

Information Advice and Support Service's Network

Funding, Casework and Staffing Data Report

2022

For any queries regarding any of the data please contact us via email iassn@ncb.org.uk

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Service differences	5
Regional Differences.....	6
Funding arrangements- Joint commissioning.....	7
Funding per head.....	8
Core reasons why children and young people and their family's access SENDIAS services.....	9
Staffing and volunteers.....	10
Casework and Tribunal.....	13
Tribunal avoidance.....	16
Social Media and other reach.....	17
Conclusion.....	18
Using this data.....	18
West Midlands.....	19
South West.....	20
South East.....	21
North West.....	22
North East.....	23
Yorkshire and Humber	24
London.....	25
London (continued).....	26
East Midlands	27
East of England.....	28

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 services 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

This Data Report

This National IASS Data Report, required as part of the DfE contract, presents an overview of the range and pressures upon SENDIAS services.

This data report is phase one of two focusing on funding arrangements, pressure and staffing levels in IAS services. Phase two will focus on service user feedback and Ofsted/CQC reporting.

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

Participating in this report

Participation in this report is voluntary, but accurate data reporting ensures an accurate snapshot of the national picture.

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

Out of the 149 services, we received full and measurable data from 121 or 82%. This is an increase from last year post the IASP reporting, however, it didn't meet our target of over 90%. We will continue to work on improving this figure, although we understand the challenges of doing so for services facing staffing or management issues.

If you are a service reading this and feel any of this data is inaccurate, please get in [touch](#). We are unable to add data on if you were late submitting but are happy to amend if we have made a mistake.

The data

Service differences

Each of the 152 areas covered by one of the 149 SENDIAS services has a unique combination of geography, population, size, funding, range of stakeholders and arrangements with local authorities.

There are of course going to be challenges when comparing a service that operates in an area with 10,068 0–25-year-old's and a service operating in an area with 466,515 0-25 year-old's. Or a service that covers 12 km² with a service that covers 8037km².

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

For services individual data, please see the tables at the end of this report.

Regional Differences

The national SENDIASS children and young people's steering group were particularly keen to see differences between regions. The following table explores this.

Table A- Comparing the regions

Region	Number of services	Number of services submitted data	Mean geographical size (KM2)	Mean population (0-25)	Mean spend per head (0-25)	% of services joint funded
West Midlands	14	13 (93%)	928	130,829	£1.29	69%
South-West	14	14 (100%)	1688	112,298	£1.69	69%
South-East	19	19 (100%)	1004	142,737	£1.36	63%
North-West	23	12 (52%)	613	119,193	£1.46	66%
North-East	12	8 (66%)	715	64,293	£1.63	55%
Yorkshire and Humber	15	15 (100%)	1027	111,594	£1.33	79%
London	32	24 (75%)	49	87,057	£1.30	54%
East Midlands	9	7 (78%)	1736	159,962	£1.28	43%
East of England	11	9 (81%)	1738	136,908	£1.24	78%
Average	17	120 (82%)	1055	118,319	£1.36	64%

Funding arrangements- Joint commissioning

Please note we are using 'joint commissioning' in this report to mean '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.'

We can see from the table below, partly due to the legacy of IASP funding, the percentage of services joint commissioned continues to rise- from 7% in 2019 to 64% this year. This is a very positive trend as Local Authorities move towards meeting their joint commissioning legal duties.

Table B- Percentage of services Joint funded

	2019	2020	2021	2022
Joint funded with Health only	2.5%	10%	23%	30%
Joint funded with Social Care only	0%	6%	7%	11%
Joint funded with both Health and Social Care	4.5%	17%	9%	23%
Total	7%	33%	39%	64%

It is worth noting that the contribution to the total SENDIAS budget from Health and Social Care ranges from **2% to 66%** of the total SENDIASs budget. 66% is a fantastic achievement with each of Education, Health and Social care contributing 33%.

Funding per head

The level of funding that SENDIAS services are receiving from Local Authorities (LA's) and CCGs varies greatly.

The table below looks at the average funding of all services, for individual service data please see the tables at the end of the report

Table C- Funding per head of the 0-25 Population

	Mean	Median	Range
Average spend per head of 2019 report	£0.99	£0.90	£0.23- £2.78
Average spend per head 2020 report	£1.09	£0.97	£0.21- £3.13
Average spend per head 2021 report	£1.20	£1.10	£0.49- £3.31
Average spend per head 2022 report	£1.36	£1.22	£0.36- £3.60

Table D- Funding per head percentage change

	Mean	Median	Range
Percentage change from 2021- 2022	15%	11%	-26% - 9%
Percentage change from 2019- 2022	39%	36%	56%- 29%

It is positive that core funding for SENDIAS services is rising. This shows the recognition of the importance of the work services do alongside rising profile in Ofsted/CQC reporting.

It is also no coincidence that core funding is increasing alongside the rise in the number of joint commissioned services.

However, it is essential to read this data in line with the data below on helpline casework and tribunal figures which show that, whilst SENDIASs funding is rising, it is still not keeping pace with the growing pressures on services.

Core reasons why children and young people and their family's access SENDIAS services

One question often asked during joint commissioning conversations between SENDIASs and commissioners, is what percentage of the time do children, young people and/ or their family's approach SENDIASs looking for support around issues other than education. Services this year submitted to us how they feel this breaks down into percentages as follows:

Table E- Percentage breakdown between CYP and families looking for IAS regarding Health, Social Care or Education

	Health only	Education only	Social care only	A combination
Reason for self-referral	8%	38%	6%	48%

The three main reasons for children, young people or their families seeking IAS were recorded by services as follows

- SEND Support in Schools
- Education, Health and Care Needs Assessment (including how to apply and refusal to assess)
- Tribunal Advice and support

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 service is not able to employ enough staff to meet the standard.

The following table explores the average number of staff across all SENDIASSs. For individual data please see tables below

Table F- Full time Equivalent (FTE) Staffing

	Mean	Median	Range
Average FTE service 2019 report	2.86	2.23	0.40-17
Average number FTE- 2020 report	2.93	2.20	0.40- 17
Average FTE- 2021 report	3.52	2.60	0.8- 17
Average FTE- 2022 report	3.66	2.90	0.8-12.6

Table G- Average numbers of Volunteers across services

	Mean	Range
2019	1.8	0-50
2020	1.9	0-50
2021	2.1	0-50
2022	2.3	0- 41

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 in the table below considers number of staff per head of 0-25 population in any area, across all services:

Table H- Staffing per head of 0-25 population

	Mean	Median	Range
2020	One staff member per 46,600	One staff member per 42,700	One staff member for 10,000- 128,000
2021	One staff member per 37,600	One staff member per 35,000	One staff member for 11,000 -91,000
2022	One staff member per 33,551	One staff member per 32,500	One staff member for 10,000 – 85,000

This shows a huge difference when comparing services. It doesn't consider needs in each area but as a general overview, may support services in areas where staff are thinly stretched.

Every service records casework data slightly differently, making this data very challenging to compare. However, what we can compare is the increase or decrease any service is recording with regards to helpline enquires, casework and Tribunal.

Table I- Casework and Tribunal per SENDIASSs

	2020	2021	2022	% Increase 21-22	% Increase 20-22
Average helpline enquires	672	1291	1610	25%	139%
Average casework numbers	348	724	1015	40%	191%
Average number of Tribunal's inputted to	No data	40	64	60%	No data
Average number of Tribunals directly supporting during	No data	4	11	175%	No data

Most services record and triage their casework based on the [IASSN Intervention levels](#). These have been revised this year in co-production with services, with the new intervention levels being rolled out before Christmas 2022.

Broadly speaking, Level One is the least complex type of intervention and includes providing generic information taking up to an hour of time to complete. Level Four is the most complex and time-consuming level of intervention which includes intensive ongoing case work, such as supporting with Tribunals or CETR's. Monitoring the level of complexity of the work is a way of monitoring pressure on services.

Table J- Intervention levels – what percentage of all casework is being done on each level

	2020	2021	2022
Level one	67%	63%	48%
Level two	23%	22%	25%
Level three	7%	11%	16%
Level four	3%	4%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Clearly, and perhaps unsurprisingly when read with data about overall numbers of Tribunal, the percentage of casework that is complex is rising. This year over half of all work was level two and above with 27% of all casework level three or four. This has a significant impact on capacity, resource, and wellbeing. With volume of casework and complexity of casework rising, to understand the true impact of this on SENDIAs it's important to consider this in-line with funding increases to services and staffing increases.

Table K- Funding increase compared with complexity and work increase

	Helpline increase	Casework increase	Increase % of cases level three or four	Mean funding increase	Mean FTE staffing increase
2021- 2022	25%	40%	12% increase	11%	4%
2019- 2022	139%	191%	17% increase	36%	28%

While it is positive that services average funding across the board is rising, we can see clearly that the volume of work is rising at a quicker pace, whilst the complexity of the casework is rising sharply too. Given salaries and costs growing through inflation, the amount of additional staffing also doesn't match funding rises. Services are trying to manage a 40% increase in casework since last year with a 12% increase in that casework being level three or four, with a 4% increase in staffing levels. It is clear that services are under growing pressure. When read with [previous reports](#) that highlight the importance, value, and impact of properly resourced SENDIAs, this is clearly a cause for concern.

Tribunal avoidance

Services also report that they feel the work that they do reduces and avoids Tribunals in their area. Whilst it is difficult to put an exact figure on this, we asked services how many tribunals they estimate they've helped avoid in the previous twelve months. On Average the number given was **44**

This suggests that services may have helped avoid 6512 Tribunals this year, saving children, young people, families and the SEND system resource, capacity, time, stress and helping foster more positive relationships. Some of the reasons given for how include:

- 'Encouraging dialogue, sticking to the law, mediation at all stages.'
- 'Facilitating better communication between parents, schools and LA. Advise and support parents / carers and young people to consider having an informal or formal mediation meeting with the local authority, rather than going straight to the appeal stage.'
- Fully supporting parents through the process, clear guidance on the law, LA often concede before the hearing.
- Requested meetings with LA, settings and other services - typically through a working document.
- Ensuring parent/YP are fully informed of the legal basis behind decisions and how they can remind the LA of their legal duty.
- Encouraging parents to communicate with LA before going directly to appeal.
- Reminding parents of their right to mediation - even if not a need to consider.
- Ensuring reports are carried over into draft/specific/quantified
- Ensuring the parent understands the process was followed for consultation and responses
- Managing a parent's expectation and looking at the support at SEN level in school
- Supporting parents to access other services who may be better placed to offer support the CYP needs to access school
- Reminding the LA of statutory process' and other factors

Social Media and other reach

It's worth noting that, in addition to casework and helpline work, services also produce and share information to empower children, young people, their families, and professionals through an online presence.

	2022
Average Twitter followers	223
Average Facebook engagement	2800
Average website hits	14387
Average number of parents and or professionals attending a training session over the last twelve months	197
Average number of resource downloads from websites	2325

When considered with all other data we can see the reach services have, as well as the impact.

The four main conclusions that can be drawn from this report are:

1. The range between services with regard to funding and staffing levels is still far too wide and does not seem to be shrinking
2. It is positive that funding is increasing, but it is not matching increasing pressures on services. For services to continue to be able to provide the essential service they do, funding must increase alongside the pressures of growing volume and complexity of work
3. 64% of services being joint commissioned is much more positive than three years ago, but we would still like to see that figure become 100%. We are on the right track
4. The level of service provided through the helpline, the intervention levels, Tribunal, social media, training and resource sharing is staggering and goes some way to explaining the positive references to SENDIAS within Ofsted reports, and the positive service user feedback services have seen in previous years as seen [here](#)

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, form a national picture of IAS services. This cannot be considered a complete picture and should not be used to make judgements about the quality of individual services. Further information and tools can be found below:

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

West Midlands

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area Km2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS budget 2022	FTE 2022	Vol 2022	Joint commissioned	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IASS % Diff 21-22	IASS % Diff 19-22
Birmingham	426,375	268	85,275	230,000	5.00	4	No	In-House	0.54	96%	85%
Coventry	135,091	99	25,017	226,754	5.40	0	No	In-House	1.68	139%	146%
Dudley	93,385	98	45,777	126,600	2.04	0	Yes	In-House	1.36	106%	116%
Herefordshire	48,018	2,180	25,273	49,952	1.90	0	Yes	In-House	1.04		83%
Sandwell	109,324	86	36,441	125,500	3.00	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.15	100%	102%
Shropshire	80,675	3,197	DNS	125,400	DNS	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.55		104%
Solihull	63,262	178	30,125	112,695	2.10	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.78	100%	141%
Staffordshire	236,258	2,620	30,683	357,710	7.70	4	Yes	In-House	1.51		133%
Stoke-on-Trent	81,537	93	17,920	152,831	4.55	1	Yes	In-House	1.87	142%	108%
Telford & Wrekin	56,383	290	No data								
Walsall	92,237	104	32,942	130,000	2.80	0	No	Out-Sourced	1.41	100%	515%
Warwickshire	164,976	1,975	47,136	147,000	3.50	1	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.89	102%	107%
Wolverhampton	83,810	69	20,953	243,959	4.00	0	Yes	In House	2.91		114%
Worcestershire	160,277	1,741	24,470	65,908	6.55	0	Yes	In-House	0.41	33%	54%

South West

Local Authority	Pop 0-25	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Bath & N.E Somerset	65,273	346	14,668	175,275	4.45	2	Yes	In-House	2.69	94%	192%
Bournemouth, Christchurch + Poole	112,925	162	13,704	267,428	8.24	10	Yes	In-House	2.37	116%	167%
Bristol	159,374	110	34,054	140,000	4.68	6	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.88	76%	256%
Cornwall (& Isle of Scilly)	151,088	3,361		55,000			Yes	Out-Sourced	0.36	94%	64%
Devon	210,741	6,564	25,575	354,000	8.24	33	Yes	In-House	1.68	119%	121%
Dorset	88,942	2,491	29,647	170,470	3.00	2	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.92		254%
Gloucestershire	176,125	2,653	50,036	245,055	3.52	0	No	In-House	1.39	253%	253%
North Somerset	57,150	374	16,958	104,416	3.37	4	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.83	153%	216%
Plymouth	82,793	80	10,097	298,442	8.20	2	No	In-House	3.60	102%	121%
Somerset	146,188	3,450	14,057	349,800	10.40	1	Yes	In-House	2.39	404%	324%
South Gloucestershire	83,821	497	25,400	86,792	3.30	4	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.04	115%	161%
Swindon	66,131	230	30,060	95,800	2.20		Yes	In-House	1.45		152%
Torbay	33,649	63	16,825	50,000	2.00	1	No	Out-Sourced	1.49		111%
Wiltshire	137,974	3,255	59,989	79,600	2.30	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.58	100%	134%

South East

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop- 2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comms	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IASS % Diff 21-22	IASS % Diff 19- 22
Bracknell Forest	37,633	109	18,817	83,755	2.00	3	Yes	In-House	2.23		306%
Brighton & Hove	94,108	83	40,917	120,000	2.30	10	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.28	114%	114%
Buckinghamshire	161,820	1,565	37,986	112,167	4.26	5	Yes	In-House	0.69	99%	113%
East Sussex	142,422	1,709	56,969	132,800	2.50	10	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.93	100%	121%
Hampshire	380,442	3,678	69,171	255,000	6	9	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.67	103%	
Isle of Wight	33,638	380	15,290	95,000	2.20	4	No	In-House	2.82	100%	101%
Kent	466,515	3,544	47,123	367,400	9.90	1	Yes	In-House	0.79		110%
Medway	87,411	194	48,562	69,853	1.80	0	No	Out-Sourced	0.80	101%	99%
Milton Keynes	86,533	309	29,333	127,333	2.95	0	No	In-House	1.47	97%	115%
Oxfordshire	215,053	2,605	33,238	244,400	6.47	41	Yes	In-House	1.14	148%	209%
Portsmouth	75,526	40	36,137	60,000	2.09	2	No	Out-Sourced	1.06		128%
Reading	54,568	40	22,182	126,800	2.46	3	Yes	In-House	2.32	86%	199%
Slough	54,319	33	21,728	154,000	2.50	1	Yes	In-House	2.84	105%	179%
Southampton	91,610	50	37,855	70,800	2.42	2	No	Out-Sourced	0.77		134%
Surrey	356,755	1,663	59,459	230,000	6.00	0	No	In-House	0.64	100%	106%
West Berkshire	45,794	704	20,085	54,900	2.28	2	No	Out-Sourced	1.20	100%	100%
West Sussex	231,071	1,991	29,249	278,600	7.90	7	Yes	In-House	1.21	98%	107%
Windsor & Maidenhead	44,163	197	24,535	38,612	1.80	0	Yes	In-House	0.87	60%	64%
Wokingham	52,615	179	18,143	107,060	2.90	1	Yes	In-House	2.03	103%	214%

North West

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop- 2022	IASS Apr 2019	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IASS % Diff 21- 22	IASS % Diff 19- 22
Blackburn with Darwen	51,612	137		28,000	No data							
Blackpool	39,481	35		55,240	92,500			Yes	Out-Sourced	2.34		167%
Bolton	91,278	140	36,511	60,000	76,400	2.50	1	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.84	100%	127%
Bury	56,727	99		45,000	No data							
Cheshire East	101,244	1,166	33,748	51,101	113,226	3.00	0	Yes	In-House	1.12	78%	222%
Cheshire West & Chester	94,580	920	23,645	151,833	236,000	4.00	3	Yes	In-House	2.50		155%
Cumbria	125,102	6,768		95,000	100,000			No	In-House	0.80	100%	105%
Halton	38,366	79	19,183	40,050	102,000	2.00	0	Yes	In-House	2.66	205%	255%
Knowsley	46,468	87		78,000	No data							
Lancashire	357,290	2,894	51,041	435,135	290,336	7.00	1	Yes	In-House	0.81	94%	67%
Liverpool	166,219	112		96,000	No data							
Manchester	209,588	116	52,397	199,631	247,000	4.00	0	No	In-House	1.18		124%
Oldham	79,282	142		47,507	No data							
Rochdale	71,316	158		51,000	No data							
Salford	85,426	97	28,475	82,000	180,000	3.00	0	Yes	In-House	2.11	131%	220%
Sefton	72,470	157		71,000	No data							
St.Helens	49,797	136		42,756	59,210			No	In-House	1.19		138%
Stockport	82,655	126	41,328	50,000	60,000	2.00	1	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.73	67%	120%
Tameside	67,682	103		64,580	No data							
Trafford	71,682	106		74,790	No data							
Warrington	58,488	181	29,244	36,478	70,000	2.00	0	No	In-House	1.20		192%
Wigan	93,051	188		32,000	No data							
Wirral	89,657	161		87,000	No data							

North East

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Darlington	29,926	197	14,963	53,096	2.00	0	No	In-House	1.77		210%
Durham	152,045	2,226		267,715		0	Yes	In-House	1.76		187%
Gateshead	55,665	142	27,833	99,707	2.00	1	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.79	199%	199%
Hartlepool	27,191	94	19,422	62,322	1.40	0	Yes	In-House	2.29	100%	243%
Middlesbrough	47,310	54	No data								
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	112,448	113		163,040			Yes	In-House	1.45	109%	262%
North Tyneside	55,747	82	27,874	93,086	2.00		No	In-House	1.67	118%	109%
Northumberland	78,865	5,020	39,433	89,620	2.00	0	No	In-House	1.14	102%	111%
Redcar and Cleveland	37,186	245	No data								
South Tyneside	41,132	64					No	In-House			
Stockton-on-Tees	56,958	205	56,958	75,000	1.00	0	Yes	In-House	1.32	206%	166%
Sunderland	77,045	137	No data								

Yorkshire and Humber

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Barnsley	69,006	329	19,716	178,000	3.50	0	Yes	In-House	2.58		142%
Bradford	188,900	366	49,711	144,000	3.80	1	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.76		83%
Calderdale	60,839	364		57,000			No	In-House	0.94	104%	119%
Doncaster	89,205	568	34,310	120,000	2.60	0	No	In-House	1.35	126%	130%
East Riding of Yorkshire	83,392	2,404	16,645	165,000	5.01		Yes	In-House	1.98		160%
Kingston upon Hull	83,972	72	25,293	135,000	3.32	1	No	out-Sourced	1.61	100%	96%
Kirklees	136,607	409		114,000			No	In-House	0.83	125%	152%
Leeds	274,160	552		165,790			Yes	In-House	0.60		109%
N.Yorkshire	154,053	8,037	34,234	224,900	4.50	4	Yes	In-House	1.46		120%
North East Lincolnshire	45,404	193	17,463	90,000	2.60	0	Yes	In-House	1.98	115%	77%
North Lincolnshire	46,916	847	15,639	135,000	3	2	Yes	In-House	2.88	95%	185%
Rotherham	76,605	287	12,356	152,721	6.20	1	Yes	In-House	1.99		80%
Sheffield	197,468	368	24,684	246,500	8.00	0	Yes	In-House	1.25	93%	130%
Wakefield	98,945	339	32,982		3.00		Yes	Out-Sourced			0%
York	68,438	272		136,000			Yes	In-House	1.99	172%	201%

London

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Barking & Dagenham	81,811	36	40,906	60,000	2.00	2	No	In-House	0.73	100%	
Barnet	123,523	87	No data								
Bexley	75,932	61	37,966	73,000	2	3	Yes	In-House	0.96	104%	
Brent	106,718	43	50,818	84,000	2.10	0	Yes	In-House	0.79	82%	161%
Bromley	95,511	150	23,878	121,720	4.00	6		In-House	1.27	100%	97%
Camden	85,364	22					Yes				
Croydon	122,665	86	61,333	79,920	2.00	2	No	Out-Sourced	0.65	100%	105%
Ealing	107,589	56	34,706	145,000	3.10	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.35	100%	106%
Enfield	109,569	81	No data								
Greenwich	92,588	47	No data								
Hackney	85,339	19	No data								
Hammersmith & Fulham	55,184	16	No data								
Haringey	81,168	30	32,467	104,997	2.50	2	No	Out-Sourced	1.29		110%
Harrow	77,653	50	51,769	87,295	1.50	0	No	Out-Sourced	1.12	101%	175%
Havering	78,359	112	35,618	76,410	2.20	0	No	In-House	0.98	106%	105%
Hillingdon	101,149	116		123,600			No	In-House	1.22	100%	105%

London (continued)

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Hounslow	86,071	56	57,381	49,500	1.50	3	No	In-House	0.58	105%	105%
Islington	76,166	15	21,762	170,823	3.50	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	2.24		92%
Kensington & Chelsea	42,021	12	No data								
Kingston-upon-Thames	55,296	37	38,135	67,500	1.45	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.22		
Richmond-upon-Thames	57,232	57	39,470	67,500	1.45	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	1.18		
Lambeth	88,952	27	No data								
Lewisham	91,635	35	36,654	110,500	2.50	0	No	Out-Sourced	1.21	117%	117%
Merton	61,228	38	30,614	97,000	2.00	0	Yes	In-House	1.58	102%	115%
Newham	120,822	36	30,206	230,000	4.00	0	No	In-House	1.90	132%	
Redbridge	101,073	56		106,849		0	Yes	In-House	1.06		97%
Southwark	94,012	29	No data								
Sutton	62,231	44	34,573	105,500	1.80	3	No	In-House	1.70		140%
Tower Hamlets (& City)	109,896	20		312,000				In-House	2.84		138%
Waltham Forest	92,237	39	34,806	60,000	2.65	2	No	Out-Sourced	0.65	62%	288%
Wandsworth	90,994	34	20,728	204,000	4.39	0	Yes	In-House	2.24		201%
Westminster	75,851	21	36,120	85,000	2.10	1	No	In-House	1.12	94%	202%

East Midlands

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop- 2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house outsourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19- 22
Derby	84,762	78	36,853	98,000	2.30	0	No	In-House	1.16	100%	105%
Derbyshire	208,634	2,547	40,122	185,256	5.20	0	No	In-House	0.89	75%	100%
Nottingham	137,687	75	No data								
Nottinghamshire	227,360	2,085	No data								
Leicester City	135,230	73	48,296	115,000	2.80	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	0.85	100%	100%
Leicestershire	203,647	2,083	69,742	182,000	2.92	4	Yes	In-House	0.89	175%	175%
Lincolnshire	207,082	5,937	36,979	215,618	5.60	0	No	In-House	1.04	121%	115%
Northamptonshire	225,187	2,364	25,706	327,401	8.76	0	No	In-House	1.45	114%	131%
Rutland	10,068	382	12,585	27,000	0.80	0	Yes	Out-Sourced	2.68	98%	100%

East of England

Local Authority	Pop 0-25 post 2022	Area KM2	FTE staff to Pop-2022	IAS total 2022	FTE 2022	Vols 2022	Joint Comm	In house out sourced	£ per head 2022	IAS % Diff 21-22	IAS % Diff 19-22
Bedford	53,551	476	No data								
Cambridgeshire	196,593	3,046	48,782	134,820	4.03	2	Yes	In-House	0.69	96%	126%
Central Bedfordshire	84,197	716	26,230	69,878	3.21	2	No	In-House	0.83	104%	106%
Essex	425,639	3,458	33,781	408,819	12.60	6	No	In-House	0.96	119%	170%
Hertfordshire	359,579	1,643		456,000			Yes	In-House	1.27	111%	229%
Luton	75,203	43	30,081	91,188	2.50	0	Yes	In-House	1.21		95%
Norfolk	243,755	5,384	45,140	191,760	5.40	0	Yes	In-House	0.79	102%	131%
Peterborough	66,191	343	26,476	70,452	2.50	0	Yes	In-House	1.06		140%
Southend-on-Sea	52,242	42	26,121		2.00	1	Yes	In-House			
Suffolk	202,688	3,800	30,710	286,225	6.60	0	Yes	In-House	1.41	110%	141%
Thurrock	57,910	164	No data								