

# **Information Advice and Support Service's Network**

## **Funding and Staffing Data Report**

### **2020**

*For any queries regarding any of the data please contact us via email [iassn@ncb.org.uk](mailto:iassn@ncb.org.uk)*

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Service differences.....	5
Funding arrangements- Joint commissioning.....	6
Funding per head .....	8
Funding change's .....	9
Joint commissioning and overall funding .....	10
Staffing and volunteers.....	12
Using this data .....	14
Appendices.....	15
West Midlands .....	15
South West.....	16
South East .....	17
North West.....	18
North East .....	19
Yorkshire and Humber .....	20
London .....	21
London (Cont.) .....	22
East Midlands.....	23
East of England.....	24

# Introduction

## The IASSN Team

As part of the [Children and Families Act 2014](#) it is a legal requirement that all local authorities ensure children and young people with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities ([SEND](#)) and their parents have access to an impartial [Information, Advice and Support \(IAS\) service](#).

The IASSN are funded by the Department for Education ([DfE](#)) to support this.

We do this by:

- Working with the [SENDIAS](#) services to ensure they have the resources and training to provide high quality information, advice and support to children, young people and parents in their area.
- Listening to, and working with, SENDIAS's to understand their challenges and successes in order to feedback to the [DfE](#) to implement positive and necessary change.
- Working with SENDIAS services and other stakeholders to develop and promote the [Standards](#) for SENDIAS services

## COVID-19

This report was due at the start of the new financial year, 2020. However due to the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic, we delayed the publication. The data in this report is the most up-to-date data we have access to whereas, for ease, previous reports have focused on the previous year's data.

## This Data Report

This National IASS Data Report contributes to an overview of the range and nature of IAS services.

This data report is phase one of two focusing on funding arrangements and staffing levels in IAS services. Phase two will focus on service user feedback and training.

Previous data reports can be found on our [website](#).

## Participating in this report

Participation in this report is voluntary, but accurate data reporting will ensure that we as a Network are able to support services in their work and create an accurate snapshot of the national picture. This provides valuable information when working with funders or when exploring development, focus, outcomes and outputs of the service.

Data will also play a key role in exploring service's challenges and successes with regards to the [Minimum Standards](#).

Out of the 152 services, we requested data from we received full and measurable data from 145. This represents an increase from previous years.

This information has been mainly taken from data gathered by the IASP in order to avoid duplication of effort. In addition all services were given the opportunity to add or amend their data via email and over the forum.

If you feel any of this data is inaccurate please get in [touch](#) with any queries or updates.

## The data

### Service differences

Each of the 152 SENDIAS services has a unique combination of geography, population, size, funding, range of stakeholders and arrangements with their local authority.

We can see the range of population size in the table below:

**Table A- 0-25 Population**

**These figures are taken from the ONS**

	Mean	Median	Range
<b>0-25 Population</b>	<b>116,370</b>	<b>88,925</b>	<b>10,919 - 481,475</b>

There are of course going to be challenges when comparing a service that operates in an area with 10,919 0-25 year olds and a service operating in an area with 481,475 0-25 year olds whilst trying to meet the [Minimum Standards](#).

The [Children and Families Act](#) sets out the [legal requirements](#) that all children and young people with SEND and their parents have access to an impartial information, advice and support service. Therefore comparing population differences is a useful tool if population size is a barrier to meeting the [Standards](#). This is explored further below when taking into account spend per member of the 0-25 population.

A tool developed by the IASSN to find and compare services that are ‘statistical neighbors and therefore similar in demographics can provide you with further insight in terms of comparison and can be found [here](#).

## Funding arrangements- Joint commissioning

*Please note we are using 'joint commissioning' in this report as 'joint commissioned where a service has formal joint commissioned arrangements with funding from health and/or social care as part of this'*

As referenced in the [Minimum Standards](#) SENDIAS services should be jointly commissioned by Health, Education and Social Care:

*'1.1. The IASS is jointly commissioned by education, health and social care in accordance with the CFA 2014. A formal agreement is set out in writing which refers directly to these Minimum Standards, whilst also considering the need for continuity and stability of the service.'*

At the time of last year's Data report published in June only **11** IAS's reported that there were joint commissioning arrangements within their local authorities. This was identified as an area in need of focus going forward.

Currently **50 out of 152** SENDIAS services are joint funded. This is broken down below:

	Last year	This year
Joint funded with Health only	4	15
Joint funded with Social Care only	0	9
Joint funded with both Health and Social Care	7	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50</b>

This is a significant improvement and helps pave the way for more sustainability of funding going forward, regardless of the continuation of IASP funding.

It is worth noting, however, that the level of joint funding from Health and Social Care ranges from **5% to 60%** of the total SENDIAS budget.

There are some significant regional differences in the level of joint commissioning

<b>Region</b>	<b>(rounded) Percentage of joint funded services in region</b>
West Midlands	20% of services are joint funded
South West	40% of services are joint funded
South East	40% of services are joint funded
North West	30% of services are joint funded
North East	10% of services are joint funded
Yorkshire and Humber	30% of services are joint funded
London	30% of services are joint funded
East Midlands	60% of services are joint funded
East of England	60% of services are joint funded
<b>Average</b>	30% of services are joint funded

The above table indicates significant differences between regions with 7 out of 11 services joint funded in the East of England and only 1 in 12 joint commissioned in the North East.

## Funding per head

The level of funding that SENDIAS services are receiving from Local Authorities (LA's) varies greatly. This is funding from the LA only, not including any national funding from the IASP.

The following displays the funding per head of the 0-25 population for 2019 and 2020.

**Table B- Funding per head of 0-25 Population-**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>Average spend per head of 2019 report</b>	<b>£0.99</b>	<b>£0.90</b>	<b>£0.23- £2.78</b>
<b>Average spend per head 2020 report</b>	<b>£1.09</b>	<b>£0.97</b>	<b>£0.21- £3.13</b>
<b>Percentage change</b>	<b>9% increase</b>	<b>7% increase</b>	<b>9% decrease – 11% increase</b>

It is important to note, that on average, funding for IAS services from LAs is increasing - as is the range. This is overall positive, but concerning for those at the lower end of the funding range.

It also further highlights the difference regarding investment by LAs/ CCG's in IAS services. This can be used, along with individual services' funding per head (found in the appendices of this report), as key information for discussions on joint commissioning and increased funding.



## Funding change's

Following on from considering the changes in spend per head for services, it is important to consider the fluctuation in services' funding in each area.

A large fluctuation in funding will have an impact on staffing, capacity and ability to meet statutory obligations for the service.

The following table displays the change in funding for each service, considering what percentage services' funding went up or down between May 17/18 - May 18/19 and May 18/19 - June 20.

**Table C- IASS % difference between 17/18 - 18/19 and 18/19- current**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>IASS funding difference 17/18 - 18/19</b>	<b>103%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>62%- 165%</b>
<b>IASS funding difference 18/19- 2020</b>	<b>116%</b>	<b>101%</b>	<b>30%- 461%</b>

We can see that although overall funding has marginally increased across the services, again the range is significant. This suggests that although the average funding is increasing, that there is still a large fluctuation which can impact on service delivery and on the ability to ensure a stable, consistent service.

This can again be used well in conjunction with feedback, local area inspections and with regards to services being able to meet the [Minimum Standards](#).


## Joint commissioning and overall funding

One of the fundamental reasons for joint commissioning is to ensure the sustainability of funding for IAS services. Because of this, it's important to consider if joint commissioning is increasing the overall budget for services, or whether it is more likely to result in a similar budget.

**Table D- Funding per Area and Joint commissioning per area.**

Area	Mean funding Diff	Mean funding per head	(rounded) Percentage joint funded services
West Midlands	94%	1.18	20%
South West	148%	1.39	40%
South East	102%	0.97	40%
North West	127%	0.97	30%
North East	102%	0.90	10%
Yorkshire and Humber	109%	1.43	30%
London	122%	1.17	30%
East Midlands	110%	0.85	60%
East of England	126%	0.86	60%
<b>Average</b>	116%	1.09	30%

The above table indicates, that generally speaking, areas with services whose budgets have increased are those with a higher percentages of services that are joint funded.



This graph suggests that joint commissioning services increases total, core funding.

## Staffing and volunteers

Staffing is key for services to be able to meet the [Minimum Standards](#) especially considering 1.3:

*'1.3 The IASS provides an all year-round flexible service which is open during normal office hours and includes a direct helpline with 24-hour answer machine, call back and signposting service, including linking to the national SEND helpline.'*

This means that services must be able to cover sick leave, holiday and other leave by having the appropriate staffing levels. This is always going to be trickier in smaller authorities where even with good levels of funding per head, the funding does not enable the services to employ enough staff to meet the standard.

### Table D- Staffing

#### FTE Staffing

	Mean	Median	Range
<b>Average full-time staff per service last report</b>	2.86	2.23	0.40-17
<b>Average number of full time staff per service- this report</b>	2.93	2.20	0.40- 17

#### Volunteers

	Mean	Range
<b>Average full time Volunteers last report</b>	1.8	0-50
<b>Average number of full time staff current</b>	1.9	0-50

Again this highlights the range of difference in structure and set up in different services. It is worth noting that different sized services serve different sized areas, so a further piece of analysis considers number of staff per number of population:

## Average number of staff per population

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>Number of CYP population per one member of staff</b>	One per 46,569	One staff member per 42,700	One staff member between 10,154-128,136

This shows a huge difference. It doesn't take into account needs in each area but as a general overview, may support services in areas where staff are thinly stretched to discuss funding and staffing needs with their LAs.

## Using this data

The IASS Network and SENDIAS services can use the data in this report to inform discussions regarding various aspects of service delivery with services, funding partners, other stakeholders and the DFE.

This report is one part of a wider data collection process which, along with service user feedback and training statistics, will form a national picture of IAS services

However this cannot be considered a complete picture and should not be used to make judgements about the quality of the services in each area. We hope that this report is useful to services when in discussions with their commissioners and to help them see where they are at in terms of funding and staffing levels compared to their neighbours.

Further information and tools can be found below:

- [Ofsted Reports](#)
- [Statistical neighbor benchmarking tool](#)
- [IASSN Website](#)

For the full tables of data please see the appendices below.

## Appendices

### West Midlands

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Birmingham	450,047	90,009	270,000	240,000	5.00	12				0.60	0.53	89%
Coventry	138,032	28,757	155,467	164,062	4.80	0				1.13	1.19	106%
Dudley	97,313	42,127	109,400	116,000	2.31	0				1.12	1.19	106%
Herefordshire	50,665	36,189	59,862	60,570	1.40	0				1.18	1.20	101%
Sandwell	112,830	28,208	123,000	125,000	4.00	0				1.09	1.11	102%
Shropshire	84,664	25,425	120,400	105,400	3.33	0				1.42	1.24	88%
Solihull	64,473	28,783	79,918	103,560	2.24	4				1.24	1.61	130%
Staffordshire	247,960	45,084	269,000	259,620	5.50	0				1.08	1.05	97%
Stoke-on-Trent	85,399	42,700	142,140	109,000	2.00	2				1.66	1.28	77%
Telford & Wrekin	57,795	26,757	64,330	74,000	2.16	0		Yes		1.11	1.28	115%
Walsall	94,282	94,282	25,231	no data	1.00	0				0.27		
Warwickshire	164,854	47,101	138,000	123,000	3.50	0		Yes		0.84	0.75	89%
Wolverhampton	86,806	22,844	213,950	182,490	3.80	3				2.46	2.10	85%
Worcestershire	167,138	49,158	121,281	143,000	3.40	0		Yes		0.73	0.86	118%
<b>Average</b>	135,876	43,387	136,075	129,285	3	2	0	3	0	1.18	100%	135,876

### South West

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Bath & N.E Somerset	67,101	18,384	91,321	169,800	3.65	5	Yes			1.36	2.53	186%
Bournemouth, Christchurch + Poole	116310	21945	160,500	176,200	5.30	0				N/A	1.51	
Bristol	167,035	50,161	54,716	141,200	3.33	2	Yes			0.33	0.85	258%
Cornwall (& Isle of Scilly)	156,643	87,024	85,667	58,600	1.80	1				0.55	0.37	
Devon	216,113	33,768	293,000	290,000	6.40	15				1.36	1.34	99%
Dorset	106,311	39,374	67,099	96,300	2.70	0				0.63	0.91	144%
Gloucestershire	181,688	106,875	97,000	no data	1.70	1				0.53		
North Somerset	58,822	30,478	48,416	51,100	1.93	3	Yes			0.82	0.87	106%
Plymouth	88,532	14,755	246,095	277,012	6.00	0		Yes		2.78	3.13	113%
Somerset	153,188	16,436	107,800	335,100	9.32	1				0.70	2.19	311%
South Gloucestershire	85,837	44,941	54,050	55,000	1.91	2	Yes			0.63	0.64	102%
Swindon	68,293	42,683	63,000	61,000	1.60	1				0.92	0.89	97%
Torbay	35,911	17,956	45,000	50,000	2.00	2				1.25	1.39	111%
Wiltshire	143,910	79,950	59,209	58,302	1.80	0				0.41	0.41	98%
	<b>113,738</b>	<b>42,353</b>	<b>93,741</b>	<b>128,865</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>148%</b>



**South East**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Pop 0-25</b>	<b>FTE staff to Pop-June 2020</b>	<b>IASS Apr 2019</b>	<b>IASS (total) June 2020</b>	<b>FTE June 2020</b>	<b>Vols June 2020</b>	<b>Heath and Social care input</b>	<b>Health only Input</b>	<b>Social Care only input</b>	<b>£ per head April 2019</b>	<b>£ per head June 2020</b>	<b>IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020</b>
Bracknell Forest	38,173	70,691	27,360	53,510	0.54	2	<b>Yes</b>			0.72	1.40	196%
Brighton & Hove	98,840	42,974	105,000	105,000	2.30	5	<b>Yes</b>			1.06	1.06	100%
Buckinghamshire	165,309	55,287	99,307	108,734	2.99	11				0.60	0.66	109%
East Sussex	149,285	57,417	110,000	110,000	2.60	4	<b>Yes</b>			0.74	0.74	100%
Hampshire	395,904		DNS	265,817	DNS	0	<b>Yes</b>			N/A	0.67	
Isle of Wight	35,966	15,240	94,001	94,724	2.36	8			<b>Yes</b>	2.61	2.63	101%
Kent	481,475	48,634	334,000	330,000	9.90	2			<b>Yes</b>	0.69	0.69	99%
Medway	92,515	46,258	70,770	70,070	2.00	0				0.76	0.76	99%
Milton Keynes	89,101	23,083	110,595	113,434	3.86	1				1.24	1.27	103%
Oxfordshire	220,443	76,015	117,000	122,000	2.90	45				0.53	0.55	104%
Portsmouth	80,703	44,835	62,506	58,926	1.80	0				0.77	0.73	94%
Reading	58,760	24,082	63,600	115,600	2.63	4				1.08	1.07	99%
Slough	54,928	27,464	85,943	26,000	2.00	0				1.56	0.47	30%
Southampton	99,721	51,669	53,000	53,000	1.93	2	<b>Yes</b>			0.53	0.53	100%
Surrey	364,541	59,566	217,600	239,126	6.12	0				0.60	0.66	110%
West Berkshire	47,937	31,958	54,900	54,900	1.50	1				1.15	1.15	100%
West Sussex	238,340	31,526	259,500	202,490	7.56	9		<b>Yes</b>		1.09	0.85	78%
Windsor & Maidenhead	44,898	32,070	60,000	60,000	1.40	0				1.34	1.34	100%
Wokingham	51,508	28,616	50,000	59,010	1.80	5				0.97	1.15	118%
	<b>147,808</b>	<b>42,632</b>	<b>109,727</b>	<b>115,234</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>102%</b>

**North West**

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Blackburn with Darwen	53,549	79,924	28,000	28,000	0.67	0				0.52	0.52	100%
Blackpool	41,716	32,089	55,240	71,111	1.30	0				1.32	1.70	129%
Bolton	94,413	37,765	60,000	70,000	2.50	2	Yes			0.64	0.74	117%
Bury	59,408	33,004	45,000	45,000	1.80	3				0.76	0.76	100%
Cheshire East	104,858	42,975	51,101	111,038	2.44	0			Yes	0.49	1.06	217%
Cheshire West & Chester	98,825	26,007	151,833	100,989	3.80	8				1.54	1.02	67%
Cumbria	133,102	53,241	95,000	90,000	2.50	0				0.71	0.68	95%
Halton	39,864	39,864	40,050	48,174	1.00	0				1.00	1.21	120%
Knowsley	47,781	21,719	78,000	78,000	2.20	0	Yes			1.63	1.63	100%
Lancashire	369,944	21,761	435,135	345,432	17.00	0				1.18	0.93	79%
Liverpool	172,469	78,395	96,000	96,000	2.20	0				0.56	0.56	100%
Manchester	221,584	55,396	199,631	200,000	4.00	0				0.90	0.90	100%
Oldham	81,770	27,257	47,507	57,709	3.00	2				0.58	0.71	121%
Rochdale	73,243	38,549	51,000	51,000	1.90	3				0.70	0.70	100%
Salford	85,131	42,566	82,000	83,200	2.00	0				0.96	0.98	101%
Sefton	75,829	75,829	71,000	100,850	1.00	0		Yes		0.94	1.33	142%
St.Helens	52,445		42,756	63,624		0				0.82	1.21	149%
Stockport	85,726	42,863	50,000	50,000	2.00	0				0.58	0.58	100%
Tameside	70,083	38,935	64,580	68,500	1.80	0				0.92	0.98	106%
Trafford	73,387	20,731	74,790	81,000	3.54	2	Yes			1.02	1.10	108%
Warrington	62,399	56,726	36,478	40,000	1.10	0				0.58	0.64	110%
Wigan	96,379	96,379	32,000	147,500	1.00	1		Yes		0.33	1.53	461%
Wirral	93,934	40,841	87,000	87,000	2.30	0				0.93	0.93	100%
	<b>123,126</b>	<b>43,647</b>	<b>94,005</b>	<b>100,673</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>127%</b>

**North East**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Pop 0-25</b>	<b>FTE staff to Pop-June 2020</b>	<b>IASS Apr 2019</b>	<b>IASS (total) June 2020</b>	<b>FTE June 2020</b>	<b>Vols June 2020</b>	<b>Heath and Social care input</b>	<b>Health only Input</b>	<b>Social Care only input</b>	<b>£ per head April 2019</b>	<b>£ per head June 2020</b>	<b>IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020</b>
Darlington	31,306	46,038	25,231	29,909	0.68	0				0.81	0.96	119%
Durham	157,247	42,499	143,000	127,596	3.70	0				0.91	0.81	89%
Gateshead	59,719	59,719	49,999	50,000	1.00	5				0.84	0.84	100%
Hartlepool	28,925	48,208	25,678	33,485	0.60	0				0.89	1.16	130%
Middlesborough	50,594	126,485	13,835	no data	0.40	0				0.27		
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	114,767	57,384	62,210	94,190	2.00	3				0.54	0.82	151%
North Tyneside	57,094	28,547	85,017	84,000	2.00	0				1.49	1.47	99%
Northumberland	83,346	41,673	80,779	80,779	2.00	0				0.97	0.97	100%
Redcar and Cleveland	39,653	49,566	25,021	no data	0.80	0				0.63		
South Tyneside	43,163		DNS	46,220		0	<b>Yes</b>			N/A	1.07	
Stockton-on-Tees	62,154	62,154	45,060	45,775	1.00	0				0.72	0.74	102%
Sunderland	83,131	83,131	57,000	17,600	1.00	0				0.69	0.21	31%
	<b>67,592</b>	<b>58,673</b>	<b>55,712</b>	<b>60,955</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>102%</b>

**Yorkshire and Humber**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Pop 0-25</b>	<b>FTE staff to Pop-June 2020</b>	<b>IASS Apr 2019</b>	<b>IASS (total) June 2020</b>	<b>FTE June 2020</b>	<b>Vols June 2020</b>	<b>Heath and Social care input</b>	<b>Health only Input</b>	<b>Social Care only input</b>	<b>£ per head April 2019</b>	<b>£ per head June 2020</b>	<b>IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020</b>
Barnsley	72,206	34,384	125,127	178,480	2.10	11			<b>Yes</b>	1.73	2.47	143%
Bradford	194,172	90,735	173,905	144,000	2.14	1		<b>Yes</b>		0.90	0.74	83%
Calderdale	63,692	50,954	48,000	58,510	1.25	1				0.75	0.92	122%
Doncaster	93,136	31,045	92,640	105,000	3.00	0				0.99	1.13	113%
East Riding of Yorkshire	87,763	18,793	103,274	147,000	4.67	3	<b>Yes</b>			1.18	1.67	142%
Kingston upon Hull	89,951	17,990	140,000	135,000	5.00	1				1.56	1.50	96%
Kirklees	143,971	52,353	75,000	98,660	2.75	1				0.52	0.69	132%
Leeds	284,601	71,150	151,560	152,000	4.00	1	<b>Yes</b>			0.53	0.53	100%
N.Yorkshire	161,522	29,368	187,000	195,200	5.50	4				1.16	1.21	104%
North East Lincolnshire	48,413	13,832	117,000	78,500	3.50	0				2.42	1.62	67%
North Lincolnshire	49,588	16,529	73,000	102,000	3	0				N/A	2.06	
Rotherham	80,277	12,742	191,533	174,569	6.30	3				2.39	2.17	91%
Sheffield	210,304	45,520	189,123	263,859	4.62	0				0.90	1.25	140%
Wakefield	101,135	15,559	268,364	247,863	6.50	0		<b>Yes</b>		2.65	2.45	92%
York	71,151	64,683	67,610	69,730	1.10	1				0.95	0.98	103%
	<b>116,792</b>	<b>37,709</b>	<b>133,542</b>	<b>143,358</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>109%</b>

London

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Barking & Dagenham	84,368	56,245	DNS	60,000	1.50	2			Yes	N/A	0.71	
Barnet	126,059	41,196	147,960	147,000	3.06	2				1.17	1.17	99%
Bexley	79,611		DNS	50,000		0		Yes		N/A	0.63	
Brent	111,397	85,690	52,037	96,630	1.30	0				0.47	0.87	186%
Bromley	98,650	24,663	126,000	143,000	4.00	6			Yes	1.28	1.45	113%
Camden	82,460	41,230	DNS	109,000	2.00	0				N/A	1.32	
Croydon	127,725	69,795	75,950	75,950	1.83	4				0.59	0.59	100%
Ealing	112,319	36,232	136,266	145,000	3.10	0	Yes			1.21	1.29	106%
Enfield	115,631	50,274	115,500	109,500	2.30	3	Yes			1.00	0.95	95%
Greenwich	97,218		DNS	173,900		0				N/A	1.79	
Hackney	89,384	17,877	200,087	209,000	5.00	0				2.24	2.34	104%
Hammersmith & Fulham	56,463	47,053	34,000	63,250	1.20	0				0.60	1.12	186%
Haringey	87,638	35,055	95,352	94,997	2.50	3				1.09	1.08	100%
Harrow	79,604	44,224	49,760	78,972	1.80	0				0.63	0.99	159%
Havering	80,219	25,068	72,770	72,000	3.20	0				0.91	0.90	99%
Hillingdon	109,016	50,238	117,600	125,800	2.17	0				1.08	1.15	107%

London (Cont.)

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Hounslow	88,748	88,748	47,145	47,500	1.00	2				0.53	0.54	101%
Islington	78,566	18,706	185,723	165,555	4.20	2				2.36	2.11	89%
Kensington & Chelsea	42,301	42,301	24,000	no data	1.00	0				0.57		
Kingston-upon-Thames	57,773	55,551	46,156	51,000	1.04	0				0.80	0.88	110%
Richmond-upon-Thames	57,967	55,738	46,156	51,000	1.04	0				0.80	0.88	110%
Lambeth	97,933	48,967	107,646	89,606	2.00	0				1.10	0.91	83%
Lewisham	98,105	37,733	94,682	94,682	2.60	1				0.97	0.97	100%
Merton	63,875	31,938	84,650	68,810	2.00	0				1.33	1.08	81%
Newham	128,136	128,136	DNS		1.00	0				N/A	0.00	
Redbridge	104,706	32,721	110,000	110,000	3.20	0			<b>Yes</b>	1.05	1.05	100%
Southwark	101,019		DNS	242,986		0				N/A	2.41	
Sutton	63,231	45,165	75,570	73,886	1.40	0	<b>Yes</b>			1.20	1.17	98%
Tower Hamlets (& City)	111,498	17,422	226,000	298,858	6.40	10		<b>Yes</b>		2.03	2.68	132%
Waltham Forest	92,544	115,680	20,832	71,000	0.80	2	<b>Yes</b>			0.23	0.77	341%
Wandsworth	95,113	43,233	101,500	135,000	2.20	0	<b>Yes</b>			1.07	1.42	133%
Westminster	70,973	70,973	42,000	78,000	1.00	3				0.59	1.10	186%
	<b>90,320</b>	<b>50,271</b>	<b>93,667</b>	<b>112,711</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>122%</b>

### East Midlands

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Derby	89,259	38,808	93,500	85,598	2.30	0				1.05	0.96	92%
Derbyshire	220,085	31,713	184,769	166,775	6.94	0				0.84	0.76	90%
Nottingham	141,372	75,198	64,751	87,972	1.88	3	Yes			0.46	0.62	136%
Nottinghamshire	236,219	62,824	123,698	164,126	3.76	4			Yes	0.52	0.69	133%
Leicester City	142,317	56,927	115,000	115,000	2.50	2	Yes			0.81	0.81	100%
Leicestershire	209,231	67,712	104,000	100,000	3.09	0	Yes			0.50	0.48	96%
Lincolnshire	213,294	34,402	188,000	193,890	6.20	0				0.88	0.91	103%
Northamptonshire	231,275	24,345	250,000	330,000	9.50	0			Yes	1.08	1.43	132%
Rutland	10,919	15,599	27,000		0.70	0				2.47	1.00	
	<b>165,997</b>	<b>45,281</b>	<b>127,858</b>	<b>155,420</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>110%</b>

### East of England

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	FTE staff to Pop-June 2020	IASS Apr 2019	IASS (total) June 2020	FTE June 2020	Vols June 2020	Heath and Social care input	Health only Input	Social Care only input	£ per head April 2019	£ per head June 2020	IASS % Diff April 2019-June 2020
Bedford	53,928	67,410	40,320	No data	0.80	2				0.75		
Cambridgeshire	202,425	77,856	107,266	98091	2.60	1	<b>Yes</b>			0.53	0.69	130%
Central Bedfordshire	83,125	46,181	65,670	137,171	1.80	3	<b>Yes</b>			0.79	1.65	209%
Essex	436,955	87,391	240,263	248,691	5.00	1				0.55	0.57	104%
Hertfordshire	371,328	55,671	199,000	225,520	6.67	0		<b>Yes</b>		0.54	0.61	113%
Luton	78,711	52,474	95,676	86,122	1.50	1		<b>Yes</b>		1.22	1.09	90%
Norfolk	253,132	47,761	146,140	151,720	5.30	15				0.58	0.60	104%
Peterborough	67,466	67,466	50,262	51,000	1.00	0	<b>Yes</b>			0.74	0.76	101%
Southend-on-Sea	54,447	32,028	61,187	97,834	1.70	1		<b>Yes</b>		1.12	1.80	160%
Suffolk	215,262	34,720	203,653	No data	6.20	0				0.95	0.00	No data
Thurrock	58,005	33,146	34,204	48,046	1.75	0		<b>Yes</b>		0.59	0.83	140%
	170,435	54,737	117,260	127,133	3.12	2	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	0.77	0.86	113%