



# **Children & Young People Board**

Agenda

Thursday, 29 September 2022  
1.00 pm

Hybrid Meeting - 18 Smith Square and  
Online

There will be a meeting of the Children & Young People Board at **1.00 pm on Thursday, 29 September 2022** Hybrid Meeting - 18 Smith Square and Online.

### **LGA Hybrid Meetings**

All of our meetings are available to join in person at [18 Smith Square](#) or remotely via videoconference as part of our hybrid approach. We will ask you to confirm in advance if you will be joining each meeting in person or remotely so we can plan accordingly, if you wish to attend the meeting in person, please also remember to confirm whether you have any dietary/accessibility requirements. 18 Smith Square is a Covid-19 secure venue and measures are in place to keep you safe when you attend a meeting or visit the building in person.

[Please see guidance for Members and Visitors to 18 Smith Square here](#)

### **Catering and Refreshments:**

If the meeting is scheduled to take place at lunchtime, a sandwich lunch will be available.

### **Political Group meetings and pre-meetings for Lead Members:**

Please contact your political group as outlined below for further details.

### **Apologies:**

Please notify your political group office (see contact telephone numbers below) if you are unable to attend this meeting.

|                          |                             |   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Conservative:</b>     | Group Office: 020 7664 3223 | email: <a href="mailto:lgaconservatives@local.gov.uk">lgaconservatives@local.gov.uk</a>         |
| <b>Labour:</b>           | Group Office: 020 7664 3263 | email: <a href="mailto:labgp@lga.gov.uk">labgp@lga.gov.uk</a>                                   |
| <b>Independent:</b>      | Group Office: 020 7664 3224 | email: <a href="mailto:independent.grouplga@local.gov.uk">independent.grouplga@local.gov.uk</a> |
| <b>Liberal Democrat:</b> | Group Office: 020 7664 3235 | email: <a href="mailto:libdem@local.gov.uk">libdem@local.gov.uk</a>                             |

### **Attendance:**

Your attendance, whether it be in person or virtual, will be noted by the clerk at the meeting.

### **LGA Contact:**

Tahmina Akther  
[tahmina.akther@local.gov.uk](mailto:tahmina.akther@local.gov.uk)

### **Carers' Allowance**

As part of the LGA Members' Allowances Scheme a Carer's Allowance of £9.00 per hour or £10.55 if receiving London living wage is available to cover the cost of dependants (i.e. children, elderly people or people with disabilities) incurred as a result of attending this meeting.

## Children & Young People Board – Membership

[Click here for accessible information on membership](#)

| Councillor                                 | Authority                              |
|--|--|
| <b>Conservative ( 7 )</b>                  |  |
| Cllr Patricia Bradwell OBE (Vice Chairman) | Lincolnshire County Council            |
| Cllr Roger Gough                           | Kent County Council                    |
| Cllr Kam Kaur                              | Warwickshire County Council            |
| Cllr Laura Mayes                           | Wiltshire Council                      |
| Cllr Antony Mullen                         | Sunderland City                        |
| Cllr Mark Sutton                           | Staffordshire County Council           |
| Cllr Adrian Hardman                        | Worcestershire County Council          |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                         |  |
| Cllr Ryan Brent                            | Portsmouth City Council                |
| <b>Labour ( 7 )</b>                        |  |
| Cllr Louise Gittins (Chair)                | Cheshire West and Chester Council      |
| Cllr Beverley Momenabadi                   | Wolverhampton City                     |
| Cllr Adam Ellison                          | South Tyneside Council                 |
| Cllr Fiona Venner                          | Leeds City Council                     |
| Cllr Imran Khan                            | Bradford Metropolitan District Council |
| Cllr Mili Patel                            | Brent Council                          |
| Cllr Tim Roca                              | Westminster City Council               |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                         |  |
| Cllr Gary Bridges                          | Manchester City Council                |
| Cllr Daniel Francis                        | Bexley Council                         |
| Cllr Leigh Redman                          | Somerset County Council                |
| <b>Liberal Democrat ( 2 )</b>              |  |
| Cllr Lucy Nethsingha (Deputy Chair)        | Cambridgeshire County Council          |
| Cllr Mark Cory                             | Colchester Borough Council             |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                         |  |
| Cllr Dine Romero                           | Bath & North East Somerset Council     |
| <b>Independent ( 2 )</b>                   |  |
| Cllr Julie Fallon (Deputy Chair)           | Conwy County Borough Council           |
| Cllr Judy Jennings                         | Epping Forest District Council         |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                         |  |
| Cllr Julian Dean                           | Shropshire Council                     |
| Cllr Charlie Hull                          | South Somerset District Council        |
| Cllr Jon Hubbard                           | Wiltshire Council                      |
| Cllr Edward Maxfield                       | Norfolk County Council                 |

## Agenda

---

### Children & Young People Board

Thursday, 29 September 2022

1.00 pm

Hybrid Meeting - 18 Smith Square and Online

---

| Item  | Page    |
|---|---------|
| 1. Welcome, Apologies and Substitutes, Declarations of Interest   |         |
| 2. Note of the Previous Meeting   | 1 - 8   |
| 3. Children & Young People Board 2022/23: Terms of Reference, Membership and Appointments to Outside Bodies | 9 - 18  |
| 4. Board Work Programme and Priorities Report for 2022/23   | 19 - 26 |
| 5. Support for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children  | 27 - 40 |
| 6. A Vision for Children and Young People   | 41 - 44 |
| 7. Schools Workforce Pay  | 45 - 50 |

**Date of Next Meeting:** Thursday, 3 November 2022, 4.00 pm, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ

## Note of the last Children & Young People Board

---

|                |                                     |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Title:         | Children & Young People Board       |
| Date and time: | Tuesday 7 June 2022                 |
| Location:      | Videoconference via Microsoft Teams |

---

### Attendance

An attendance list is attached as **Appendix A** to this note.

| Item     | Decisions and actions  |
|----------|--|
| <b>1</b> | <p><b>Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>The Chair (Cllr Bramble) welcomed members to the Children and Young People Board meeting.</p> <p>No apologies were received and no declarations of interest were made.</p>  |
| <b>2</b> | <p><b>Notes of the previous meeting</b></p> <p>Members of the Children and Young People Board agreed the notes of the last Board meeting, held 15 March 2022.</p>  |
| <b>3</b> | <p><b>SEND Green Paper</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced the report which set out a number of proposals that sought to improve outcomes for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) via reforms to the SEND system.</p> <p>The Chair invited Edmund Boggis, Department for Education to present to the board. Edmund explained that the consultation had been extended to the 22 July 2022. As of 27 May they had completed 71 events with 65 left to go, to supplement the main e-consultation. There was also on-going work in preparation of the consultation and a delivery plan they had committed to publishing. The School's Bill was currently working its way to the House of Lords. Whilst they did not lead on this, they would be getting involved due to changes in the wider education system particularly around academy standards and intervention. Additionally, they were involved with the Independent Review of Children's Social Care due to the impact on wider delivery and systems. In response to the publication, the government had set out actions taken in an oral statement and the Department for Education (DfE) were committed to publishing a detailed implementation strategy later this year.</p> |

Following the discussion, the following comments were made:

- Members highlighted that there needed to be a significant cultural change where parents, carers and family members of children with additional needs felt their needs were being met, without having to go through the Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) route. Ed responded that the cultural change and greater confidence needed to give to parents and providers that they can support children with additional needs without the recourse of EHCP was their ambition.
- Members raised that there were huge issues around funding and the funding formulae. The current system was not viable in schools with high levels of SEND and in particular, small schools in rural areas. As well as Ofsted/CQC SEND area inspections which were proposed to come into effect from 2023 with no further funding. Ed replied that they understood the issues around funding and would take note of this issue back to DfE.
- Members commented that as a series of measures were coming forward, would these incentivise schools to be more inclusive and hold partners to account with their duty to cooperate. Ed answered that from a DfE perspective they were looking at inclusivity a lot more across the department, which was a shift in thinking and that they would look into incentives.
- Members highlighted that identifying children with educational needs cost schools £6,000 which pushed incentivising schools in the wrong direction for early identification.
- The Schools Bill worked against the SEND green paper objectives as it pushed for full academisation and continuing competitiveness, which was conflicting. The Chair added that SEND green paper, The Schools Bill and Care Review were not speaking to the holistic view of children and young people. Each were being treated as separate pieces when in fact they were linked.

**Direction:**

Members of the Board noted the update.

**Action:**

- Officers to take forward Member's comments in our response to the proposals set out in the SEND Green paper.
- Members are encouraged to share their council's responses to the Green paper with officers to ensure the LGA's response actively reflects the views of member councils.

#### **4 Mental health and wellbeing action plan**

##### a) Mental health and wellbeing plan consultation

The Chair invited Flora Wilkie, Adviser who introduced the report, which covered the government's commitment to developing a new cross-government, 10-year plan for mental health and wellbeing for England.

Flora went on to mention that there were six key questions presented as part of the consultation document in which they sought the Boards views to form part of the consultation response. Kevin Halden, Adviser had presented the report to the

Community and Wellbeing Board a few weeks ago and would include their responses into the consultation.

Following the discussion, the following comments were made:

- Members asked for a clarification of the definition of child versus a young person. Would this include all children up to the age of 18? This needed to be made very clear as it would have an impact on provision. Furthermore, report heavily focused on schools with no mention of colleges.
- Members expressed that they would like to see social prescribing as an option within provision. Having local authorities, partners and stakeholders work together to understand what that social prescribing might look like.
- Members commented that the section around the impact of poverty needed to be more robust with a clear explanation as to why on poverty had such a negative impact had on children's mental health. Additionally, the impact of domestic violence and domestic upset on family home and the impact of mental wellbeing needed to be included. As well as the need for local government to have a robust role in preventative measures on anti-bullying strategies as a preventative measure in schools.
- Members raised concerns over school access to drug and alcohol workers, which not all children wanted to access through schools but there was no mention of how this would be accessed outside of a school setting.
- The Chair added that she thought there should be more support around what organisations could do in the interim while children and young people waited to receive support. As the length of time in some cases escalated the issues they had due to the delay. Also, how money was being spent was not clear and needed transparency to help the system move forward.
- Members asked if girls were at risk of mental health issues, in particular eating disorders. How would different types of needs be reflected within the document as eating disorders was a growing problem. Alongside that, providing help and support for refugee and asylum seeker children.

**Decision:**

Member of the Board noted the report.

**Actions:**

Officer to:

- Work closely with the Community Wellbeing Board to develop a consultation response.
- Continue to engage with the department to ensure the view of the local government sector is taken into consideration.
- Circulate the LGA's response with lead members for sign off.

**5 UK Youth Parliament**

The Chair introduced the report which discussed the UK Youth Parliaments work and the outcomes of the Make Your Mark survey of young people across the UK.

Louise Smith, Senior Adviser, introduced Callum Parr, member of the Steering Group representing the East Midlands who informed the board that the UK Youth Parliament provided opportunities for 11-18 year olds to use their elected voice to bring about social change through meaningful representation and campaigning. Members of Youth Parliament (MYPs) are elected every two years by other young people in their area. MYPs are currently elected in 110 council areas in England and Wales. Some of the various debates included; mental health, animal welfare, sex and relationships education, knife crime, safety for LGBTQIA+ for young people, financial education, period poverty, transport, climate change, schools funding, tackling abuse and support for young people with caring responsibilities.

Callum continued that the Make Your Mark survey gave all young people aged 11-18 in the UK a chance to have a say on the biggest issues facing young people. Almost half a million young people took part this year. The biggest issue identified by young people this year was health and wellbeing, followed by jobs, money, homes and opportunities.

Callum introduced Julija Solovjova, former MYP for North Lincolnshire who spoke about her experience as an MYP.

Following the discussion, the following comments were made:

- Members asked what work MYPs did to encourage other young people and children who are from marginalised communities and have struggled to get into institutions like parliament. Julija responded that setting up focus groups and inviting young people and children who were keen and open to getting involved provided a gateway to getting those from a marginalised community to join.
- Members asked how young people would like to access mental health support and what did volunteering opportunities look like for young people. Callum answered that MYPs will conduct focus groups within their local areas to identify mental health support available and any access issues. This will be collated into a report and fed back to the annual conference.
- Members commented what engagement and input could the board make to help support the UK Youth Parliament. Julija responded that national level issues raised usually had no outcome and instead focused on local issues that they knew would be achievable. Marjaan Aman, MYP for Hounslow, added that she felt it would be useful to have annual meetings with councils to address issues and concerns and ensure their voices were being heard. Callum suggested that it would be great to have the opportunity to have access to key policy leads to make a real change to key issues.

The Chair thanked members of the UK Youth Parliament for joining the meeting and sharing their insightful ideas and opinions.

**Decision:**

Member of the Board noted the report.

## **6 Independent Review of Children's Social Care**

The Chair introduced Louise Smith who introduced the report which set out recommendations and an initial LGA view on the Independent Review of Children's Social Care report.



Louise highlighted the Independent Review of Children's Social Care was published on 23 May 2022 and included the following key points:

- Family help – ensuring children and families receive support as soon as they need it, driven by an investment of £2 billion.
- Child protection – introducing an Expert Child Protection Practitioner role, an experienced social worker to co-work child protection cases with family help social workers.
- Data – a taskforce dedicated to achieving 'frictionless sharing of information' between council and partner systems and improving case management systems.
- Family networks – improving support for kinship carers and introducing a legal right for all families to access family group decision making.
- Children in care – improving placements through the introduction of up to 20 Regional Care Cooperatives, owned and run by councils, which would commission and manage all placements.
- Care leavers – extending corporate parenting to other public sector bodies; making care experience a protected characteristic; and improving outcomes in relation to relationships, education, housing, employment and health.
- Multi-agency safeguarding - clarifying the role and improving the transparency of multi-agency safeguarding arrangements.
- Improvement – Ofsted inspections to increase transparency in how judgements are made and consider more how families as a whole are supported.

Following the discussion, the following comments were made:

- Members raised that there was a conflict in the recommendations for the Josh MacAlister review and Annie Hudson review. Louise responded that the LGA wasn't for or against either and were still gathering views.
- Members highlighted that the Secretary of State for Education had announced up to 40% cuts to civil service and DfE jobs, would this not compromise the ability to implement the Josh MacAlister review. As well as if there were any plans for the government to reinstate targets on child poverty. Louise replied that would be a team set up with DfE to look at the implementation of this report, along with the CMA report and National Panel report. The LGA would like to see a white paper published to demonstrate commitment from government. Child poverty was high on the agenda as the cost of living was rising and would continue to drive this forward.
- Members highlighted that there were no significant mentions around health and funding.
- Members mentioned that long-term, sustainable sharing of foster carers was needed. With regard to Regional Care Cooperatives, views were varied as to the circumstances in which these would work best but it was recognised more regional working would be helpful.
- Members mentioned that they were unclear about proposals to remove the Independent Reviewing Officer role and would like more information for the board to discuss and have a better view on.

**Decision:**

Member of the Board noted the report.

**7. End of Year Report 2021/22**

The Chair introduced Ian Keating, Principal Policy Adviser who introduced the report which set out the Children and Young People end of year report, including initial proposals for the 2022/23 work plan.

Following the brief discussion, the following comments were made:

- The Chair commented that she would like to see more discussions held around schools, how they are run and local authority responsibilities. As well as managing relationships with academies.
- The Chair and members thanked officers for their work and commitment to pushing members views.

**Decision:**

Member of the Board noted the report.

**Action:**

- Officers to prepare a paper setting out the proposed work plan for 2022/23 in line with the Board's feedback.

**Date of the next meeting:** Thursday, 29 September 2022, 1.00 pm, Hybrid Meeting - 18 Smith Square and Online

**Appendix A – Attendance**

| <b>Position</b>  |                            | <b>Authority</b>                       |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Chair            | Cllr Antoinette Bramble    | Hackney London Borough Council         |
| Vice Chairman    | Cllr Teresa Heritage       | Hertfordshire County Council           |
| Deputy Chair     | Cllr Julie Fallon          | Conwy County Borough Council           |
| Deputy Chair     | Cllr Lucy Nethsingha       | Cambridgeshire County Council          |
| Committee Member | Cllr Patricia Bradwell OBE | Lincolnshire County Council            |
|                  | Cllr Roger Gough           | Kent County Council                    |
|                  | Cllr Laura Mayes           | Wiltshire County Council               |
|                  | Cllr Anthony Mullen        | Sunderland City                        |
|                  | Cllr Janet Sanderson       | North Yorkshire County Council         |
|                  | Cllr Mark Sutton           | Staffordshire County Council           |
|                  | Cllr Eamonn O'Brien        | Bury Metropolitan Borough Council      |
|                  | Cllr Sara Rowbotham        | Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council  |
|                  | Cllr Fiona Venner          | Leeds City Council                     |
|                  | Cllr Imran Khan            | Bradford Metropolitan District Council |
|                  | Cllr Mili Patel            | Brent Council                          |
|                  | Cllr Mark Cory             | Colchester Borough Council             |
|                  | Cllr Judy Jennings         | Epping Forest District Council         |

Substitutes Cllr Dine Romero



**Children & Young People Board**

29 September 2022

Cllr Adam Ellison  
Cllr Ed Maxfield

LGA Officers

Ian Keating  
Flora Wilke  
Clive Harris  
Louise Smith  
Sally Burlington  
Charlotte Maguire  
Emily Hackett  
Bushra Jamil  
Hannah Small  
Kevin Halden  
Tahmina Akther  
Ryan Priest

In attendance

Edmund Boggis  
Callum Parr  
Julija Solovjova  
Marjaan Aman

Department for Education  
UK Youth Parliament  
UK Youth Parliament  
UK Youth Parliament

Press

Jessica Hill

LGC





**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** Friday 29 September 2022

## **Membership and Terms of Reference and Appointments for Outside Bodies for 2022/23**

### **Purpose of report**

For information

### **Summary**

This report outlines the terms of reference and membership for the LGA's Children and Young People Board for the 2022/23 meeting cycle. The report also identifies outside bodies to which the Board is asked appoint for the 2022/23 meeting cycle.

### **Recommendation**

The Children and Young People Board is asked to:

1. Formally note the membership of the Board for 2022/23 at **Appendix A**;
2. Agree the appointments to Outside Bodies for 2022/23 at **Appendix B**;
3. Agree the Board's Terms of Reference for 2022/23 at **Appendix C**;
4. Formally note the list of Board dates for 2022/23 at **Appendix D**;
5. Agree the appointment of the Equalities Advocate for the Board; and
6. Receive appropriate feedback from members representing the Board on outside bodies over the previous meeting cycle.

### **Contact details**

Contact officer: Ian Keating

Position: Principal Policy Adviser

Phone no: 0207 664 3032

Email: [ian.keating@local.gov.uk](mailto:ian.keating@local.gov.uk)

**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** Friday 29 September 2022

## Membership and Terms of Reference for 2022/23

1. Members are asked to formally note the membership and the Board's Lead Members for 2022/23 (as detailed in **Appendix A**). Members are invited to agree the appointments to Outside Bodies for 2022/23. Members are also invited to agree the Board's terms of reference for this year (attached as **Appendix C**). In addition Members are asked to note the meeting dates for the 2021/22 cycle (attached as **Appendix D**).

### CYP Equalities Advocate

2. The Equalities Advocate for the Board will be appointed by the Political Groups in due course.

### CYP outside body appointments

3. The LGA benefits from a wide network of member representatives on outside bodies across all Boards. These appointments are reviewed on an annual basis across the Association to ensure that the aims and objectives of the outside bodies remain pertinent to the LGA. A database for centrally recording all the information relating to appointments is held by the Member Services team.
4. Further details regarding the outside bodies can be found in the table at **Appendix B**, which lists the organisations to which the Board will appoint member representatives for the 2022/23 meeting cycle.
5. The current appointments to outside bodies is set out below. The Board is asked whether it wishes to reconfirm these appointments.

| <b>Current outside bodies</b>                      | <b>Current post holder</b>        |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Children's Improvement Board                       | Recommended it is the Board Chair |
| Adoption and Special Guardianship Leadership Board | Cllr Sutton                       |
| National Youth Agency                              | Cllr Cory                         |
| LGA's Asylum, Migration and Refugee Task Group     | Cllr Fallon                       |

### Financial Implications

6. There are no substantial financial implications arising directly from this report. Reasonable travel and subsistence costs will be paid by the LGA for expenses incurred by a member appointee, whilst carrying out a representative role on an outside body on behalf of the LGA.

**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** Friday 29 September 2022

**7. Appendix A – Children & Young People Board – Membership 2022/23**

*\* indicates new appointee for 2022/23 meeting cycle*

*\*\* Indicates new substitute for the 2022/23 meeting cycle*

| <b>Councillor</b>           | <b>Authority</b>                       |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Conservative ( 7 )</b>   |  |
| Cllr Patricia Bradwell OBE* | Lincolnshire County Council            |
| Cllr Roger Gough            | Kent County Council                    |
| Cllr Kam Kaur*              | Warwickshire County Council            |
| Cllr Laura Mayes            | Wiltshire County Council               |
| Cllr Anthony Mullen         | Sunderland City Council                |
| Cllr Mark Sutton            | Staffordshire County Council           |
| Cllr Adrian Hardman*        | Worcestershire County Council          |
| <b>Substitutes</b>          |  |
| Cllr Ryan Brent**           | Portsmouth City Council                |
| Cllr Robert Flatley**       | Derbyshire County Council              |
|                             |  |
| <b>Labour ( 7 )</b>         |  |
| Cllr Louise Gittins*        | Cheshire West and Chester Council      |
| Cllr Beverley Momenabadi*   | Wolverhampton City                     |
| Cllr Adam Ellison           | South Tyneside Council                 |
| Cllr Fiona Venner           | Leeds City Council                     |
| Cllr Imran Khan             | Bradford Metropolitan District Council |
| Cllr Mili Patel             | Brent Council                          |
| Cllr Tim Roca*              | Westminster City Council               |
| <b>Substitutes</b>          |  |
| Cllr Garry Bridges**        | Manchester City Council                |
| Cllr Daniel Francis**       | Bexley Council                         |

**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board**Date:** Friday 29 September 2022

|                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Cllr Leigh Redman**                 | Somerset County Council            |
|                                     |                                    |
| <b>Liberal Democrat ( 2)</b>        |                                    |
| Cllr Lucy Nethsingha (Deputy Chair) | Cambridgeshire County Council      |
| Cllr Mark Cory                      | Colchester Borough Council         |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                  |                                    |
| Cllr Dine Romero                    | Bath & North East Somerset Council |
|                                     |                                    |
| <b>Independent ( 2)</b>             |                                    |
| Cllr Julie Fallon (Deputy Chair)    | Conwy County Borough Council       |
| Cllr Judy Jennings                  | Epping Forest District Council     |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                  |                                    |
| Cllr Julian Dean                    | Shropshire Council                 |
| Cllr Charlie Hull                   | South Somerset District Council    |
| Cllr Jon Hubbard                    | Wiltshire Council                  |
| Cllr Ed Maxfield                    | Norfolk County Council             |
|                                     |                                    |



**Appendix B – Outside Bodies**

Please see below details regarding outside bodies to be appointed by the Board:

| Organisation / contact details  | Background   | Representatives   | LGA Contact Officer   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p><b>National Youth Agency</b></p> <p>Contact: Jaede Todner</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:jaedet@nya.org.uk">jaedet@nya.org.uk</a></p>   | <p>The Agency aims to advance youth work to promote young people’s personal and social development, as well as their voice, influence and place in society.</p>  | <p><b>1 position</b></p>  | <p>Louise Smith, Senior Adviser</p> <p><a href="mailto:louise.smith@local.gov.uk">louise.smith@local.gov.uk</a></p> |
| <p><b>Adoption and Special Guardianship Leadership Board</b></p> <p>Contact: Maria Atkins (Business Support Officer)</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:maria.atkins@cva.org.uk">maria.atkins@cva.org.uk</a></p> | <p>The ASGLB was jointly developed by Government, local authorities and the voluntary sector to provide national leadership to the adoption system, improve its performance and tackle the key challenges it currently faces.</p>  | <p><b>1 position</b></p>  | <p>Louise Smith, Senior Adviser</p> <p><a href="mailto:louise.smith@local.gov.uk">louise.smith@local.gov.uk</a></p> |
| <p><b>Children’s Improvement Board</b></p>  | <p>The CIB is a partnership between the LGA, the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS), the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) and the Association of Independent LSCB Chairs (AILC), bringing together senior political and officer leadership to consider issues related to performance and improvement in children’s services.</p> | <p><b>1 position</b></p> <p>(Advised that the Chair is appointed to this position).</p> | <p>Clive Harris, Senior Adviser</p> <p><a href="mailto:clive.harris@local.gov.uk">clive.harris@local.gov.uk</a></p> |

|   |   |                          |   |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| <p><b>LGA Asylum, Refugee and Migration Task Group</b></p> <p>Contact: Fatima De Abreu<br/>(Member Services Assistant)</p> <p>Email:<br/><a href="mailto:Fatima.DeAbreu@local.gov.uk">Fatima.DeAbreu@local.gov.uk</a></p> | <p>LGA policy in this area is led by the LGA Asylum, Refugee and Migration Task Group, made up of regional member and strategic migration partnership representation covering all of the English regions, Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>Cllr Gillian Ford, previous Deputy Chair of the Children and Young People Board, was a member of the Task Group, which reports to the CYP and the Community Wellbeing Boards.</p> <p>The Task Group will continue to push for clearer alignment between and sustainable levels of funding for all the programmes that resettle asylum seekers and refugees to minimise the pressures on local authorities, local communities and vulnerable individuals.</p> | <p><b>1 position</b></p> | <p>Louise Smith, Senior Adviser</p> <p><a href="mailto:louise.smith@local.gov.uk">louise.smith@local.gov.uk</a></p> |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|

## **Appendix C – Terms of Reference: Children and Young People Board**

1. The purpose of the Children and Young People Board is to engage with and develop a thorough understanding of the issues within its brief and how legislation does or could affect councils and their communities. The Board's brief is to provide strategic oversight of all the LGA's policy and improvement activity in relation to the wellbeing of children and young people, including education and social care.
2. The Board should seek to involve councillors in supporting the delivery of these priorities (through task groups, Special Interest Groups (SIGs), regional networks and other means of wider engagement); essentially operating as the centre of a network connecting to all councils and drawing on the expertise of key advisors from the sector.
3. The Children and Young People Board's responsibilities include.
  - 3.1. Ensuring the priorities of councils are fed into the business planning process.
  - 3.2. Developing a work programme to deliver the business plan priorities relevant to their brief, covering lobbying campaigns, research, and improvement support in the context of the strategic framework set by Improvement & Innovation Board and events and linking with other boards where appropriate.
  - 3.3. Sharing good practice and ideas to stimulate innovation and improvement.
  - 3.4. Representing and lobbying on behalf of the LGA including making public statements on its area of responsibility.
  - 3.5. Building and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders.
  - 3.6. Involving representatives from councils in its work, through task groups, Commissions, SIGs, regional networks and mechanisms.
  - 3.7. Responding to specific issues referred to the Board by one or more member councils or groupings of councils.
4. The Children and Young People Board may:
  - 4.1. Appoint members to relevant outside bodies in accordance with the Political Conventions.
  - 4.2. Appoint member champions from the Board to lead on key issues, with responsibility for liaising with portfolio holders on key issues that require rapid response/contact with councils.

**Quorum**

5. One third of the members, provided that representatives of at least 2 political groups represented on the body are present.

**Political Composition**

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Conservative group     | 7 members |
| Labour group           | 7 members |
| Liberal Democrat group | 2 members |
| Independent group      | 2 members |

6. Substitute members from each political group may also be appointed.

**Frequency per year**

7. Meetings to be held five times a year.

**Reporting Accountabilities**

8. The LGA Executive provides oversight of the Board. The Board may report periodically to the LGA Executive as required, and will submit an annual report to the Executive's July meeting.

**Appendix D – Meeting Dates 2022/23**

| <b>Date</b>               | <b>Time</b>      |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Tuesday 29 September 2022 | 1.00pm – 3.00pm  |
| NCASC November 2022       | 4.00pm – 5.00pm  |
| Tuesday 24 January 2023   | 11.00pm – 1.00pm |
| Tuesday 14 March 2022     | 1.00pm – 3.00pm  |
| Tuesday 27 June 2022      | 11.00pm – 1.00pm |





**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** 29 September 2022

## **Board Work Programme and Priorities Report for 2022/23**

### **Purpose of report**

For discussion and direction.

### **Summary**

This paper sets out proposals for the Children and Young People Board's (CYP) priorities and work programme for 2022/23. Subject to the Board's views, officers will develop a work programme to deliver these priorities.

### **Recommendation**

Members are asked to discuss and agree the Board's priorities and work programme for 2022/23.

**Contact officer:** Ian Keating  
**Position:** Principal Policy Adviser  
**Phone no:** 0207 664 3032  
**Email:** [ian.keating@local.gov.uk](mailto:ian.keating@local.gov.uk)

## **Board Work Programme and Priorities Report for the 2022/23 meeting cycle**

### **Background**

1. LGA Boards are asked to consider their priorities for the coming year at their first meeting of the new cycle. Set out below are a list of priorities for discussion, based on the priorities identified last year, and adapted to reflect work that has been completed, recent developments in Government policy and issues raised by member councils.
2. The following are recommended as immediate priorities, with the remaining work outlined in this paper taking place over the 2022/23 Board year:
  - 2.1.1. Independent review of children's social care
  - 2.1.2. SEND Green paper
  - 2.1.3. Healthy development review

### **Education and SEND**

3. Our work in response to proposals set out in the SEND Green paper will continue to be based on three broad themes; structures, including clarity on responsibility for delivering various aspects of SEND support; levers, specifically ensuring that councils, as leaders of local SEND systems, have the powers to hold partners to account for the work and; sufficiency of funding to meet the needs of children with SEND. Given that implementing the high-level proposals set out in the Green paper will take a number of years, we will continue to call for additional high needs funding in the interim and for the Department for Education (DfE) to bring forward proposals to manage down and eliminate Dedicated Schools Grant deficits. We will continue to work with a broad range of partners, including central government departments, third sector and parent-carer groups to ensure there is a shared understanding of and confidence in detailed proposals as they are developed.
4. The Schools White paper acknowledged that the existing education system is fragmented and councils have a continued role at the centre of local education systems with powers to match their duties around place-planning and ensuring pupils out of school return to the classroom as soon as possible. In our work on the Schools Bill we will focus on ensuring that powers to direct all schools to admit pupils without a place are given to councils quickly, reflecting the fact that in many areas the majority of schools are already academies. We will also work to ensure that all councils will have the opportunity to set up their own Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) and that the proposed register for home-educated children is supported by



powers for councils to check that those children are receiving a suitable education.

5. We will support the DfE to ensure that the proposals set out in the SEND Green paper compliment those set out in the Schools Bill and vice-versa, as well as making the linkages with wider reforms including the Independent review of children's social care. In particular, any revised regulatory framework for MATs (replacing the proposed framework that has been removed from the Schools Bill) must support the SEND Green paper's ambition to increase levels of mainstream inclusion.

### **Children's social care**

6. The Independent Review of Children's Social Care was published in May 2022. The Government has committed to publishing an implementation plan by the end of 2022 to deliver the review's ambitions to transform the children's social care system and ensure children grow up with loving, safe and stable families. The LGA is engaged in discussions with the Department for Education around the key recommendations and the Board will continue to influence emerging policy.
7. Councils continue to report significant challenges with placement sufficiency for children in care, particularly in relation to placements for children with complex and challenging needs. The LGA will continue to work with the Government and the wider sector to consider how we can ensure sufficient, high-quality homes for children in care that fully meet their needs, including looking at how to engage the NHS more fully in the delivery of these homes, seeking more involvement by the Government in the delivery of secure children's homes placements and working with the DfE on foster carer recruitment and retention.
8. Workforce challenges are posing a significant risk to the delivery of children's social care services in many councils, both in relation to ensuring posts are staffed and in relation to budgets. In particular, councils are reporting that the changing behaviour of agencies is proving exceptionally difficult, while the cost-of-living crisis is anecdotally driving in-house staff to join agencies where pay rates are higher. The LGA is working with the DfE in relation to the children's social care workforce in particular, and with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on wider workforce pressures in local government.
9. Asylum and immigration issues are increasingly placing pressure on children's services, including rapidly rising numbers of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children arriving in the UK and related changes to the National Transfer Scheme; the introduction of the Homes for Ukraine scheme and the family visa scheme for

- those fleeing the war in Ukraine; and the challenge of Afghan families continuing to live in hotels due to housing shortages. The LGA is engaged in regular discussions with the Home Office and the DfE about these issues and will work with the Board to develop solutions to try to ensure that all children seeking safety in the UK can receive the help they need. This will include seeking full funding to support children, speeding up asylum claims, ensuring access to support including health and education, and improving placement sufficiency.
10. The rising cost-of-living is an issue of significant concern for children's services, with well-established links between deprivation, poverty and involvement with children's social care. The LGA has already established a range of workstreams in relation to the cost-of-living crisis and will work with the Board to monitor the impact of the crisis on children and families.
  11. The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse will publish its final report on 20 October 2022. The LGA will consider closely the findings of the review and how to support councils to implement its recommendations.
  12. Families of, and organisations representing, disabled children have highlighted concerns around the limited recognition in either the SEND Green Paper or the Independent Review of Children's Social Care of the challenges in accessing social care. Councils have also highlighted that there are challenges in supporting young people as they transition to adult social care services, while we know there are wider difficulties around accessing ongoing support. To improve our understanding of these issues, the LGA has commissioned Alma Economics to work with disabled people, the families of disabled children and social workers to identify the main barriers to accessing such services, for those who have lifelong disabilities and will therefore require ongoing support from both children's and adult's social care. This work will form the basis for further work identifying solutions to these challenges to enable the LGA to seek the funding, levers or legislation that councils need to provide disabled people with the changing support that they need over the course of their lives.
  13. In 2016, the LGA commissioned the Isos Partnership to develop a [report looking at the enablers of improvement in children's services](#). This report continues to be well-used and well-respected by children's services departments across the country. Recognising that there have been significant changes since 2016, including the impact of the pandemic, rising demand and increasing financial challenges, we are commissioning an update to this report to ensure that it is as relevant as possible for councils.

**Early years**

14. High quality early years provision will help to support the Levelling Up agenda and close the attainment gap, which widened during the pandemic. We commissioned research to understand ‘what works’ in the delivery of high quality provision and the cost of extending such provision to all children for their early entitlements (2, 3 and 4 year old offers). We will share the outcomes of this research with the Government to show the importance of a sufficiently funded system that supports highly qualified staff and access to education and care for all children.
15. Long term challenges within the early years system due to underfunding of the system has been exacerbated by the pandemic and the current cost of living crisis. Recruitment and retention of high quality staff has always been challenging for the sector but is now heightened with staff leaving the sector completely for better paying roles elsewhere. The Government has put in place a workforce team and we are feeding into their review. The impact of staff challenges along with rising costs is leading to reported closures of early years settings. We will commission work to explore the impact of closures of early years settings, particularly in more deprived areas.

**Children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing****(activities sit across both this Board and the Community Wellbeing Board)**

16. Covid-19 has had a significant impact on the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people. We will continue to work with government to prioritise the wellbeing of children and young people.
17. The roll out of mental health support teams in schools (MHSTs), as set out in the 2017 Green Paper, has been progressed with an intention to reach more of the country within the next few years. Although this is a positive step forward, there is still more that can be done.
18. We are looking at the support that could be available in the community, such as through early support hubs, and will continue to work with government to ensure that they recognise the role that councils can play in ensuring early intervention and prevention in mental health and the specialist roles that are required in children’s services to support vulnerable children’s mental health.
19. The government is consulting on a 10 year cross departmental strategy on mental health for all ages. We have worked closely with the government to show that councils are a core part of ensuring a preventative mental health offer and

supporting children and young people when they have mental health needs. We have called for this strategy to have the resources it needs to ensure there is change for children, young people and their families.

20. Building on previous commissioned research such as whole household approaches to mental health, transitions from children's to adults mental health services, and the evidence around early intervention and prevention, further case studies will be collated around supporting children in care and care leavers with their mental health.

### **Youth Services**

21. The Government announced a Youth Review in February 2022 that highlighted the priority areas for the youth investment fund (YIF), reforming the National Citizen Service (NCS) and reducing waiting lists for non-military Uniformed Youth Groups. Although we welcomed the focus on youth services, it was disappointing that the YIF was predominantly focused on capital spend when the sector needs greater investment into staff and training. We continue to lobby for long term direction and funding from the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) on youth services. We will continue to champion the importance of youth services, particularly given the evidence around the importance of these services during the pandemic and to support recovery.
22. We are working with councils to explore good practice in commissioning, developing or delivering youth service provision. This includes holding a webinar on partnership working in youth services and drawing together good practice case studies. We are anticipating the refresh of the consultation on statutory guidance on youth service provision and will work with partners to respond to this.

### **Youth justice**

23. The Board supported a position on an increase to the minimum age of criminal responsibility and we will continue to lobby for this, in particular through the Police, Crime, Policing and Courts Bill. In 2022, we produced research that explored the impact criminalisation at an early age on young people and the wider community and held a webinar exploring local authority experiences.
24. The Ministry of Justice has announced £300m to prevent youth crime. This is a positive investment into the system and will help to deliver changes in the system. We developed a youth justice policy statement and will continue to lobby on the wider structural changes needed to improve the justice system.
25. A priority continues to be over representation of black and ethnic minority children in the youth justice system therefore we are working closely with the YJB on a

disparity protocol. We are also engaged in the government's review of youth remand following a report in 2021 and will ensure the recommendations are actionable for councils.

### **Supporting disadvantaged families and children**

26. The Family Hubs and Start for Life Programme has gone live with 75 local authorities able to apply to be part of the programme and to receive part of £302m funding. The LGA has worked closely with the Government from the initiation of the programme.
27. We will continue to work with DHSC, DfE and partners to ensure "Start for Life" is a collaborative and strength-based programme which empowers councils to improve services and ensure local flexibility and leadership rather than a one-size fits all approach. We will work with DfE and the Centre for Family Hubs to ensure sector input into the roll out of Family Hubs.
28. We are developing a Must Know guide for Councillors to explain the process for the 75 local authorities that will be receiving the funding and for those that will not in this round. We are also working with the Government to show the importance of long-term funding available for the programme and for councils to have certainty after 2025.
29. The Board has agreed to review and inform the national and local approach to children's food and nutrition, including the Holiday Activities and Food Fund, Healthy Start Vouchers, the Department for Work and Pensions' Household Support Fund and local welfare funding more widely. There was a focus on children's food throughout the pandemic, and this is also reflected in Part One and Part Two of the national food strategy (NFS). Many organisations are calling for a review of school food and we have pushed for increasing the eligibility criteria and introducing automatic-enrolment for Free School Meals, we will continue to bring relevant proposals to the Board's attention and develop an LGA position as appropriate. The Board will also work jointly with the Community Wellbeing Board on cross-cutting issues such as childhood obesity, nutrition and maternity support. We are also engaging with councils and partners on the wider recommendations of the NFS on local food strategies and partnerships, food security and resilience, local food economies and the environment.
30. We will continue to consider the impact of national and local welfare policy and support on families with children and will work jointly with the Resources Board to ensure that the role of councils in supporting low income and disadvantaged households is both properly recognised and adequately resourced. Our Reshaping Financial Support programme is directly addressing the ways in which councils are supporting low income families to alleviate financial hardship and promote financial inclusion and resilience.
31. The current and future impact of the pandemic on children's health, social and economic wellbeing - particularly those from the most affected places, groups and

communities - will be a core strand within the LGA's strengthened cross-cutting approach to equality, diversity and inclusion.

32. We will continue to make the case for early intervention and prevention across services for socially and / or economically vulnerable families. The Board will lead the LGA's work with Government and the sector on the implementation and future funding of Supporting Families (formerly Troubled Families) and the development of Family Hubs, as well as targeted support such the Department for Work and Pensions' Reducing Parental Conflict programme.

### **Children's Health**

30. Covid-19 and now the rising cost of living will undoubtedly have an impact on the health, wellbeing and development of children and young people. We will continue to work with Government to ensure that children's health is prioritised.
31. We will continue to work with government to ensure that the views and concerns of local government are addressed in the developing policy agenda for childhood obesity, the Healthy Child Programme and any proposals identified in the Health Disparities White Paper.
32. We will continue to make the case that funding and capacity are mission critical issues affecting local public health teams' ability to deliver essential health promoting services for children and young people in their local areas.
33. We will refresh our policy lines on child obesity, healthy weight, planning, oral health, the vision for the refreshed Healthy Child Programme and with a new system, cost of living, inequalities and Covid-19 recovery lens.
34. We will continue to work with partners across the system to strengthen the position of children's health and public health in Integrated Care Boards/Partnerships.
35. Workforce challenges within the children's health workforce, and the wider public health workforce in general. We will continue to lobby to rebuilding the Healthy Child Programme workforce to ensure children and families are supported, unmet need is identified and work begins to address the adverse impact COVID-19 and the cost of living crisis will have on child health inequalities.

### **Financial implications**

33. The priorities will be delivered within existing resources.



**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** 29 September 2022

## Supporting unaccompanied asylum-seeking children

### Purpose of report

For direction

### Summary

Councils have a responsibility to support unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) who are identified in their area. As this disproportionately affects port authorities, the National Transfer Scheme (NTS) has been established to move children from the area where they are first identified to care placements around the country.

Exceptionally high numbers of arrivals of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children into the UK via small boats have, in 2021 and 2022 in particular, placed the NTS under enormous strain, with significant numbers of children currently placed in hotels while they await transfer. Changes to the NTS have been announced to try to ensure children can transfer to their new homes more quickly, however councils are clear that these changes fail to address the challenges within the NTS that are hampering their ability to support more children.

This paper outlines those challenges along with a range of proposals for improvement, including both existing and recommended LGA positions. Those that are not current LGA policy, for which members' approval is sought today, are outlined in bold and summarised in the recommendation box below.

### Recommendations

Members are recommended to call on the Government to:

- a) work with councils to develop additional reception and safe care services to replace hotels for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children in line with the suggestions in paragraphs 33-36

b) ensure one of the foster carer recruitment pathfinder campaigns already committed to focusses specifically on meeting the needs of UASC (paragraph 37)

c) Explore further options to expand suitable placement capacity as outlined at paragraph 39

d) Re-examine the UASC threshold, in particular to recognise councils' support for former-UASC care leavers. (paragraph 44)

### **Contact details**

Contact officer: Louise Smith

Position: Senior Adviser – Children and Young People

Phone no: 07464 652769

Email: [louise.smith@local.gov.uk](mailto:louise.smith@local.gov.uk)



# Supporting unaccompanied asylum-seeking children

## Background

1. Councils have a responsibility to support unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) who are identified in their area. As this disproportionately affects port authorities, the National Transfer Scheme (NTS) has been established to move children from the area where they are first identified to care placements around the country. This was first established in 2016 and refreshed in June 2021 to incorporate a UK-wide voluntary rota, to encourage more councils to participate. Funding for councils supporting UASC was also increased at that point.
2. In November 2021, the Government informed all councils in the UK of its intention to temporarily make participation in the NTS mandatory. Since February 2022, all councils have been expected to accommodate UASC on a rota system, with the rota taking into account various issues including numbers of children in care and wider asylum pressures. Councils already at the UASC cap do not have to accommodate more children, but are able to if they wish.
3. There is currently a threshold applied to the numbers of UASC a council is expected to support. While councils are below this threshold, they must participate in the NTS and they cannot refer any UASC who arrive in their area into the NTS. Government changed the threshold from 0.07 per cent of a council's child population to 0.1 per cent on 24 August 2022. Councils receive more funding to support children when they are above the 0.07 per cent threshold.
4. There have been significant increases in the numbers of children arriving in the UK, largely in small boats off the south coast. In July 2021, the Home Office began placing UASC in hotels as children could not be placed quickly enough via the National Transfer Scheme (NTS). The mandate of the NTS was intended to reduce the use of hotels, however while rates of transfer have improved<sup>1</sup>, at the start of September 2022 there were still more than 300 children accommodated in 5 hotels, with the fifth opening in Warwickshire days after the changes to NTS were made in response to a period of particularly high numbers of arrivals.
5. 1,606 children have been housed in hotels between July 2021 and June 2022, with the average length of time spent in a hotel [15.5 days](#). The legal framework for this provision remains unclear. Between July 2021 and March 2022, [45](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> 2021 Q2 - 101 children transferred  
2021 Q3 – 66 children transferred  
2021 Q4 – 293 children transferred  
[2022 Q1 – 304 children transferred](#)

[unaccompanied children have gone missing](#) from hotels, with the whereabouts of some of those children still unknown.

6. On 24 August 2022, in response to growing concerns around the number of children in hotels and the length of time these children were waiting, government implemented changes with immediate effect:
  - 6.1. Increasing the UASC threshold on when a council can refer UASC into the NTS to 0.1% of a council's child population;
  - 6.2. Reduce the number of days a council has to transfer a child referred to them from a hotel from 10 working days to 5 working days.
  - 6.3. Councils transferring a child from a hotel within 5 working days will receive an additional £6,000 to support that child.
7. Many councils have flagged pressures caused by their statutory support for lone children. In October 2020, Portsmouth City Council informed the Government that it could no longer accept responsibility for more UASC until the number it was supporting reduced, due to a lack of placements for those children. In June 2021, Kent County Council notified the Government that it could no longer take responsibility for any more UASC as the pressures on its social workers and placements meant they could not guarantee children's safety any longer. Both councils have since resumed taking children, however significant pressures remain in these and other port authorities.
8. Medway Council is the latest council to inform the Government that it is unable to safely support more UASC, citing pressures on its children's services department, and was given permission in August 2022 to take legal action against the Government with regard to its decision to make participation in the NTS mandatory.

## Challenges in the system

### Placement capacity

9. There are [significant challenges](#) across children's social care with regard to the sufficiency of placements for all children in care. While there are more approved places than children deemed to be in need of placements, this is not translating into sufficient *appropriate* places for a number of reasons including:
  - 9.1. Not all approved placements are available at any one time. Around 20 per cent of approved fostering places were 'not available' at [31 March 2021](#), while on the same date around 9 per cent of places in secure children's homes [were unavailable](#). Children's homes are currently reporting that workforce challenges are leading them not to fill all approved placed as there are not enough staff to support children.
  - 9.2. Homes need to meet children's needs, including mental and physical health, behavioural, educational and cultural.

9.3. For most children, being placed near to their friends and family is important, however placement availability does not always correlate with where children live. For UASC, children may wish to be placed close to friends they have travelled with or within communities that speak their language or practice similar customs.

10. Councils also highlight the importance of acting in a child's best interests when agreeing a placement. A child needs to be placed in a home that meets their needs and where can they feel safe and settled. Some councils report that UASC have run away from placements where these are not in areas they wish to be.

#### Workforce capacity

11. Councils are reporting increasing difficulties recruiting and retaining children's social workers, with these problems being exacerbated in recent months by the dual impact of the pandemic and the cost-of-living crisis.

12. These challenges are diminishing capacity within children's services departments, making it more difficult to provide support to additional children.

13. Supporting UASC can also require specialist skills, including an understanding of the tensions between immigration legislation and child welfare legislation and a recognition of the likely trauma suffered by children on their way to the UK. These skills may not always be available in social work teams, particularly in areas with less experience in supporting UASC.

#### Funding

14. Councils are concerned that current funding rates do not fully cover council's cost supporting these children and young people; particularly care leavers. The LGA and local government have been calling for shared understanding of the true cost of care, building on existing sector led work including:

14.1. A [study by East Midlands councils](#) in 2017 found that the average cost to councils of supporting UASC was £55,194 (this is prior to the significant rises councils have since seen in placement costs). Even if this cost was still accurate, this would leave councils above 0.07% with a shortfall of £2,999 per year, and councils below 0.07% with a shortfall of £13,584 per year.

14.2. A [study by East Midlands councils](#) in 2020 found that the average cost to councils of providing leaving care services to UASC care leavers aged 18-24 was £16,602 per care leaver per year. At current rates, this leaves councils with a shortfall of £2,562 per year.

15. Following lobbying by the LGA and national partners, funding to support UASC has increased significantly in recent years.<sup>2</sup> The [funding rates](#) paid to councils for 2022/23 are:
- 15.1. £143 per person per night (councils at or above 0.07%) - £52,195 per year
- 15.2. £114 per person per night (councils below 0.07%) - £41,610 per year
- 15.3. Where a council below 0.07% accepts a child from a council above 0.07%, the higher rate follows the child. [this funding arrangement remains in place despite the increase in the threshold to 0.1 per cent outlined at paragraph 3]
16. [Funding for UASC care leavers](#) has also increased, with councils receiving £270 per week<sup>3</sup> (£14,040 per year) per UASC care leaver until the young person reaches 21, or until 25 if they are in education or training. This funding is subject to the young person having [eligible immigration status](#) (for example, they have indefinite leave to remain, refugee status or they have an outstanding asylum claim). Councils continue to highlight the additional costs of supporting care leavers with no recourse to public funds.
17. The following table outlines the number of UASC supported by councils for the past four years alongside council expenditure on supporting these children. The table also includes the number of former UASC care leavers being supported (spend on these young people is incorporated into reporting on spend for all care leavers, rather than being reported separately).

| Year    | UASC <sup>4</sup> | Expenditure <sup>5</sup><br>(£000s) | Former UASC care leavers <sup>6</sup> |
|---------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2020-21 | 4,070             | 181,151                             | 11,290                                |
| 2019-20 | 5,060             | 191,570                             | 10,200                                |
| 2018-19 | 5,140             | 175,950                             | 8,550                                 |
| 2017-18 | 4,560             | 152,440                             | 7,100                                 |

### Asylum decisions

18. Children and young people can wait for a significant period of time for a decision on their asylum claim. A [report](#) by the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration in 2021 found that the length of time claimants wait for an initial decision has increased year-on-year since 2011. UASC who received a decision in 2020 had waited on average 550 days.

<sup>2</sup> [Funding rates](#) introduced with the National Transfer Scheme on July 2016 were £114 per night per child under 16 for all councils, and £91 per child aged 16 or 17. Rates increased in 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Up from a maximum of £200 per week prior to 2020

<sup>4</sup> <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/data-tables/permalink/99eb74ac-c37c-49d1-bc15-c5eb4a2d12db>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/local-authority-revenue-expenditure-and-financing>

<sup>6</sup> <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/data-tables/permalink/4630614c-eab2-4209-a726-5f29661fae1a>

19. Lengthy delays mean that many children turn 18 while waiting for a decision. This means that they [no longer automatically receive the same protections](#) and support as children, such as a legal representative, responsible adult and interpreter. They can also have a significant emotional impact on children and young people whose futures are uncertain, while children's social workers and personal advisers face additional challenges in developing plans for children's futures.
20. Furthermore, while young people aged over 18 are waiting for their decision, they have no recourse to public funds and subsequently require additional support from their local authority.

### Age assessment

21. The age assessment of UASC is a challenging and controversial issue. It is an inexact process, with even "scientific methods" such as dental checks or x-rays only offering an estimated age with a significant margin of error. However, when those seeking asylum arrive in the UK, it is important to complete an age assessment to ensure so far as possible that people receive the most appropriate support. This includes ensuring that children are appropriately safeguarded, and that adults are not placed in accommodation with unrelated children.
22. [Home Office guidance](#) states that all asylum seekers and migrants who claim to be children must be asked for documentary evidence to help establish their age when they are first encountered. Where this is not possible, the principle of "the benefit of the doubt" is applied; where there is uncertainty about whether the individual is an adult or a child, they should be treated as a child and referred to a local authority with a request for a "Merton compliant age assessment".<sup>7</sup> Individuals should be treated as adults if their physical appearance and demeanour "very strongly suggests they are significantly over 18 years of age and there is little or no supporting evidence for their claimed age".
23. Age assessment is a challenge to local authorities, both from a child protection perspective of ensuring that children are appropriately safeguarded (either as children, or ensuring that adults are not placed with children inappropriately) and from a legal perspective. Challenges to age assessments can be lengthy and expensive for councils, drawing on significant financial and human resource.
24. The Nationality and Borders Act 2022 introduced a new system for age assessments, which will be overseen by a National Age Assessment Board (NAAB). The NAAB is a Home Office body which will eventually carry out a significant proportion of age assessments currently conducted by councils. It is hoped that applying a national approach will help to ensure expertise in social workers carrying out age assessments while also protecting councils from costs of potential challenges.

---

<sup>7</sup> Much of the guidance and minimum standards for age assessments was set out in a High Court case involving Merton Council

### System capacity

25. The broader asylum and immigration system has been under significant pressure for some time, with these pressures increasing as a result of high numbers of asylum-seekers arriving on small boats, the Afghan evacuation, Syrian resettlement and the dedicated visa scheme for those leaving Hong Kong. Further challenges caused by limited join up across central government on different schemes and limited consideration of the cumulative impact of high numbers of new arrivals across the whole system.
26. There are also issues are causing local challenges in relation to sufficiency of support services, long waiting lists for health services including mental health services, availability of housing and in some areas and community cohesion issues, including far right activity centred around hotels.
27. Pressures across the system, from financial and capacity pressures in children's services through to long waiting lists for NHS support, have also been cited in the [cases of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children](#) who have died by suicide, highlighting the risks to children as a result of failures in the current system.

### **Cohort**

28. At 31 March 2021, councils were caring for [4,070 UASC](#). 92 per cent (3,740) were male, and 87 per cent (3,560) were 16 and over.
29. On the same date, councils were supporting 11,290 former UASC care leavers aged 17-21. 91 per cent of these were male.

### **Proposals for improvement**

30. The LGA has always been clear that placing children in hotels is unacceptable, and needs to be a driver of system change. However, we want to continue to work with government to look at the impact and deliverability of the recent announcements on councils, children and Strategic Migration Partnerships.
31. We would welcome further engagement with government on how best to collectively respond to what is likely to remain high numbers of arrivals until the weather worsens. There also needs to be a less reactive and more planned, long term and sustainably funded approach that is in place well before next summer, and one that also recognises parallel asks for councils in other asylum and resettlement schemes.
32. As part of these discussions, there needs to be a clearer recognition from and understanding by government that while it is important for children to be moved swiftly from hotels, councils also have clear statutory responsibilities to ensure that children transferred to their care are moved to placements that best meet their needs. These duties ensure children are not only safe but receiving the support they need, and careful placement planning allows councils to



appropriately manage the inherent risks that are transferred to them when they take on corporate parenting duties for a child.

#### Post arrival support and reception

33. While hotels are plainly unsuitable for unaccompanied children, we are currently in a situation where a range of factors – in particular, a lack of suitable placements and an underfunded system – mean that we are unable to place every child as soon as they arrive in England. We must therefore find an alternative to hotel use to ensure children are safe and receiving appropriate care as soon as they arrive, while they wait for their long-term placement. Such an alternative should be used only as long as is required to develop sufficient new placements and to overcome challenges within the current system; we would expect a clear action plan detailing work that would lead to alternatives being stood down and all UASC being immediately transferred to their new homes.
34. **Members are asked to consider whether we should call on the Government to learn from the experiences of Kent County Council (see Appendix A) in providing temporary support to new arrivals, as well as expertise from organisations such as [Save the Children](#), and develops a series of reception and safe care services to replace hotels.** These should be staffed by those appropriately trained in child safeguarding and support, including social workers. Children should remain in these services for as limited time as possible, which should be spent providing initial support such as mental and physical health services, assessing their needs to ensure that appropriate services are in place at their long-term placement, and identifying the best possible long-term home.
35. **Members are further asked to consider whether, to recognise the additional pressure that hosting a reception service will place upon the local area, those councils should be exempt from mandatory participation in the National Transfer Scheme, or be asked to provide permanent accommodation to a smaller number of UASC.**
36. Finally, **members are asked whether the Government should explore options for primary legislation allowing the Government or a charity to act as the corporate parent** to children in these reception services as a longer-term solution where reception services need to be stood up quickly in response to high numbers of arrivals.

#### Placements

37. Much of the focus of the response from government has been focused on increasing the pool of foster carers. The DfE has [already committed](#) to working with councils to recruit more foster carers, utilising pathfinder local recruitment campaigns to build towards a national programme. **Members are asked whether we should request that one of these pathfinder campaigns focuses specifically on recruiting foster carers able to meet the needs of UASC**, to develop good practice in this space, and that work begins on this immediately.

38. We also recommend that the Government adopts the recommendations of the Independent Review of Children's Social Care to improve support for foster carers through the rollout of foster carer support based on the principles of the Mockingbird programme. This will help both to retain our existing foster carers and encourage more people to come forward. The Review identified that this would cost £82 million over five years.
39. Given the majority of the cohort are males aged 16-17, many of whom do not wish to live in a family setting, we need to work together with government to look at rapidly expanding other forms of accommodation and support that can best meet children's needs including children's homes, supported lodgings and semi-independent accommodation. **Members are asked whether we would support options to:**
- 39.1. **work with providers of supported lodgings and semi-independent accommodation to scale up provision, including the potential to build on support for the Homes for Ukraine scheme by encouraging people to consider if they could provide supported lodgings (subject to assessment and approval);**
  - 39.2. **the potential for Government to block book, or support councils to block book, provision to enable swift transfers from reception authorities; and**
  - 39.3. **investigate where planning regulations may be preventing councils and providers from using property to provide homes to children, including issues raised by the Independent Review of Children's Social Care.**
40. It also would be helpful for the DfE and the Home Office to work together with councils to better understand the needs of UASC. A strong understanding of children's needs, from the kind of education and language support they require, to the types of accommodation where they thrive to their health and wellbeing needs, will better enable councils to develop appropriate provision.

#### Workforce

41. Options are being considered to identify where the wider workforce can be used to support UASC, within regulations and ensuring children still receive the help they need and are entitled to, to help create capacity in the face of social worker shortages.

#### Funding

42. Councils must be fully funded for the support they provide to UASC and former UASC care leavers. We recommend that the Home Office commissions an independent analysis of costs to a range of councils of supporting these young people and revises the funding rates to councils on this basis. This needs to include the costs of any support to care leavers who have not obtained a form of



settled status by the time they turn 18 and who may subsequently have no recourse to public funds.

43. We also call for the reinstatement of the funding for exceptional costs that was available for councils from 2021/22. This funding is particularly important where councils are supporting children with particularly complex needs or who need, for example, a special school placement which can be very costly.
44. **Members are asked whether the Government should re-examine the UASC threshold** to ensure that this fully considers those factors impacting upon councils' ability to support UASC, including consideration of including former UASC care leavers in the threshold.
45. We also remain keen to explore with government including lone children from Ukraine as part of threshold in recognition of the capacity and workforce pressures.

#### Sharing the learning – holistic support

46. There is good practice to be learned from those councils around the country who have worked to welcome UASC, including in areas not traditionally associated with supporting those seeking asylum such as more rural areas.
47. We are in discussion with the Government about the potential for the LGA to utilise its extensive experience in delivering sector-led improvement to implement an improvement support package to support councils to develop the capacity and holistic support to provide more homes to UASC. While this will not tackle the existing issues in the NTS, there is significant value in supporting councils to work together to identify solutions and make best use of existing resources while work continues at a national level to address the structural challenges.

#### Asylum decisions

48. Young people should not be waiting significant periods of time for decisions to be taken that will affect the rest of their lives. The Government should have clear targets to process most asylum decisions where children are involved.

#### A cross-system approach

49. It would be helpful to see regular datasets outlining the numbers and proportion of UASC, UASC care leavers, asylum seekers and refugees being supported by each council. This transparency would help to illustrate and support understanding of the collective pressure on each area, and inform discussions across partners and regions around how to provide effective support.
50. We continue to emphasise to the Government the importance of all departments working together to ensure suitable support, including the provision of health and education services.

## **Implications for Wales**

51. While children's social care is devolved, all of the devolved nations participate in the NTS. The devolved administrations and the LGA's counterparts in the devolved nations are engaged in discussions with the Government on this issue.

## **Financial Implications**

52. There are no financial implications to the LGA.

## **Equalities implications**

53. There has been significant discussion within and between councils and central government around how we support children seeking safety from all countries, including those seeking asylum, those who have arrived as part of the Afghan resettlement programme and those who are fleeing the war in Ukraine. Ensuring all children are treated equitably, including access to the support they are entitled to as swiftly as possible, is a key aim of these discussions, and the proposals for improvement outlined in this paper are part of our approach to ensuring this is possible.

54. Our call on the Government to reinstate access to additional funding for exceptional costs will support councils to provide homes to children with additional needs, including disabilities and health needs.

## **Next steps**

55. Any additional asks agreed by the Board will be incorporated into our ongoing discussions with and lobbying of the Government in relation to support for UASC.

## Appendix A

### Kent Reception and Safe Care Service

In September 2021, Kent County Council (KCC) signed an agreement with the Home Office to provide up to 120 care places at any one time for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC) while they waited for their transfer via the National Transfer Scheme (NTS). This service is called the Reception and Safe Care Service (RSCS).

KCC remains the corporate parent for all UASC in the RSCS, and also supports UASC in its permanent care at the 0.07 per cent threshold (now increasing to 0.1 per cent). KCC receives funding per child to operate the centre.

The RSCS is supported by two social work teams responsible for placing the children and undertaking statutory social work tasks and includes a variety of provision:

- Two reception centres with capacity for up to 90 16-17 year old boys.
- Semi-independent provision with tailored support for 16-17 year old girls.
- Foster placements (often with independent fostering providers) for children under 16.

For all children, placement planning will identify needs to be addressed as part of care planning. A dedicated Independent Reviewing Officer supports the arrangements.

Reception Centres offer each child their own bedroom and food is provided. Both centres are overseen by an operational manager who is responsible for day-to-day management and developing the centre programme. The offer for children includes daily education activities focussing on English language learning, alongside sports, cooking, orientation to living in the UK and other activities guided by young people's wishes. Each child has an allocated key worker who offers individual sessions, and there is a weekly residents' meeting to seek young people's views.





**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** 29 September 2022

## **A Vision for Children and Young People**

### **Purpose of report**

For discussion

### **Summary**

This report seeks the views of the Children and Young People Board on a potential medium to long-term vision for children and young people, which can be used to guide the LGA's policy work in this area and influence the Government and the manifestos for the next general election.

### **Is this report confidential?**

No

### **Recommendation**

Members are recommended to give their views on what should be included in an ambitious vision for children and young people.

### **Contact details**

Contact officer: Louise Smith

Position: Senior Adviser – Children and Young People

Phone no: 07464 652769

Email: [louise.smith@local.gov.uk](mailto:louise.smith@local.gov.uk)

# A Vision for Children and Young People

## Background

1. In addition to working on the immediate issues facing councils, including the cost-of-living crisis, the LGA is now considering those medium to long-term challenges and ambitions that its members are considering.
2. This work was kick-started at the LGA Conference in June with the publication of "[Signals of the future – horizon scanning for local government](#)", which provides insights into what the leading drivers of change are in the country today and how these might play out over the coming years. These drivers include supporting the next generation of more diverse young people, addressing the digital divide, harnessing the power of communities and considering environmental issues including green energy and biodiversity.
3. To support this longer-term view, we are seeking to develop a Vision for Children and Young People. This vision, to be developed in partnership with the Board and building on feedback from councils, will guide the LGA's policy work in relation to children and young people in the lead up to the next general election and beyond. Our intention is that this work will develop a clear and compelling narrative around the role of councils in supporting children and young people, and their families. This will build on the successful work carried out by the Board through the [Bright Futures campaign](#).

## Proposal

4. It is proposed that a vision for children and young people is developed focussing on what a new government could deliver by the end of a fixed term, that is by 2029 (assuming there is no change to the current schedule of elections).
5. Members are asked to consider what an ambitious vision for children and young people could look like, including:
  - 5.1. What outcomes councils want to see for children and young people, what outcomes children and young people want for themselves
  - 5.2. What factors impact upon those outcomes
  - 5.3. What levers and funding councils need to deliver those outcomes.
6. Some initial suggestions for a high-level vision, based on existing policy and evidence in relation to what makes a difference to children's lives (including what [children told the Children's Commissioner](#) mattered to them in the Big Ask), are outlined on the next page to help begin this discussion.

| By 2029, every child should have five things every day:  |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Love   | Fun   | A chance to learn and grow   | Safety   | The best health they can  |
| We can get there by helping children to have:  |   |  |  |   |
| Stable, loving homes and trusted relationships   | Play, leisure and friendships   | Formal and informal learning   | Safe places to live  | Good homes and good health  |
| Support for families<br>Children in care & care leavers<br>Welfare<br>Immigration  | Playgrounds, parks & leisure facilities<br>Access to digital technology<br>Youth services | Early education, schools, home education<br>SEND<br>Alternative provision<br>Culture<br>Further education & jobs | Tackling abuse, neglect & exploitation<br>Youth justice<br>Community safety<br>Online safety | Affordable housing<br>Physical & mental health services<br>Disability support<br>Climate change<br>Healthy food |
| Cross-cutting themes:<br>Childrens rights & participation * Workforce * Partnerships * Equality, diversity & inclusion * Funding |   |  |  |   |

7. The vision and each theme underpinning it will be supported with evidence to build a clear narrative as to why each strand is important, along with case studies of good practice and clear asks of Government (costed where possible and appropriate) for any legal, financial or other levers that councils need to deliver the vision as effectively as possible.

## Implications for Wales

8. Children's social care and education are devolved in Wales, however areas of commonality will be sought and where the vision includes non-devolved policy areas such as immigration we will work with our colleagues in the Welsh LGA to ensure appropriate join up.

## Financial Implications

9. Work to develop the vision will be carried out within existing LGA resources.

## Equalities implications

10. It is recommended that equality, diversity and inclusion is a key theme running across all elements of the vision. There is significant evidence around the differing access to and experience of different services by children and young people of different backgrounds and protected characteristics and it is therefore important to consider this evidence to identify where work must take place to ensure equity of provision and opportunity.

## Next steps

11. Comments made by the Board will be incorporated into a high-level vision document which will be agreed by Lead Members in the first instance with the aim of launching this at the National Children and Adult Services Conference in November. Members of the Children, Welfare, Equalities and Democracy team will then work to draw together evidence underpinning the proposed high-level vision. The evidence will ensure clarity over how to achieve the overarching vision, and be used to develop outcomes and asks of Government rooted in the evidence as to what matters to and for children and young people.

12. The Board will receive regular updates on progress of the vision work including final sign off for key documents.





**Meeting:** Children and Young People Board

**Date:** 29 September 2022

## Schools workforce pay

### Purpose of report

For discussion.

### Summary

The Local Government Association holds the majority membership as well as providing the secretariat for the National Employers' Organisation for School Teachers (NEOST). NEOST is the employer statutory consultee body for the annual schoolteacher's pay review process. You will be given a brief overview of the annual process and an opportunity to hear the headlines of this year's NEOST response to the Government's consultation on the proposed teachers' pay award for 2022.

The Local Government Association is engaged in negotiations around pay for school support staff. Today's discussion is an opportunity to hear about those negotiations and the challenges facing schools and councils.

### Recommendation

Members are recommended to note the discussion.

### Contact details

Contact officer: Ian Keating

Position: Principal Policy Adviser

Phone no: 07917 234827

Email: [ian.keating@local.gov.uk](mailto:ian.keating@local.gov.uk)

## Schools workforce pay

### Background

1. The Local Government Association holds the majority membership as well as providing the secretariat for the National Employers' Organisation for Schools Teachers (NEOST). NEOST is the employer statutory consultee body for the annual school teachers' pay review process. You will be given a brief overview of the annual process and an opportunity to hear the headlines of this year's NEOST response to the Government's consultation on the proposed teachers' pay award for 2022.
2. The LGA is engaged in negotiations around pay for school support staff. Today's discussion is an opportunity to hear about those negotiations and the challenges facing schools and councils.

### Local government pay (including school support staff)

3. On 6 June 2022, the NJC unions (UNISON, GMB and Unite) lodged their one-year pay claim for:
  - *A substantial increase with a minimum of £2,000 or the current rate of RPI<sup>1</sup> (whichever is greater) on all pay points*
  - *COVID-19 recognition payment*
  - *A national minimum agreement on homeworking policies for all councils and the introduction of a homeworking allowance*
  - *An urgent review of all mileage rates currently applying*
  - *A review and update of NJC terms for family leave and pay*
  - *A review of term-time only contracts and consideration of retainers*
  - *A reduction in the working week (without loss of pay) to 35 hours (34 in London)*
  - *One additional day of annual leave*
4. Councils in each of the nine English regions, Wales and Northern Ireland were consulted at regional pay consultation briefings during June; in total more than 600 officers and councillors attended.
5. The National Employers were faced with very difficult decisions when considering their response to the unions' claim. First, there is the continuing

---

<sup>1</sup> On 6 June, when the claim was lodged, RPI was 11.1 per cent, which would equate to an increase of £2,035 on SCP1.

challenge of how to deal with the relentless pressure from the proximity of the National Living Wage (NLW) on the bottom of the NJC pay spine, which, on current forecasts, could increase by almost 20 per cent by April 2024.

Second, the almost unprecedented backdrop of the wider economic situation: inflation (CPI) was at 9.4 per cent when the employers met in July; and the continuing increases to fuel, food and energy that are impacting employees and employers.

6. On 25 July, the National Employers agreed unanimously to make the following one-year (1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023), final offer:
  - *With effect from 1 April 2022, an increase of £1,925 on all NJC pay points 1 and above*
  - *With effect from 1 April 2022, an increase of 4.04 per cent on all allowances*
  - *With effect from 1 April 2023, an increase of one day to all employees' annual leave entitlement*
  - *With effect from 1 April 2023, the deletion of pay point 1 from the NJC pay spine*
7. This offer would achieve a bottom rate of pay of £10.50 with effect from 1 April 2022 (which equates to a pay increase of 10.50 per cent for employees on pay point 1); everyone on the NJC pay spine would receive a minimum 4.04 per cent pay increase; and the deletion of pay point 1 on 1 April 2023, would increase the bottom rate to £10.60 (providing 10p headroom above the current upper-end forecast for the NLW on that date. See para 16), pending agreement being reached on a 2023 pay award.
8. The offer, if accepted, will increase the national paybill by 6.886 per cent (£1.045bn). The cost impact in individual councils will vary from place to place, according to the profile of its workforce. For councils that employ few or no staff on the bottom pay points, the cost will be lower than for those councils who have substantial numbers of staff on the lower part of the pay spine.
9. However, the cost impact in schools will be universally high given that all support staff, up to and including some teaching assistants, are paid on the lower pay points where the greatest costs arise.
10. **UNISON** remained neutral on the question of whether the employers' offer should be accepted or rejected. Its consultation closed on 20 September and members will be updated on the outcome, which is due to be announced on 26 September.
11. **Unite** is consulting its members with a recommendation that the offer should be rejected and its consultation closes on 14 October.
12. **GMB** has also remained neutral on the question of whether the employers' offer should be accepted or rejected. Its consultation will close on 21 October.

13. In order for a formal collective agreement to be reached, two of the unions, one of which must be UNISON, are required to vote to accept the employers' offer.

### The National Living Wage

14. Since its introduction in 2014, the NLW has presented a huge challenge for local government in managing to maintain headroom between the bottom pay points and the statutory NLW. Local government is almost alone in the public sector in having this challenge. Other public sector pay structures' lower rates of pay are far enough above the NLW for it not to present the same pressure as we face and involve a far smaller proportion of those sectors' workforces than is the case in local government.
15. The National Employers hold a longstanding principle of not pegging the bottom rate in local government to the NLW, as they do not believe the sector should be a minimum wage employer.
16. When the NLW was increased to 60 per cent of national median earnings in the last parliament, local government managed to achieve some breathing space by revamping its pay spine in 2018-19. On 1 April 2019, there was 79p headroom between the lowest local government pay rate and the NLW. However, following the General Election in December that year, central government introduced a revised policy for the NLW to increase from a target of 60 per cent of national average earnings, to 66 per cent by April 2024.
17. The economic turmoil over the past two years has only increased the volatility of the projections. In April 2020, the Low Pay Commission (LPC) set out that the projected NLW rate for April 2024 was £10.69. Due to the impact on the economy of the COVID pandemic, the OBR revised down this forecast to £10.10 in December 2020, though by April 2021, when the LPC published that year's NLW consultation documentation, the projection had rebounded to £10.33. By the Budget in Autumn 2021, the projection had rebounded once more and stood at £10.70.
18. The LPC's latest published forecast, in March 2022, states:
- “Although our recommendations in the autumn will be subject to Commissioners' assessment of economic conditions, **our current best estimate for the on-course NLW rate in April 2023 is £10.32, within a range of £10.14 - £10.50. Our current best estimate of an NLW set at two-thirds of median earnings for those aged 21 and over in 2024 would be £10.95 within a range of £10.58 - £11.33.** These are based on the latest wage growth forecasts, but actual wage growth may turn out higher or lower, and we will update these ranges in the summer based on changing forecasts. We will publish a report, to coincide with the increase in NLW and NMW rates, setting out this pathway in more detail.”*
19. This projection is the highest rate yet predicted for the NLW in 2023 and 2024 and there is no guarantee it won't rise further due to the ongoing economic

volatility, potential impact of the international context and expected further increases in the rate of inflation. The lack of a fixed figure to work towards and the volatility of the forecasts of what the NLW rate will be, has made it difficult for local government to plan effectively over the past few years.

20. The National Employers fully support the increase of the NLW but have made clear to government that in meeting the cost of this policy, additional funding is required. If this is not forthcoming, jobs and services will be at risk as employers struggle to accommodate this additional cost when trying to balance their budgets.
21. 2023 is going to be another extremely difficult year for the national bargaining machinery, and the National Employers in particular, who will again have to make decisions on pay that will be challenging, albeit they will be taken primarily as a result of decisions and policies emanating from government and the LPC.

### **Implications for Wales**

22. Negotiations apply to England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

### **Financial Implications**

23. This discussion does not have financial implications for the LGA.

### **Equalities implications**

24. The teaching workforce in England is predominantly female (75.5 per cent). Male teachers are more likely to work in secondary schools than nursery or primary schools, where 14.1 per cent of teachers are male.<sup>2</sup>
25. 14.9 per cent of teachers in England identify as belonging to an ethnic minority group (compared to 21.5 per cent of the working age population, including 6.6 per cent white minorities).
26. 89 per cent of the support staff workforce of England is female, and 17.9 per cent are from an ethnic minority group.

### **Next steps**

27. Board members are invited to note the presentations.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-workforce-in-england>

