There may be a beneficial impact on those living in rural areas as a greater range of AP is developed.</p> <p>It is anticipated this will increase the range of options and the understanding of what is available in rural areas with a clear package into adulthood within the local rural community</p>
...have a low income?	✓	✓		<p>The proposals should have no or even a positive impact on low income families. Children in AP will be overseen by a central officer who will monitor participation and progress and can intervene if any difficulties arise and are impacting on outcomes.</p> <p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of setting the High Needs Budget</p>

Section 8. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.

It is anticipated the proposed budget will impact more on the following:

Secondary aged pupils with additional needs especially boys. Boys make up the larger numbers accessing PRS/AP provision at present.

These groups are more likely to find change challenging and will need support to make the transition. This will be mitigated by careful planning for any changes, work with ISOS on new models, phased transition to the new models, ongoing engagement with schools, young people and parents/carers and careful review during and following implementation of changes. The overall development of the continuum of need will also provide mitigation. In addition, for young people with an EHCP, the LA have a statutory duty to make the provision contained in that plan and for those young people who are permanently excluded it is statutory duty upon the LA to provide education.

Young People with EHC Plans may also benefit from the wider implications of changes to the targeted mainstream provision model and the increase in capacity within the specialist sector.

Young people with special educational needs and disabilities.

These groups are more likely to find change challenging if changes are made to current services they will need support to make the transition. For each child, there is a statutory process of annual reviews, which ensures that their needs are reviewed annually and the provision is reviewed to ensure it meets their special educational needs.

Section 9. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)	Tick option chosen
1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.	✓
2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.	

3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts. Get advice from Legal Services)	
4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.	
Explanation of why option has been chosen. (Include any advice given by Legal Services.) <p>The Council must set a budget for High Needs within the funding envelope available including the councils resources approved as part of the Budget/ Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) on 22 February 2023. The High Needs Budget proposal enables funding to meet projected demand, alongside provision against any deficit approved as part of the Council's Budget/ MTFS on 22 February 2023. There is a projected shortfall of up to £3m and the proposals acknowledge that this represents a savings gap which will require further work to identify remedial budget action. Equalities impact and consultation will be developed alongside any further proposals.</p>	

Section 10. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)

In addition to the regular monitoring and reporting of finances to the Schools Forum, the Strategic SEND Plan sets out a comprehensive countywide North Yorkshire Inclusion Partnership model which will provide a strategic vision across North Yorkshire.

We will review performance across North Yorkshire Special Schools through regular discussions with Headteachers and Finance staff from special schools.

Whilst this proposal incorporates decisions made by the Executive on 24 January 2023, the proposal is principally about setting the totality of the budget available for High Needs/ SEN. The proposal has been developed with due regard to the funding made available through the High Needs Block of the DSG, the budget provision made available through the Council. Therefore, the budget performance and system-wide performance will be reviewed by the Executive through the Quarterly performance monitoring regime.

Section 11. Action plan. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA, including post implementation review to find out how the outcomes have been achieved in practice and what impacts there have actually been on people with protected characteristics.

Action	Lead	By when	Progress	Monitoring arrangements
1. Review of implementation / impact	Howard Emmett/ Jane Le Sage	March 2024		Quarterly Performance and Finance Monitoring Arrangements

Section 12. Summary Summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

At this stage of the EIA there is no evidence to suggest that the 2023/24 High Needs Budget proposals will significantly disadvantage one or more protected characteristics

Section 13. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Sally Dunn

Job title: Head of Finance – Schools, Early Years & High Needs

Directorate: Central Services

Signature: Sally Dunn

Completion date: 23/02/2023

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Howard Emmett

Date: