

Final stage impact assessment

Title: Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill Impact Assessment

Type of measure: Primary Legislation

Department or agency: Department for Education

IA number: DfE-CWSB-01

RPC reference number: RPC-DfE-24016-IA (1)

Contact for enquiries: Legislation.division@education.gov.uk

Date: 30 January 2025

Contents

Final stage impact assessment	1
1. Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill Overview.....	3
1. Summary of proposal	3
2. Strategic case for proposed regulation.....	5
Part 1: Children’s Social Care – overall rationale for intervention.....	5
1A. Keeping families together and children safe	6
1B. Supporting children with care experience to thrive	8
1C. Making the care system child-centred	10
1D. Improving the children’s social care placement market and tackling profiteering	11
Part 2: Schools – overall rationale for intervention	13
2A. Removing barriers to opportunity in schools.....	14
2B. Creating a safer and higher-quality education for every child	15
2C. Driving high and rising standards for every child	16
3. SMART objectives for intervention.....	17
4. Options considered	26

2. Summary of the Bill's Impacts	29
5. Policies and key impacts	29
Methodology for analysis of impacts.....	29
Summary of impacts	31
6. Regulatory scorecard for the Bill	50
Part A: Overall and stakeholder impacts	50
Part B: Impacts on wider government priorities	58
7. Small and micro business impacts	59
8. Wider Impacts	60
3. Monitoring and Administrative/Compliance Costs	63
9. Monitoring and evaluation of preferred option	63
10. Minimising administrative and compliance costs for preferred option	66
Declaration	67

1. Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill Overview

1. Summary of proposal

1. The Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill (“CWSB”, or “the Bill”) will put children and their wellbeing at the centre of the education and children’s social care systems, and make changes so that every child has a fulfilling childhood enabling them to achieve and thrive.
2. The Bill will remove barriers to opportunity and raise school standards to ensure the school system is fair for every child, no matter their background and will deliver manifesto commitments on children’s social care to ensure that all children can thrive in safe, loving homes.
3. This Bill-level Impact Assessment summarises the impacts of the Bill’s measures, which are further analysed in Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document.
4. This first section outlines seven different groups of measures in the Bill. Each individual measure is also listed in Section 3, Table 1. This section also identifies the subset of Bill measures that are considered ‘Regulatory Provisions’ by the Better Regulation Framework, given their potential to directly impact businesses and other external organisations or groups. The remaining measures are not Regulatory Provisions because they regulate publicly-funded organisations only (mainly schools and local authorities), and/or do not have direct impacts on businesses.
5. The seven groups of measures in the Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill are as follows.
 - a. **Keeping families together and children safe.** The Bill includes measures that will help more families to stay together where this is in the child’s best interests by giving them the support they need, and measures to improve child protection and safeguarding practice to keep children safe. This includes: mandating local authorities to offer ‘Family Group Decision Making’; improving information sharing by enabling a single unique identifier (‘consistent identifier’), which aims to address a lack of joint working or information sharing between agencies involved in children’s safeguarding; strengthening the role of education in safeguarding; requiring multi-agency child protection teams; and ensuring children are employed safely.
 - b. **Supporting children with care experience to thrive.** The Bill includes measures that will enable children with experience of care (be it, currently in care, at risk of care, or care leavers) to thrive and have the best life chances. This includes: requiring local authorities to publish their local offer for children in kinship care and their carers; extending the virtual school head role to children in kinship care as well as those with a social worker; strengthening support for eligible care leavers through ‘Staying Close’; and requiring local authorities to publish information to ensure care leavers have a planned and supportive transition to adulthood.
 - c. **Making the care system child-centred.** The Bill includes measures that will support every child to have a loving, secure home. This includes: a statutory framework to enable children with complex needs and who need to be deprived of their liberty to be placed in community provision; empowering the regulator, Ofsted, to tackle breaches of the Care Standards Act 2000, including against unregistered children’s homes; limiting the use of agency social workers; and closing a legal gap around low-level abuse (ill treatment or wilful neglect) of children aged 16 and 17.

- d. **Improve the children’s social care placement market and tackle profiteering.** The Bill includes measures that will strengthen regulation so that children’s social care works in the best interests of all children. This includes: establishing a ‘Financial Oversight Regime’ to increase financial and corporate transparency of difficult-to-replace care providers and their corporate owners, as well as a ‘Provider Oversight Regime’; enabling the Secretary of State for Education to implement a cap on the profits of non-local authority providers of children’s social care in future, if other market intervention measures do not have the desired effect; and supporting the creation of ‘Regional Care Co-operatives’ to improve the forecasting and commissioning of placements. The Financial Oversight Regime, Provider Oversight Regime, and future profit capping powers are Regulatory Provisions, as they introduce regulations that directly impact businesses.
- e. **Removing barriers to opportunity in schools.** The Bill includes two measures that deliver manifesto commitments on free breakfast clubs and limiting the number of branded uniform items that schools can require. This is to support the government’s mission to break down barriers to opportunity by supporting children to arrive at school ready to learn.
- f. **Creating a safer and higher-quality education system for every child.** The Bill includes nine measures, some of which were originally introduced in the Schools Bill 2022¹: the duty for local authorities to have and maintain Children Not in School registers; changes to the regulation and inspection of independent education institutions; and improving investigation of serious teacher misconduct. These measures support the government’s commitment to raise school standards for every child by supporting attendance and quality education across all institutions. The Children Not in School, independent education institution (hereafter “independent schools”), and teacher misconduct measures are all Regulatory Provisions as they introduce regulations that directly impact businesses.
- g. **Driving high and rising standards for every child.** The Bill includes ten measures aimed at delivering high and rising school standards across the education system and make sure that parents, wherever they live, will have a good local school for their child, and can be confident they will achieve and thrive. Some measures deliver manifesto commitments on school admissions, national curriculum and qualified teacher status. Alongside these, further measures concern driving high and rising standards in all schools.
6. The measures identified to be Regulatory Provisions are those for which impacts have been analysed most extensively in accordance with the Better Regulation Framework guidance, and include the use of economic appraisals and methodologies in the Green Book guidance. The remaining measures still include an analysis of expected or estimated impacts, but that analysis is often more qualitative and does not apply the same appraisals as for Regulatory Provisions due to no impacts on businesses or such impacts being indirect.
7. This Bill-level Impact Assessment summarises the impacts across both sets of measures and the Bill as a whole, including aggregated quantifiable impacts of the Regulatory Provisions. Before doing so, it outlines the overall strategic case for government intervention at the Bill-level, above and across groups of measures, in the next section.

¹ Since the Schools Bill 2022, the measures have been updated. For example, changes to the Children Not in School measure include: a requirement for parents to seek LA consent before children are removed from school to be home educated if they are subject to certain conditions; a power whereby if a child is subject to a s47 Children Act enquiry or on a child protection plan and is already being home educated, the local authority will be able to require them to attend school; and amendments to the School Attendance Order process. Each is covered in more detail in the respective Measure-level Impact Assessment published alongside this document.

2. Strategic case for proposed regulation

8. There are various problems that necessitate government intervention through the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill. This section of the regulatory impact assessment sets out a summary of these problems – supported by evidence – why government intervention is necessary, and what could occur if the government does not intervene.
9. The structure of this section follows the layout of the Bill's two parts – Children's Social Care and Schools – and, within each part, the seven groups of measures identified in Section 1.
10. More detail on the problem each measure is aiming to address, evidence of problems, and rationales for intervention, is included in the Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document.

Part 1: Children's Social Care – overall rationale for intervention

11. Despite specific interventions across children's social care over a number of decades (for example, the introduction of Youth Offending Teams, Sure Start children's centres, and Every Child Matters), key reports and reviews have shown that the system is not delivering consistently good outcomes for the children, young people, and families it serves. Reviews, including the [Independent Review of Children's Social Care](#) and a number of reviews into child protection and safeguarding carried out by [the Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel](#) have shown that children have consistently poor outcomes, and that some services designed for children and young people are not consistently meeting their needs or offering value for money to the taxpayer.
12. The [Independent Review of Children's Social Care](#) (2022) assessed the needs, experiences and outcomes of children supported by care. The report's executive summary states that, "without a dramatic whole system reset, outcomes for children and families will remain stubbornly poor and by this time next decade there will be approaching 100,000 children in care (up from 80,000 today) and a flawed system will cost over £15 billion per year (up from £10 billion now)".² Furthermore, this is shown in the latest data where overall local government spending on looked after children has increased from £3.51 billion in 2012/13 to £8.17 billion in 2023/24.
13. Furthermore, the review cites multiple statistics in relation to the outcomes of children in care or children who have care experience, as set out on page 68, which evidence that despite increased spending children in need and children who enter care achieve significantly worse outcomes than those not in need or children who are not in care. For example "the lifetime outcomes of children in need (most of whom never enter care) are not dissimilar to children who enter care... in the year of exams, children in need were around 50% less likely to achieve a strong pass in their English and Maths GCSEs. Pupils who were in need at some point in the four years leading up to exams were 25-50% less likely to achieve a strong pass".³ During a parliamentary debate in the House of Commons, the cost of adverse outcomes from children's social care was quantified at £23 billion a year.⁴ This is derived from a report as part of the

² The report states that, "these costs approximate children's social care spend by local authorities. There is no agreed definition of children's social care spend, but the aggregate presented here includes all those children's and young people's services lines from the Section 251 return except: 3.4.5 Universal family support, 3.5.1 Universal services for young people, 3.0.1 Spend on individual Sure Start Children's Centres, 3.0.2 Spend for services delivered through Sure Start Children's Centres, 3.0.3 Spend on management costs relating to Sure Start Children's Centres, 3.0.4 Other spend on children under 5, and 3.6.1 Youth justice".

³ [Independent review of children's social care: final report - GOV.UK](#)

⁴ By Rachael Maskell, MP (York Central, Lab/Co-op) [Independent Review of Children's Social Care - Hansard - UK Parliament](#)

Independent Review entitled, '[Paying the Price: the social and financial costs of children's social care](#)', which provides the following tabular breakdown on page 16.

	Children who need a social worker (including children looked after, or 'in care') [<i>i.e.</i> , overall figure, children in need and in care]	Children looked after (or 'in care') [<i>i.e.</i> , one part of the overall figure, children in care only]
Wellbeing impact	£5.8 billion	£1.2 billion
Loss in productivity	£4 billion	£1.2 billion
Cost of public services	£12.5 billion	£6.2 billion
Other social costs	£1 billion	£260 million
Total	£23 billion	£9 billion

14. Investing in reform to children's social care should be considered a public good because it is investment will bring benefits to society as a whole and tackle escalating costs, including to those delivering children's services, such as local authorities (where local government spending on looked after children has increased from £3.5 billion in 2012/13 to £8.1 billion in 2023/24) Improving children's social care will also reduce downstream costs to healthcare and/or criminal justice which result from poor outcomes children in need and/or children in care experience (as outlined in the aforementioned Independent Review). This makes children's social care a 'merit good'⁵, because it is anticipated that reform to children's social care will also result in societal benefits, including better educational outcomes for children, as well as increased wellbeing and life satisfaction for children. Reform to children's social care is critical to giving hundreds of thousands of children and young people the start in life they deserve. 'Keeping Children Safe, Helping Families Thrive' was published in November 2024 and sets out plans to reform children's social care. The plans it sets out will ensure children can remain with their families where it is in children's interests to do so, support more children to live with kinship carers or in fostering families and fix the broken care market to tackle profiteering and put children's needs first. Within these plans for reform, some actions will require regulatory change which are detailed below in thematic areas. Overall, it is for these reasons that the department is intervening in children's social care in the following ways.

1A. Keeping families together and children safe

15. Broadly, this group of five measures seeks to keep families together where it is in the child's best interest, and to also take forward a number of proposals to improve child protection and safeguarding practice across the country. There is also an issue of information asymmetry, and families not necessarily being aware of support that can help them and their children's needs to be met; and that current information sharing and safeguarding arrangements are not working as efficiently as was originally intended.

16. **Evidence supports these broad problem statements.** They are explored and documented in the Independent Review of Children's Social Care (for example, respectively, section two 'a revolution in family help, from page 47, and section 3.4, 'information sharing – a five year challenge). Regarding safeguarding, the review draws on the Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel National Review to examine the circumstances leading up to the tragic deaths of Arthur Labinjo-Hughes and Star Hobson.

⁵ Goods or services whose consumption is believed to confer benefits on society as a whole greater than those reflected in consumers' own preferences for them. A good may be classed as a merit good if it causes positive externalities ([Oxford Reference](#))

- a. Regarding family support, for example, research by Pro Bono Economics and the Children's Charity Coalition has found that more local authority expenditure on children in care is being tilted towards later support and away from early intervention. They report, for example, that "in 2022/23, local authorities in England spent £2.4 billion on residential care placements, compared with £2.2 billion on all early intervention services that support families and help prevent children entering care." "There has been a drop of almost half (44%) of spending on early intervention services for families by councils." "The spending on late intervention services when families reach crisis point has reached record levels, increasing by £3.6 billion in 12 years (a 57% increase)."⁶
- b. Regarding safeguarding, for example, the [Child Protection in England National Review](#) reported that, "Despite the intentions of recent reforms (and most recently the Children and Social Work Act 2017), multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are not yet fit for purpose everywhere. This results too often in blurred strategic and operational responsibilities, creating fault lines in practice arrangements. This has major consequences for the ability of practitioners across different agencies to work together skilfully and purposively to protect children." (page 5)
- c. Ineffective multi-agency working is a key factor where child protection activity fails to keep children safe. Following a review of child protection practice in England, The Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel (CSPRP) recommended introducing multi-agency child protection units in every local authority area to address this.
- d. Regarding information sharing, for example, the same Child Protection National Review reported that "There needs to be much greater focus on creating the optimum conditions and environment for what is very complex and high-risk decision making. The perennial problems of sharing, seeking and using information about a child and a family persist. This must be tackled. We cannot afford to revisit these problems again and again; new approaches are required." (page 6). The [Independent Review of Children's Social Care](#) reported that, "Poor critical information exchange was present in 40% of the serious incident notifications in 2018/19 and has featured in high profile inquiries, including the inquiries into the deaths of Victoria Climbié and Peter Connelly (Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel, 2020). Information sharing is important not just because it protects children from significant harm, but because it also helps identify lower level needs more clearly so that children are provided with support (Crockett et al., 2013)."

Rationale for intervention:

17. The Independent Review reported that too often families enter care proceedings without a 'Family Group Decision-Making' (FGDM) meeting having taken place and opportunities may have been missed in identifying family network members who could act as a support system to the parents to promote the wellbeing of the child or be considered as alternative care givers if the need arose.
18. While we know that many local authorities (LAs) already deliver forms of meetings to consider kinship options at different stages, the number of such meetings held by LAs has been found to vary significantly. ranged from 5 to 800.⁷ Government intervention is therefore required to bring consistency to the FGDM approach, and to encourage a family-first culture. Without intervention and a national duty, we have no evidence or indication to believe that the significant variability in

⁶ [childrens-services-spending_2010-2023.pdf](#)

⁷ Cascade research (2022) - [CASCADE-Family-VOICE-survey-findings.pdf \(cascadewales.org\)](#). in a 2022 study⁷, 83% of the LAs that participated reported providing a Family Group Conferencing (FGC) service, representing 54% of all LAs in England

the number of FGDM meetings would change, and therefore regional inequalities in access to early intervention would be likely to persist, leading to ‘under-consumption’ of family support in some areas compared to others. Given the Independent Review found that children in care are overrepresented from disadvantaged areas and families experiencing poverty, there is a risk that areas with less early support are those that have the most children at risk of entering the care system, so we consider government intervention to address regional inequality as essential.

19. The sharing of data/information across services is a long-standing issue and has been well documented in many reports and serious case reviews over decades.⁸ Whilst the law permits information sharing for the purposes of safeguarding, this is often interpreted as the section 47 threshold of suspecting that a child is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm. This means that information sharing is inconsistent, which can make it difficult for practitioners across the health, social care, education and police sectors to understand how and when it is appropriate to exercise these freedoms.
20. Furthermore, while existing laws⁹ go some way in supporting current policy on multi-agency working in child protection, they fall short of legislating for it and instead, duties are currently placed directly on LAs. With no specified legislation directing multi-agency work, the existing policy position is reliant on statutory guidance and the goodwill of agencies other than the LA. Similarly, multiple expert reviews have found that current multi-agency safeguarding arrangements do not go far enough to ensure that education has an effective and proportionate role. Reports describe inconsistent communication between education settings and children’s social care, police, and health services, and a lack of strategic connections when making decisions. Government intervention is required to address these issues, including to make sure that crucial knowledge and insights of education settings are not missed from decision-making by safeguarding partnerships.

1B. Supporting children with care experience to thrive

21. Broadly, this group of four measures seeks to address that a greater proportion of children in need¹⁰, children in care (also known as looked-after children)¹¹ and care leavers experience poor outcomes across a range of metrics compared to children and adults not in these groups.
22. These measures therefore seek to remove barriers to opportunity for children in care and care leavers.
23. **Extensive evidence supports this problem statement.** The most recent statistical publication on [outcomes for children in need, including children looked after by local authorities in England](#), reported that, “children on a child protection plan and in each of the CIN social care groups at 31 March were half as likely to achieve the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics (combined) at Key Stage 2 compared to the overall pupil population” and “children in the key social care groups perform less well than their peers across all Key Stage 4 measures (with their overall average Attainment 8 score being broadly less than half of that of the overall pupil population)”. Furthermore, the [Children in Need Review](#), published in 2019, found that 1.6

⁸ E.g., Improving Multi-Agency Information Sharing (July 2023) and Children’s social care data and digital strategy (Dec 2023)

⁹ The Children Act 1989 and The Children Act 2004

¹⁰ A child in need is defined under the Children Act 1989 as a child who is unlikely to reach or maintain a satisfactory level of health or development, or their health or development will be significantly impaired without the provision of children’s social care services, or the child is disabled.

¹¹ Under the Children Act 1989, a child is looked-after by a local authority (a ‘child in care’) if he or she falls into one of the following: i. is provided with accommodation, for a continuous period of more than 24 hours [Children Act 1989, Section 20 and 21], ii. is subject to a care order [Children Act 1989, Part IV], iii. is subject to a placement order. Nb, all children in care are also children in need (but not all children in need are children in care).

million children needed a social worker between 2012/13 and 2017/18, equivalent to 1 in 10 children, and that these children have worse educational outcomes at every stage and poorer outcomes persist even after social care involvement has ended.

24. Furthermore, care leavers¹² face significant challenges when comparing core education and wellbeing metrics to those of non-care leavers. Thirty-eight percent of care leavers aged 19-21 were not in education, employment, or training (NEET) at the year ending March 2023¹³; care leavers experience higher rates of poor emotional health and well-being; over half become homeless during the two years following leaving care; and they are more likely than their peers to report feeling lonely or isolated.

Rationale for intervention

25. The market mechanism is not incentivising investment in, or allocation of resources to improve, better outcomes for children in need, in care and care leavers. This is likely to be because there is not monetary reward for doing so and due to their statutory duty to support these cohorts, local authorities have to purchase enough care placements (for which there is growing demand), and do not have, and/or are unable to exercise due to information asymmetries (i.e., not knowing the cost of neighbouring providers' provision and their outcomes), buyer power to balance against supplier power in driving better outcomes. Children's social care should be considered a public good because of the long-term benefits to society as a whole from children achieving good outcomes and becoming adults more likely to be in education, employment or training with greater productivity and improved life satisfaction. Therefore, first and foremost we will achieve better outcomes for children in need, care and care leavers, as well as achieving better value. In the absence of this being achieved through the market as it currently operates, government intervention should be considered.

26. Regarding children in need, much non-legislative support is already ongoing and while it is having a desired effect, to increase and accelerate its impact, there is a rationale for intervention legislatively. Virtual School Heads (VSHs) are strategic leaders who promote the educational outcomes of children with a social worker. The [Children in Need Review](#) recognised the crucial role that VSHs have in helping schools/education settings and local authorities work together to support the cohort of children and young people. This policy is already being delivered by local authorities on a *non-statutory basis* and is an effective and critical service to improving educational outcomes for children in need. From September 2024, the duties under this non-statutory function include children in kinship care, to broaden the support to more children in need. It is our assessment that continuing VSHs on a non-statutory basis only risks some local authorities deprioritising the role given current local authority budgetary and staffing pressures (which are well-documented in various published reports). This in turn would risk a postcode lottery of support for children, with different local authorities offering different levels of support dependent on local circumstances. We have seen that since the VSH role became statutory for looked-after children and previously looked-after children, that VSHs have the seniority within their local authorities to affect the outcomes of these children and young people. Intervention is therefore required to ensure VSH provision is statutory, to support outcomes of children in need. Failure to do so would risk the accessibility of, and disempowering the impact and seniority of, VSHs for this cohort of children.

27. Regarding care leavers, as outlined in [Staying Close guidance](#), "many care leavers report experiencing a 'cliff-edge' when they leave care and move into semi-independent accommodation or an independent tenancy. They report not feeling equipped to deal with the challenges of living independently and as a result, many care leavers get into debt and arrears

¹² The [Children's Commissioner website](#) includes helpful definitions of care leavers.

¹³ [Written questions and answers - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament](#)

and lose their tenancies. Also, many young people leaving care do not have strong support networks to help them with the transition to independent living. As a result, care leavers are particularly at risk of homelessness due to a lack of transitional and practical support, and a lack of suitable accommodation.” This is supported by some examples of evidence of relatively poor outcomes for this cohort, above. Failure to address these challenges in the short-term, when people become care leavers, leads to negative externalities of increased expenditure on healthcare, housing and, in some cases, the criminal justice system, costing the taxpayer more in the long-term, with an opportunity cost on other uses for this public expenditure. A publication by Pro Bono Economics reported that, “since 2010-11, real terms expenditure on the care system has increased by more than £2 billion, a rise of almost two-thirds (61%). Additional spending of almost £500 million in 2021-22 meant more than one-fifth (22%) of that increase occurred in 12 months alone. A 25% increase in the number of children in care in the last 12 years partially explains this, but a dramatic transformation in the kind of care that children receive has also played a significant role... With almost universal acceptance that the current system is failing, [there is] recognition that the system must be rebalanced away from cost-intensive late intervention services and towards earlier support for families and children.”¹⁴

28. The department currently operates a grant funding scheme known as Staying Close which began as a pilot in 2018 with 8 initiatives and has now expanded to 47 LAs. Staying Close is a model which provides an enhanced support package for young people leaving care from children’s homes and is designed to be a comparable offer to the option to Stay Put, which supports young people in foster care to remain with their former foster carers until age 21. Staying Close provides help to find and maintain accommodation, alongside a package of practical and emotional support, provided by someone who they know and trust. These bespoke packages of support help develop their confidence and skills for independent living, and for their emotional health and wellbeing. Evaluation of the initial 8 pilot sites concluded that the programme had a significant impact on increasing outcomes for care leavers including an increase in sustained tenancies, increased placement stability, a reduction of young people not in education, employment, or training (NEET), and a significant increase in health and wellbeing.¹⁵ While, as is the case for VSHs, we could continue to support this provision on a non-statutory basis, doing so would risk inconsistent provision and a postcode lottery of care leaver support. Furthermore, there can be a disconnect between LA housing and care leaver teams and while the department is aware of good practice, this is not consistent. We therefore deem it necessary to intervene in the provision of information for care leavers, in addition to Staying Close. This is to ensure each local authority includes the arrangements it has in place to support and assist care leavers in their transition to adulthood and independent living as part of that offer. Without this government intervention, there is a risk of continued variable access to, for example, information about different local authority’s arrangements for anticipating the future needs of care leavers in respect of accommodation and/or co-operation with local housing authorities in its area in assisting former relevant children aged under 25 to find and keep suitable accommodation,

1C. Making the care system child-centred

29. The four measures in this group aim to address system-wide problems affecting the quality of children’s social care, including issues facing the children’s placements regulator, Ofsted.
30. The first such problem is that currently where Ofsted has reasonable grounds to believe that there are systemic concerns in more than one children’s social care setting owned by the same provider group, they do not have powers to act at pace and scale to improve the quality of

¹⁴ [The well-worn path: Children's services spending 2010-11 to 2021-22 | Pro Bono Economics](#)

¹⁵ Evaluations are ongoing as of yet unpublished.

provision. Additionally, where a provider of children’s social care settings or agencies (e.g. children’s homes, fostering agencies) does not register with Ofsted – as they legally must – Ofsted only has the power to prosecute individuals, which is resource-intensive and a lengthy process. The second is that the use of agency social workers in children’s social care is increasing. The third is that current deprivation of liberty order (DOLO) placements do not have a clear legal framework, there would be no opportunity to develop clear and specific requirements for the provision, for example within Ofsted regulation, and a continued conflict of rights when children with and without deprivations of liberty orders are held in the same settings

31. **Evidence supports these problem statements.** Regarding unregistered settings, despite investigations finding an increase in the number of children placed in such settings,¹⁶ under the current system only one case has been brought to court for prosecution. Regarding agency workers, there were 7,200 agency social workers in post on 30 September 2023, the highest since the data series started in 2017 and representing an increase of 6.1% from 2022. Four in five agency social workers (80.1%) were covering vacancies in 2023.¹⁷ [‘The independent review of children’s social care: final report’](#) was published in May 2022 and described the engagement of agency social work resource as “costly and works against providing stable professional relationships for children and families.

Rationale for intervention

32. Government intervention is necessary to address the problems evidenced in the previous paragraph. Without intervention, there is no evidence to suggest that the trends in the increased placement of children in unregistered settings or the use of agency workers in children’s social care would reverse. Furthermore, there is no indication that existing placements of children in DOLO placements without a clear framework for care would cease. Intervention here is required to increase high-quality provision for looked after children with complex needs which maintain their links with the community and are a space for care and therapeutic input and reduce the usage of DOLOs, which were always intended to be used as a last resort rather than as a norm.

1D. Improving the children’s social care placement market and tackling profiteering

33. The four measures in this group seek to address the broad problem that the cost of placements for children in care have rapidly increased over recent years, outstripped demand, failed to deliver better outcomes and value for money, and are on an unsustainable trajectory without intervention.
34. **Extensive evidence strongly supports this problem statement.** Evidence has already been set out in paragraphs 12-14 and, given three of the measures in this group are Regulatory Provisions, is outlined extensively in Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document. This section does not therefore duplicate what is set out elsewhere.
35. In summary of the evidence, in England LA spending for children’s social care placements has increased 131% since 2012/13 (from £3.5 billion to £8.1 billion in 2023/24)¹⁸, far outstripping the 23% increase in CLA over the same period.¹⁹ Departmental concerns about this situation were

¹⁶ A recent investigation by the Observer newspaper and Together Trust found an increase of 277% of children placed in unlawful unregistered children’s homes between 2020 and 2023.

¹⁷ Children’s social work workforce, Reporting year 2023. Figures quoted are full-time equivalent (FTE) <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-s-social-work-workforce/2023>

¹⁸ [LA and school expenditure, Financial year 2023-24 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

¹⁹ As of 31st of March 2024, there were 83,630 Children Looked After (CLA) in England. This figure has risen steadily. By comparison, as of 31 March 2013, the number of CLA in England was 68,060.

supported by an independent review. A Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) study of the children's social care placements market highlighted: a lack of placements of the right kind, in the right places; materially higher prices and profits among the largest providers than the CMA would expect to see in a well-functioning market; and very high levels of debt among some of the largest private providers creating a risk of disruption to placements.²⁰ Regarding the second point, on profits being made, the Competition and Markets Authority have estimated the operating profit margins for large providers as 22.6% for children's homes; 19.4% for Independent Fostering Agencies and 35.5% for Supported Accommodation (between 2016 and 2020); and, according to the Local Government Association, in 2018/2019 there were 120 children in placements costing over £0.5 million every year, whereas by 2022/2023 the number of placements costing this amount had risen to 1,500. One reason for these issues is the structure of the market for children's social care provision; the children's homes market in particular is dominated by private providers with 83% of children's homes places provided by private companies.

Rationale for intervention

36. Government intervention is necessary to address the significant pressure on children's social care budgets. We know from the aforementioned evidence that the placement market is not functioning properly and costs to local authorities are rising unsustainably. In addition to the CMA's 2022 report, evidence from the Association of Directors of Children's Services²¹, the Local Government Association²², and Ofsted inspection, shows that children's social care budgets are under significant pressure, largely due to rapidly increasing placement costs for children in care. Without government intervention, it is unclear whether or how these issues would be addressed. As outlined above for 'evidence', given three of the measures in this group are Regulatory Provisions, further rationales for intervention for each measure in this group are outlined extensively in Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document and are therefore not duplicated here. The only measure that this does not apply to in this group is 'Regional Care Co-operatives' (RCCs), which are referred to as 'regional co-operation arrangements' in the legislation.
37. For RCCs, as outlined more extensively in '[Keeping children safe, helping families thrive](#)', and as supported by CMA evidence above, there is currently a gap in the data around the underlying costs of different types of children's social care provision. It is difficult to access the data that individual LAs hold on the prices paid for private placements and their cost breakdown, and there is often only piecemeal sharing of this data across some local authority groupings. These gaps create challenges for assessing whether prevailing price levels in the sector are appropriate. LAs need more shared cost information to inform their commissioning practices and enable them to negotiate effectively with providers to secure the best placement for children at the lowest possible cost. The CMA and the Independent Review of Children's Social Care both recommended a regional approach to planning and commissioning children's care places. In the department's view, it is sensible for central government to intervene to support this because playing a coordinating role above and across all LAs, while retaining local flexibility, can accelerate the adoption and efficiency of approaches taken by every LA to address these challenges. The department is already intervening in a non-statutory way by working with two RCC pathfinder areas in Greater Manchester and the South East to support the delivery of a regional approach to planning and commissioning children's social care places under current legislation. We will continue to support local authorities to increase the number of RCCs over time. However, as with Virtual School Heads and Staying Close above, we think it is important to mitigate the risk of regional or local inequality. Therefore, as a last resort, the proposed

²⁰ [Children's social care market study final report - GOV.UK](#)

²¹ [Safeguarding Pressures – ADCS](#)

²² [High-cost children's social care placements survey | Local Government Association](#)

legislation would give the Secretary of State the power to direct local authorities to establish regional co-operation arrangements.

Part 2: Schools – overall rationale for intervention

38. Education is a merit good because of the benefits to wider society from a more highly educated population, which has been found to increase productivity, earnings and satisfaction. It is therefore important to raise educational standards for all. Furthermore, pupils from some backgrounds have achieved relatively worse outcomes. The Institute for Fiscal Studies reported, “only 57% of children who are eligible for free school meals (FSM) are assessed as having a good level of development in meeting early learning goals, compared with 74% of children from better off households. These inequalities persist through primary school, into secondary school and beyond” (September 2022).
39. The cost of living and inflation is having an impact too. Evidence shows that over a third of low-income parents reported cutting back on food for their children due to financial pressures, and a notable increase in the number of households unable to afford basic items for their children due to rising inflation and stagnant wages.²³ Essential expenses of energy, food and housing represents a larger proportion of income for lower-income households. The National Foundation for Education Research (NFER) has also reported that “pupil mental health and wellbeing needs remain a significant concern for schools and a wide range of factors are likely to be contributing to this sustained increase in mental health needs among pupils... For example, financial pressures create additional stress for parents and cause families to cut back on essentials, including food and energy, which may lead to instability and uncertainty at home”.²⁴
40. The same NFER survey²⁴ found, “most senior leaders (84 per cent or more across all settings) agree or strongly agree that increases in the cost of living have driven an increase in the number of pupils requiring additional support and the level of their needs” and “schools report an increase in safeguarding concerns, behaviour incidents and pupil absence because of the increased cost of living, particularly in secondary schools and more disadvantaged schools”. These are examples of the evidenced problems that the government is seeking to intervene in to support all children and young people to thrive.
41. As well as barriers to opportunity, this Bill seeks to address problems concerning pupil absence, safeguarding, and independent educational institutions. Firstly, regarding pupil absence, departmental data on schools in England, for autumn and spring term 2023/24, show that in these terms the overall absence rate was 6.9%, a reduction from 7.3% in 2022/23 but higher than comparable pre-pandemic two term rates which were below 5%. It also reported that the rate of persistently absent pupils decreased from 21.2% in autumn and spring 2022/23 to 19.2% in autumn and spring 2023/24, but before the pandemic, in 2018/19, the persistent absence rate was 10.5%.²⁵ Secondly, regarding safeguarding local authorities have a duty to establish the identities of children in their area who are of compulsory school age, not registered at a school and are not receiving a suitable education. Parents are responsible for ensuring that their child is receiving a suitable education and can choose to do this by having their child attend a school “or otherwise” – for example, home education. However, currently parents do not need to notify their local authority that they are home educating, which can make it difficult for local authorities to fulfil their duty. Lastly, regarding independent educational institutions, there are c2450 registered independent schools. While the current regulatory approach works well for most independent schools, with a vast majority meeting the ISS at any given time (c.94%) and those

²³ [Cost of living crisis: Impact on schools - Full Report | NFER, ASK Research and the Nuffield Foundation](#), section 1

²⁴ [The ongoing impact of the cost-of-living crisis on schools - NFER](#) (page 6)

²⁵ [Pupil absence in schools in England, Autumn and spring term 2023/24 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

not meeting the ISS addressing issues swiftly; there are several problems with the existing regulatory regime of independent schools, making oversight to ensure pupil safety, wellbeing, and that pupils are receiving a safe and appropriate education, challenging. While these affect relatively few settings and children, the impact on each can be significant.

42. Lastly, evidence from inspections and outcome evidence shows that a majority of schools and pupils achieve good outcomes, but that there is a consistent proportion of schools and pupils that do not make expected progress across different school types. It is important to increase standards for all. As of the 2023/24 academic year, “while 43.5% of all schools were academies, over half of all pupils (56.2%) were attending an academy. This is due to higher proportions of secondary schools being academies than primary, with typically much higher numbers of pupils”.²⁶ To support high and rising standards for all, the government wants to ensure that pupils across all schools can benefit from best practice, for example by introducing a cutting-edge national curriculum, ensuring new teachers are qualified and updating our pay and conditions framework to give all teachers a core and guaranteed pay and conditions offer and allow all schools the flexibility to create an attractive pay offer to recruit and retain the best teachers.
43. Given the arguments for education as a merit good (defined above), and the desire to avoid negative externalities and longer-term costs on society of fewer young people or adults in education, training or employment, it is important for the government to support families and children experiencing these problems, to achieve benefits and avoid risks of longer-term costs from worsening educational outcomes. Overall, it is for these reasons that the department is intervening in schools in England in the following ways, summarised by three broad groups of measures.

2A. Removing barriers to opportunity in schools

44. The two measures in this group aim to solve the problem that rising food insecurity, the high cost of before-school childcare, and the cost of living are putting significant pressure on households and impacting children’s ability to achieve and thrive at school.
45. **These problems are supported by extensive evidence.** In the 2022/23 period, 17% of children lived in food-insecure households, a sharp increase from 12% in 2021/22.²⁷ Furthermore, 38% of state school teachers reported a noticeable increase in the number of pupils arriving at school hungry,²⁸ a trend closely linked to the ongoing cost-of-living crisis. In addition to this, an external report from 2020 found that where parents had to buy two or more uniform items from specific shops, the average cost of a primary school uniform was around 50% more expensive and, for secondary schools, where parents had to buy two or more items of uniform from a specific supplier, costs were on average £75 per year higher.²⁹
46. **Government intervention is necessary** to ensure breakfast clubs are available to all children so that every child can benefit from the opportunities that breakfast clubs offer, including being able to access a breakfast before school, to have the chance to socialise in a relaxed setting before lessons begin, helping to develop social skills and a sense of community, and enabling them to start the school day ready to learn and achieve their full potential. Breakfast clubs will also support parents with the cost of living by removing or reducing the cost of before school childcare, and by supporting them to work. In addition, government intervention is necessary to

²⁶ [Schools, pupils and their characteristics, Academic year 2023/24 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

²⁷ House of Commons Library (2024) [Who is experiencing food insecurity in the UK?](#)

²⁸ Sutton Trust (2022) [Cost of Living and Education](#)

²⁹ The Children’s Society Wrong Blazer report (2020)

enable children and parents to choose from a wider and less expensive range of uniform items, to avoid longer-term costs to society from children avoiding school or physical education.

47. There is no existing legislation that could be used to solve these problems. On breakfast clubs, there is a duty on LAs to ensure sufficient childcare for working parents or in education for children aged 0-14 (up to 18 for disabled children) and there are existing funded programmes such as the Holiday Activities and Food Programme, but there is limited capacity to achieve the former for all and the latter applies in school holidays only. Therefore, legislation is necessary to ensure breakfast club provision across primary schools in England. On school uniform, Section 551A of The Education Act 1996³⁰ creates a duty on the Secretary of State for Education (hereafter “Secretary of State”) to publish guidance on the cost of school uniform and requires schools to “have regard” to that guidance. Because it is open to schools to depart from statutory guidance with good reason, simply adding a limit on the number of branded items a school could require to the existing guidance would not meet our policy objectives. Legislating for a limit puts the requirement on the strongest possible footing.

2B. Creating a safer and higher-quality education for every child

48. The nine measures in this group aim to solve problems concerning children receiving a safe education.

49. **Extensive evidence supports this problem.** Local authorities are unable to identify all children in their areas who are not in school and not receiving a suitable education, limiting local authorities’ ability to take action to support these children. Data shows that elective home education (EHE) numbers have been increasing on an annual basis since data collection began in 2016 by the Association of Directors’ of Children’s Services (ADCS). The department took over the data collection from the ADCS in 2022. The department’s 2023/2024 EHE data publication shows that there were an estimated 92,000 children in EHE in England on the Autumn census day in October 2023, up from 80,900 the previous year.³¹ Most parents who home educate do so in their children’s best interests, and many home educated children receive a suitable education that supports them to thrive. However, increasingly, parents of children with complex needs are choosing to home educate and may not be well prepared or equipped to provide a suitable education. There are also concerns that rising numbers will mean a risk of more children being out of sight of safeguarding professionals and potentially at risk of harm. Between April 2022 and March 2023, the Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel (CSPRP) received 393 serious incident notifications and rapid reviews. A high proportion of school aged children who died or were seriously harmed were either not in school (11%) or reported to be regularly absent (29%).³² Intervention is therefore necessary to ensure children not in school are known to local authorities, which means, where necessary, action can be taken to safeguard and support these children.

50. Secondly, there are gaps in the current legislation which mean that not all teachers who have committed misconduct are subject to the Teaching Regulation Agency’s (TRA) regulatory regime. This means that some people who may be a threat to children’s wellbeing are permitted to, or not prevented from, working with children in an educational setting.

51. The third problem concerns independent educational institutions (hereafter “independent schools”). The problems are that, firstly, while the department already takes regulatory and

³⁰ As inserted by the Education (Guidance about Costs of School Uniforms) Act 2021.

³¹ [Elective home education, Academic year 2023/24 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#). Nb, local authorities are concerned that the numbers they have provided for the department’s EHE data collection are underestimates of the number of children not in school in their area as parents do not need to notify them that they are home educating.

³² [The Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel Annual Report 2022-23](#)

enforcement action against schools which fail to meet the Independent School Standards (ISS), in line with our published policy, at times the regulatory regime and enforcement action available to the department has proven to be disproportionate. Evidence of this is outlined in the independent education Measure-level Impact Assessment published alongside this document. Secondly, a small number of independent schools currently operate without inspection, regulation or oversight, meaning low assurance can be given that children who attend them are receiving a safe and/or high-quality education. Government intervention is therefore necessary to ensure there is assurance over the safety or quality of the education that is provided in these settings, and that regulatory action is proportionate, flexible and where appropriate gives institutions with problems an opportunity to resolve issues.

2C. Driving high and rising standards for every child

52. The ten measures in this group aim to solve the problems that local authorities do not always have levers to fulfil duties related to schools in their areas, and that children attending different types of school can experience differences in key areas of their education that drive high standards for all.
53. Three of the measures in this group concern school admissions and will give local authorities greater powers and influence to deliver their admissions and place planning duties. For example, local authorities have various statutory duties designed to ensure children of compulsory school age have access to suitable education but the powers and levers currently available to them to achieve this are not always effective, which can result in children being out of school for too long and have serious consequences. Government intervention is necessary so that local authorities are able to secure places for unplaced and vulnerable children more quickly and efficiently, in the event that the usual admissions processes fail to secure a place.
54. Furthermore, over 58% of pupils in state-funded education study in academies. Unlike maintained schools, academies are not required to teach the national curriculum, although they can choose to do so. Academy trusts have the freedom to set and deliver their own curriculum, although they are obliged to meet the curriculum requirements of section 78 of the Education Act 2002 – offering a “balanced and broadly based curriculum”. This leaves potential for inconsistencies in education standards, opportunities and outcomes for students across different types of state-funded schools. The government has committed to requiring all state schools to teach the national curriculum after the Curriculum and Assessment Review has concluded, we have considered its recommendations and reflected this in subject Programmes of Study.
55. Academies are also not required to follow the School Teacher Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD) when determining their pay and conditions offer for teachers, and although the majority do tend to follow it, not all do. The government is creating a floor on teacher pay in all state schools, and through the STPCD the government will ensure there is no ceiling, as is the case for academies, enabling healthy competition and innovation beyond a core framework to improve all schools. We will require academies, for the first time, to have regard to the rest of the terms and conditions in the STPCD, ensuring an established foundation for all schools, but giving confidence that existing or future changes which benefit teachers and pupils continue. Maintained schools will continue to follow the entire STPCD and they will see the benefit of further flexibilities that we will remit the School Teachers’ Review Body (STRB) to consider following Royal Assent.
56. Lastly, the government is committed to ensuring that new teachers entering the classroom have or are working towards Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Unqualified teacher rates are slightly higher in academies (3.6%) compared to LA maintained schools (2.5%) based on 2023 data.

Intervention is needed to ensure that new teachers in state schools in England are well trained and qualified and have an induction which supports their development.

3. SMART objectives for intervention

57. Following evidence of problems in Section 2, this section outlines SMART objectives from government intervention in attempting to address these problems.

58. Our overall, broad aims from legislative intervention in the form of the Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill are to lay primary legislation that will enable the department to:

- a. Deliver manifesto commitments to put children and their wellbeing at the centre of the children’s social care and education systems, and make changes so that every child has a fulfilling childhood enabling them to achieve and thrive.
- b. Remove barriers to opportunity and raise school standards to ensure the school system is fair for every child, no matter their background.

59. These broad aims are not time-bound as the date by which we can deliver primary legislation will be subject to parliamentary timetabling and procedure.

60. Specific objectives for each measure are summarised in Table 1, with more detail in Measure-level Impact Assessments which are published alongside this document. As is the case for our broad aims, the date by which these objectives can be delivered will depend on parliamentary timetabling and procedure which, for many measures requiring secondary legislation (see Section 5, Table 2), will in turn determine when statutory instruments can begin to be laid. We would be making too many estimates by making these objectives time bound now, but for all measures requiring secondary legislation to be implemented, we will include desired dates to achieve objectives by once impact assessments are updated going forward. For other measures only requiring primary legislation, we have made objectives time bound, although these dates are indicative due to the uncertainty and dependency on parliamentary procedure.

Table 1. Objectives of Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill measures

1A. Keeping families together and children safe.

	Measure³³	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
1	Family group decision making (FGDM)	Mandate LAs to offer FGDM. FGDM is an umbrella term to describe family-led meetings that allow a family network to come together and make a plan in response to concerns about a child’s safety and wellbeing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of families at pre-proceedings that receive the offer of FGDM – by mandating this consistent offer from LAs, we expect 67% families will accept the offer. • Increase the number of families with the opportunity to form a plan for the child and potentially avoid care proceedings.

³³ Where the description of a measure is slightly different in legislative terms in the Bill print, both its common name and legislative version (in brackets) are included.

	Measure³³	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
2	Strengthen the role of education in safeguarding in safeguarding ('inclusion of childcare and education agencies in local safeguarding arrangements')	Strengthen the role of education in local multi-agency safeguarding arrangements (MASAs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all education settings are named as relevant agencies by default so that they are automatically included in safeguarding arrangements in a local area, to bring about better join-up between children's social care, police, and health services with education. • Ensure all local safeguarding arrangements include educational representation at both operational and strategic decision-making levels, to improve understanding of the thresholds for referrals and intervention and the roles of each agency.
3	Multi-agency child protection teams (MACPTs)	Place a duty on safeguarding partners in England to establish one or more MACPTs for their area. MACPTs will consist of a prescribed membership including representation from the local authority, police, health and education. Other relevant agencies would be required to co-operate as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable dedicated skilled multi-agency front-line child protection practitioners from the local authority, police and health and other relevant agencies to work together in an integrated way to accurately and quickly identify actual or likely significant harm and take rapid and effective protective action.
4	Information Sharing and Single Unique ('Consistent') Identifier for children	Improve data sharing for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children across multi-agency services; and introduce a single unique identifier, known as a consistent identifier in legislation, to better support children and families.	<p>Following a pilot programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote timelier and more confident sharing of information to help identify and address risks to a child's safety and wellbeing and enable better provision of services to support their health and wellbeing. • Give professionals more relevant information on which to base their assessment of a child's needs and decisions regarding appropriate services to safeguard and promote the welfare if the child.
5	Employment of children	Give the Secretary of State the power to make regulations in relation to child employment in England which will replace a power which English local authorities have to make byelaws or similar. The measure also updates certain restrictions contained in the Children and Young People Act 1933.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modernise and standardise child employment restrictions to bring them in line with modern societal attitudes, technological advancements and changes to work that may become either suitable or unsuitable for children. • Remove Sunday employment restrictions, allow children to work for an hour before school and an extra hour in the evening*, require an employment permit. *Nb, the total number of hours permitted to be worked in a week will remain at 12 hours a week when a child is required in school.

1B Supporting children with care experience to thrive

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
6	Kinship local offer requirement ('information: children in kinship care and their carers')	Introduce a duty for local authorities to publish a kinship local offer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure 100% of local authorities have a clear and accessible published kinship local offer. • Increase awareness of support available to kinship carers and potential kinship carers.
7	Virtual school head (VSH) ('promoting educational achievement')	Make VSH statutory for all cohorts, to include kinship, and children on child in need plans and child protection plans which are not currently statutory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve educational achievements (including attainment and attendance) of children in need and child protection plans and those in kinship care. • Enhance collaboration between social care and education establishments for children with a social worker to improve education outcomes.
8	Staying Close ('provision of advice and other support')	Create a duty on local authorities to consider whether each former relevant child (up to age 25) in their area requires a package of support known as 'Staying Close support' and if their welfare requires it, provide that support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that when a young person leaves their care placement, and at any point upon review of their pathway plan, that all local authorities will consider whether Staying Close support may be suitable for that young person, depending on their needs and wider plans and aspirations.
9	Local offer for care leavers	Require each local authority to publish its internal processes and procedures to ensure, as far as possible, a planned and supportive transition between care and independent living for all eligible children, relevant children and former relevant children.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate and plan the sufficiency of care leaver accommodation. • Ensure that 100% of local authorities set out the offers available to care leavers. • Reduce the risk of care leaver homelessness, specifically in the early years of leaving care.

1C. Making the care system child-centred

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
10	Accommodation to deprive children of liberty	Provide a statutory framework to authorise the deprivation of liberty of children in provision other than a secure children's home, which will provide care and treatment and where restrictions that amount to deprivation of liberty can be imposed, if required to keep children safe. in connection with the care and treatment being provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly reduce the usage of deprivation of liberty orders, which should be used as a last resort rather than as a norm. • Create a framework of clear rights and safeguards for children subject to a deprivation of liberty order. • Increase high-quality provision for looked after children with complex needs which maintain their links with the community and are a space for care and therapeutic input.

	Measure²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
11	Ofsted powers for breaches of the Care Standards Act 2000, and linked regulations	Expand Ofsted powers for breaches of the Care Standards Act including in unregistered children's homes - by giving powers to Ofsted to impose monetary penalties to individuals who do not register their children's social care setting or agency, and to registered providers/provider groups that commit offences/do not comply with requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability to all services and settings delivering children's social care, in line with all legislation and standards. • Act as a deterrent to those who wish to set up and run children's social care settings or services without legal oversight. • Improve Ofsted's capacity to act proportionately and efficiently, by facilitating a middle step between no action and prosecution.
12	Children's social care agency workers	Introduce a regulation making power to govern the use of agency workers in local authority's children's social care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a more sustainable workforce in children's social care by creating the circumstances which allow English local authorities to invest more resource in developing and maintaining their permanent workforces. • Improve the stability and quality of the agency workforce and support workers to build quality relationships with children and families that can lead to better outcomes.
13	Legal protection for children aged 16 and 17 from ill-treatment or wilful neglect	Close a legal gap to make ill-treatment or wilful neglect of children aged 16 and 17 in children's social care settings a prosecutable offence. ³⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the prosecution of workers/providers of children's social care and youth detention accommodation involved in ill-treatment or wilful neglect against children of all ages.

1D. Improving the children's social care placement market and tackling profiteering

	Measure²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
14	Regional Care Cooperatives (RCCs) ('regional co-operation arrangements')	Regionalise the commissioning, analysis, and sufficiency practices of local authorities, by giving the Secretary of State the power to direct them to join together to establish regional commissioning arrangements, harnessing their collective buying power.	Support local authorities through RCCs': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing current and future requirements for looked after children's accommodation needs; • Developing and publishing strategies for meeting children's accommodation needs; • Commissioning accommodation for looked after children; • Recruiting and supporting local authority foster parents; • Developing, or facilitating the development of, new accommodation for looked after children.
15	Provider Oversight Regime: Children's Social Care (Regulatory Provision)	Establish a 'Provider Oversight Regime' to strengthen Ofsted's regulatory power of children's social care settings at a group level when quality issues have been identified in two or more individual settings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that Ofsted can take action to secure change in multiple settings where Ofsted have reasonable grounds to believe that there are systemic issues that relate to safeguarding and welfare concerns. • Improve quality of care in settings more quickly, without needing to rely on individual Ofsted inspections of settings.

³⁴ The current legislative framework only covers children under 16 and adults in social care who are over 18.

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
16	Financial Oversight Scheme: Children's Social Care (Regulatory Provision)	Establish a 'Financial Oversight Scheme' covering the largest and most 'difficult to replace' children's social care placement providers. The scheme will monitor risk of financial distress and failure and require contingency planning by providers to increase their accountability when managing company financial distress or market exit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guard against sudden or disorderly market exit of 'difficult to replace' providers due to financial failure. Support local authorities to meet their statutory duties to ensure there is sufficient provision in their area to meet the needs of children in their care and arrange care/support and accommodation that best meets the needs of the child.
17	Future children's social care profit cap (Regulatory Provision)	Introduce legislation that allows for a future cap on the profits of non-local authority Ofsted-registered providers of children's homes, supported accommodation and independent fostering agencies if we do not see a decrease in profiteering through other market intervention measures.	<p>If the profit cap is implemented in the future, the objectives would be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce excessive profit-making in the children's social care market. Reduce placement costs and provide better value for money for LAs, which will increase their financial sustainability.

2A. Removing barriers to opportunity in schools

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
18	Breakfast clubs	Introduce free breakfast clubs in all primary schools.	<p>Upon commencement of the clause, across all state-funded schools with primary aged children in England, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce the number of children starting their school day hungry; decrease the amount that families spend on food and before-school childcare; increase the accessibility of supervision before the start of the school day, giving parents greater flexibility to pursue employment opportunities and ensuring all children have access to the benefits of a soft and supportive start to the school day that sets them up ready to learn.
19	Uniform limit	Introduce a numerical limit on the number of branded uniform and PE items schools can require in their uniform policies. The limit will be 3 items, with secondary schools permitted an additional branded school tie.	<p>From AY 2026/27, across all state-funded schools in England, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce the number of compulsory branded items parents are required to buy. increase the proportion of generic items parents can purchase, allowing them greater choice to make the spending decisions which reflect their individual circumstances.

2B. Creating a safer and higher-quality education system for every child

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
20	Children Not in School Registers and associated safeguarding measures (Regulatory Provision)	<p>Introduce compulsory local authority (LA)-maintained Children Not in School registers. Also introduce a requirement for parents to seek consent to home educate if children are subject to a section 47 enquiry, on a Child Protection Plan, or are attending a special school maintained by a LA, special academy or non-maintained special school, or attending an independent special school which is named in their Education Health and Care (EHC) plan.</p> <p>Broaden the School Attendance Order process to require LAs to consider the home and any other learning environment when determining whether not children should be required to attend school.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable LAs to identify all children not in school in their areas. • Improve LAs' ability to take action where they identify children who are not receiving a safe, suitable education and/or are of wider safeguarding concern.
21	Independent schools: suspension powers (Regulatory Provision)	Grant a power to the Secretary of State to suspend registration for up to 12 weeks if a registered independent school is failing to meet the Independent School Standards ("ISS") and placing children at risk of significant harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable temporary suspension of independent schools that fail to comply with the ISS and put children at risk of harm, where the department could assure a Justice of the Peace that the threat to children's wellbeing was significant and immediate.³⁵
22	Independent schools: material change approvals (Regulatory Provision)	Make changes to the regime for independent schools to seek Secretary of State approval before making material changes (e.g. to the school capacity), to ensure continued compliance with the ISS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be able to impose a 'relevant restriction' (not only 'de-registration' of the school, as at present) on independent schools that make an unauthorised material change, to improve safeguarding. • Reduce the risk and use of unsafe school buildings by introducing a new requirement for independent schools to tell us about the use of "additional premises".
23	Independent schools: appeals against de-registration (Regulatory Provision)	Make changes to how an independent school may appeal against a decision to deregister.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reshape how the tribunal exercises its discretion on an appeal against a decision to deregister a school in some specific circumstances where schools have failed to meet the required standards for a long time. • Resolve appeals in these cases more quickly and close failing schools sooner.

³⁵ Our estimate is that we will consider using this power is 5 to 10 times per year across all c2450 registered independent schools.

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
24	Independent schools: suitability of proprietors (Regulatory Provision)	Expand existing Secretary of State powers, enabling a wider set of due diligence checks on a person seeking to run an independent school and to remove a previously approved proprietor whose behaviour or conduct has been found to be unsuitable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of independent school proprietors who are approved despite departmental concerns about their previous behaviour or track record to zero, from a small baseline at present (estimated at <5).
25	Independent schools: Inspectorate (Ofsted) powers (Regulatory Provision)	Extend enhanced powers to Ofsted to address the issue of non-cooperation by proprietors of settings believed to be operating as an unlawful, unregistered independent school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce to zero the number of section 97 inspections which are unable to reach a decision about whether a criminal offence is being committed (from roughly <10), by facilitating an entry into, and inspection of, a setting believed to be acting unlawfully and remove the deterrent for non-cooperation.
26	Independent schools: registration of full-time settings (Regulatory Provision)	Expand the definition of independent schools to require more settings to register and become subject to the requirement to meet the ISS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulate more independent educational institutions, which currently do not meet the legal definition of an “independent school”, because of the narrowness of their curriculum, and therefore operate without regulation. Place the definition of “full time education” on to a statutory basis to assist proprietors of educational settings with determining whether they need to register with the Secretary of State.
27	Independent schools: Ofsted Information Sharing	Make changes to the relationship between Ofsted and the Independent School Inspectorate (ISI) by permitting Ofsted to share information with ISI and changing the existing obligation on Ofsted to report annually on ISI's performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate improved, quicker joint working between the two approved inspectorates of independent schools.
28	Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime (Regulatory Provision)	Broaden the scope of the existing teacher misconduct regulatory regime to include more individuals and settings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the regime to explicitly capture anyone who has ever been ‘employed or engaged’ in teaching work, to permit more people to be subject to the Teaching Regulation Agency (“TRA”) for: i. referral, ii. investigation, and iii. prohibition. Cover misconduct in a wider range of settings, by bringing the following settings into regulation: Further Education colleges, 120+ Special Post 16 Institutions, c1300 Independent Training Providers (ITPs), and an online education setting. Allow departmental officials to make referrals to the TRA if relevant information is brought to their attention, where the misconduct is uncovered during their normal day to day duties.

2C. Driving high and rising standards for every child

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
29	School teachers' qualifications and induction	Ensure new teachers entering the classroom have, or are working towards, Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) ³⁶ , and an extension of statutory induction to academies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that new teachers employed in state funded primary and secondary settings in England have, or are working towards, QTS. • Once teachers achieve QTS, for teachers to undertake the statutory induction.
30	Curriculum	Introduce a requirement for academies to follow the national curriculum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the time the Curriculum and Assessment Review is complete and subsequent reforms are reflected in subject Programmes of Study, to require all academies to teach the national curriculum, ensuring a core, high-quality curriculum across all state-funded schools. • Provide assurance and transparency to parents, who will know the details of what their child should be taught, regardless of the school they attend.
31	Academy schools: educational provision for improving behaviour	Extends statutory power to academy schools through section 29A of the Education Act 2002 to direct pupils off-site to another location (such as another education setting) to improve their behaviour.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove ambiguity around an academy's power to use off-site direction and set a consistent standard of acceptable practice for directing pupils off-site between academy schools and maintained schools. • Ensure that pupils are treated fairly and consistently between academy schools and maintained schools when they are placed off-site to improve their behaviour.
32	Academies: power to secure performance of proprietor's duties etc	A power to direct academies which are not complying with legal duties or unreasonably exercising their legal powers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that academy trusts act in a way which complies with the law and is reasonable. • Increase the department's effectiveness as the principal regulator of academies.
33	Repeal of duty to make Academy order in relation to school causing concern	Conversion of the Secretary of State duty to issue an academy order to Inadequate maintained schools to a discretionary power, so the most appropriate intervention action is able to be taken for each school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the Secretary of State is better placed to take the most appropriate intervention action in each school's specific circumstances, which in many cases will still be to become a sponsored academy but might also be through a different intervention action or through providing targeted support to the school.

³⁶ Unqualified teachers will not require QTS to work in further education, 14–19 and 16-19 academies, university technical colleges, studio schools and non-maintained school early years settings.

	Measure²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
34	Teachers' Pay and Conditions in maintained schools and academies	Introduce a power for the Secretary of State to determine minimum levels of pay through secondary legislation for academy schools and alternative provision academies, and a duty requiring them to have regard to the rest of the terms and conditions in the STPCD. Following Royal Assent, we are making changes, through secondary legislation, to the STPCD to spread innovation and best practice in all schools. It is only after we have made these changes will academies be required to have regard to the rest of the STPCD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce a floor on teacher pay for all schools, and our subsequent reforms to the STPCD will ensure there is no ceiling for all schools to enable innovation beyond a core framework. This will provide a core pay offer for teachers, which is subject to scrutiny and consultation through the pay review process. • Recognise and encourage innovation and healthy competition in all schools to help them attract and retain the best teachers. • Move towards a core framework for all schools by requiring academies to have regard to the STPCD, but giving academies confidence that existing or future changes that benefit teachers and pupils can continue. • Committing to making changes to the STPCD to enable innovation and best practice to spread in all schools.
35	School admissions: duties to co-operate regarding admissions and place planning	Introduce new duties on schools and LAs to cooperate regarding their respective admissions' functions and for schools to cooperate with local authorities regarding their place planning functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster greater co-operation between local authorities and schools regarding admissions and place planning so that that the system functions more effectively, and both parties better work together to deliver their statutory responsibilities and help meet their local communities' needs. • Ensure that where co-operation breaks down or fails, the Secretary of State can intervene and seek to ensure that admissions and place planning functions can be fulfilled.
36	School admissions: local authority (LA) direction powers	Enable LAs to direct the admission of an individual child into an academy, as they can currently do for maintained schools. This will include powers for LAs to direct admissions for vulnerable children, including previously looked after children and other groups, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) (but without education, health and care plans) to reduce/prevent children being left without a suitable placement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that LAs have the necessary levers to fulfil their statutory duties of ensuring education for all children in their area, in a timely manner. • Rationalise and streamline existing direction processes, to ensure that school places for unplaced and vulnerable children are secured more quickly and efficiently.

	Measure ²²	Description of preferred way forward, to:	Objective(s), to:
37	School admissions: Published admission numbers (PANs) and objections to the Schools Adjudicator	Introduce a power for the Schools Adjudicator to determine school admission numbers as a result of upholding an objection or referral.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support a change we intend to make in regulations to extend local authorities (LAs)’ ability to object to the Adjudicator about PANs set by other admission authorities. This will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support all LAs to fulfil their statutory duty to secure sufficient school places in their area, where there is a capacity issue; ○ Support all LAs experiencing issues around surplus capacity to better manage this, and decrease the pressure it puts on school finances and, in the worst case, school failure. • Provide greater clarity, transparency and an independent arbiter to resolve disputes. Make clear to all parties the PAN that must be determined where an objection is upheld, to reduce bureaucracy and ensure that changes are made quickly.
38	Opening new schools	Change the legal framework that local authorities (LAs) follow when they have identified the need for a new school; removing the requirement that when a new school is needed a LA should first seek proposals to establish an academy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support 100% of LAs to better fulfil their statutory responsibility to secure sufficient school places, and help ensure new schools are opened in the right place at the right time by the provider with the best offer for local children and families.

4. Options considered

61. This section of the Bill-level Impact Assessment presents a summary of the types of options that were considered to solve the problems evidenced in Section 2 and achieve the SMART objectives identified in Section 3. Further detail about alternative options for each measure and their appraisals are included in Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document.

62. Given this is an Impact Assessment for the Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill, it follows that for all measures included in this Impact Assessment, we ultimately concluded that, on balance, primary legislation is the preferred option to deliver the policy objectives.

63. However, for a number of areas that do not appear in the Bill, primary legislation was considered as an option but this was deemed unnecessary to achieve our objectives, and/or costs would have outweighed benefits, at this time. One such example is that further intervention was considered to support children in care, in the form of the Children’s Social Care National Framework. On balance, the department did not think it was right to legislate for the National Framework at this stage, through this Bill (e.g., through a “have regard to” requirement in primary legislation now), because we are working with local authorities to implement the statutory guidance following a year-long implementation period which ended in December 2024. Instead, as set out in the recent [Keeping Children Safe, Helping Families to Thrive](#) policy paper, the department will prioritise investment in supporting outcomes the Framework sets out and continue to support local authorities through partnership working to improve how they deliver

children's social care through our improvement and intervention work. This will require investment but not further primary legislation and is therefore not covered in the Bill.

64. Across all Bill measures we considered the following options:

- a. Do nothing (retain the status quo)
- b. Improve or increase communications, including of guidance
- c. Strengthen non-statutory guidance
- d. Increase funding
- e. Establish grant funding conditions
- f. Amend statutory guidance
- g. Amend academy trust funding agreements
- h. Primary legislation

65. We considered a 'do nothing' option for most measures, notwithstanding where retaining the status quo would not deliver a direct manifesto commitment (for example the school uniform limit) or risk a manifesto commitment being delivered inconsistently without legal requirements (for example ensuring breakfast clubs in every primary school). We also ruled out 'do nothing' options for measures considered critical to protecting the safety of children which required updates to the legislative framework.

66. In some cases, initiatives are already ongoing on a non-statutory basis and we considered an option to build on the status quo by supporting, or increasing support for, existing non-statutory provision. For example, we considered supporting local authorities to make provisions for VSHs to support children in need and those in kinship arrangements on a non-statutory basis. However, where we deemed that the risk of not intervening in the problems outlined in section 2 were too costly and outweighed by benefits of attempting to intervene, in this example's case to improve outcomes for children in need, we ruled such options out. As another example, we considered broadening the pilot of Staying Close sites in different areas of England on a non-statutory basis. However, our assessment was that while this option would allow for a further expansion of the service to care leavers nationally, it would not allow for it to become a requirement of all LAs to offer to the programme and therefore there could be a risk of gaps in provision that a statutory duty would prevent.

67. We did not consider options beyond 'do nothing' or 'primary legislation' for a small subset of measures in the group of measures titled, '2C. Driving high and rising standards for every child', specifically on school intervention and opening new schools. This is because these matters are highly technical such that other options or variations of a legislative option simply were not realistically available. Furthermore, whilst we considered alternative options for the measure 'conferring a power on the Secretary of State to make child employment regulations'. This is an example where alternative options (e.g. guidance, or 'doing nothing') were quickly ruled out from not meeting our policy aims because the existing legislation from 1933 which was since superseded by European Union legislation now has to be updated domestically.

68. Notwithstanding these points in paragraph 66, for a vast majority of measures we explored at least three options. This typically included primary legislation in a different way to the way we concluded as our preferred option. Our preferred options are those identified in column 3 of Table 1, Section 3, which were arrived at following option appraisals and cost-benefit analysis. As above, further detail about alternative options and appraisals are included in Measure-level Impact Assessments.

69. In summary, common reasons not to pursue alternative options across Bill measures include: i. other primary legislative options not going far enough to meet SMART objectives to resolve

problems (e.g., multi-agency child protection teams), ii. other ways to legislate being likely to result in disproportionate impacts (e.g., provider oversight), iii. estimated unintended consequences (e.g., profit cap), iv. high complexity, v. disproportionate burdens on LAs or other bodies e.g., courts (family group decision making), vi. avoiding duplicating existing statutory guidance , vii. providing less central control than needed to achieve desired outcomes (e.g., Staying Close).

2. Summary of the Bill's Impacts

5. Policies and key impacts

70. Having outlined a summary of problems and rationales for intervention in Section 2, a description of the preferred way forward and objectives of intervention in Section 3, and options considered in Section 4, this section of the Bill-level Impact Assessment summarises impacts (benefits and costs) of the preferred way forward for each of the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill's measures. This is presented in Table 2, below, following an explanation of the methodology we adopted for this analysis of impacts.

Methodology for analysis of impacts

71. As outlined in Sections 1 and 3, eleven measures are Regulatory Provisions (listed again below, 'a' to 'f'). For the eleven Regulatory Provisions, as per the Better Regulation Framework guidance, we have presented the Net Present Value (NPV), Equivalent Annual Net Direct Costs on Business (EANDCB), and Equivalent Annual Net Direct Costs on Households (EANDCH). This is shown for each measure in Table 2, and precedes an aggregate Bill-level regulatory scorecard for Regulatory Provisions in Section 6. Further detail and analysis of impacts is provided in each Measure-level Impact Assessments published alongside this document.

- a. **Children's social care (CSC) Financial Oversight Scheme.** This measure directly impacts private and voluntary CSC providers.
- b. **CSC Provider Oversight Regime.** This measure directly impacts private and voluntary CSC providers.
- c. **CSC Profit Cap.** This measure directly impacts providers by tackling profiteering in the children's placements market.
- d. **Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime.** This measure directly impacts a wide range of settings, some of which are private providers (a full list is provided in page 54).
- e. **Children Not in School.** This measure directly impacts out-of-school education providers.
- f. **Strengthening regulation of independent education institutions:** All of the following measures directly impact independent education providers.
 - i. Power of suspension
 - ii. Material change approvals
 - iii. Appeals against de-registration
 - iv. Suitability of proprietors
 - v. Inspectorate (Ofsted) powers
 - vi. Registration of full-time settings

72. The remaining twenty-seven measures are not Regulatory Provisions. These measures either do not directly impact business activities (breakfast clubs and the uniform limit), or only impact public sector organisations and not businesses; in some cases only schools (e.g., national curriculum), in others local authorities too (e.g., admissions, agency workers). The Better Regulation Framework (BRF) guidance is clear that, "...the scope of the BRF is regulatory measures which impact on business, and so measures which only affect households are likely to be out of scope [of the BRF]". We have therefore not included an NSPV, EANDCB or EANDCH (*descriptions for acronyms in paragraph 70*) for these measures.

73. While these measures are out of scope of the BRF, the Guide to Making Legislation requests of all Bill measures, "the likely costs and benefits and the associated risks of a proposal that might have an impact on the public, a private or civil society organisation, the environment and wider

society over the long term”.³⁷ We have therefore provided descriptions of expected impacts on businesses and households where possible, although these are more so qualitative in comparison to the analysis of impacts of Regulatory Provisions. These are also summarised in Table 2, below, and more information is provided in Measure-level Impact Assessments.

74. Across both groups of measures, as per the general exemptions in the BRF guidance, this document does not detail impacts related to taxes, duties or levies, i.e., from the cost of measures in terms of total public expenditure. These are instead outlined in the Explanatory Notes ‘Financial Implications’ section and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government New Burdens Assessments process where there are cost impacts on local authorities (this document does also note where this is likely to be the case throughout Table 2).
75. A majority of measures in the Bill require secondary legislation (20/38). This includes all eleven Regulatory Provisions. This subset of twenty measures can be thought of in three ways: i. while secondary legislation is required to help to operationalise the policy, the impacts that have been identified on businesses and other organisations derive entirely from primary legislation (i.e., while secondary legislation will be laid, the impacts could materialise without it); ii. measures where impacts are *wholly* dependent on secondary legislation before businesses and/or other organisations are affected (i.e., impacts will remain purely theoretical until secondary legislation is laid), iii. measures where impacts are *partially* dependent on secondary legislation before businesses and/or other organisations are affected (i.e., the size/extent of the impact(s) will be dependent on secondary legislation being laid).
76. The second and fourth columns of Table 2 (next page) identify, for each measure, which impacts derive from primary and/or secondary legislation (information about primary/secondary legislation is italicised). In the next section, Section 6, the split of the NPV and EANDCB/Hs attributable to primary and secondary legislation is shown. Beyond this Impact Assessment, as a next step, in accordance with BRF guidance, for each measure requiring primary and secondary legislation, we will keep under review where the assessment of impacts “evolve and develop as the requirements of both pieces of legislation are finalised and the underlying information and modelling is refined”, and assess whether “appropriate IAs may be necessary for both primary and secondary legislation”. Where necessary, we will produce or revise impact assessments to reflect changes to impacts once secondary legislation is further developed.

³⁷ As outlined in Section 8. For environment impacts we have also carried out Environment Principles Assessments.

Summary of impacts

Table 2. Expected Impacts of Children’s Wellbeing and Schools Bill measures

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
1	<p>Family group decision making (FGDM)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive impact on children on the edge of care (e.g. children with a Child Protection Plan, children with a Child in Need plan) – through likely increased support from the wider family network • benefits for parents who can draw on the support of their network to help meet the needs of their children • positive impact on children for whom it is no longer possible to stay with their parents - during the FGDM meeting, potential alternative carers from within the family network that could provide a home for the child could be identified • any reduction in care proceedings should alleviate some pressure on the courts and bring Public Law Outline closer to the recommended 26 weeks target, reducing the backlog of cases in family courts <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a new burden for LAs in the short-term to set up or expand FGDM services and update systems - the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet these duties (and we expect a positive impact on LAs in the long-term) • increased social worker workload as it would involve more family work throughout the process and an additional mandated offer of FGDM at pre-proceedings, however although more work is required at the pre-proceedings stage, if the FGDM measure is successful (as suggested by the Foundations evidence), in the longer term there will be fewer looked after children 	<p>Evidence from Foundations (What Works Centre for Children and Families) suggests the mandated offer of FGDM from the LA will see an estimated 67% families engaging in FGDM.</p> <p>-</p>

³⁸ This is quantitative where available. Where measures are Regulatory Provisions, this column includes the NPV, EANDCB, and EANDCH (descriptions for acronyms are in paragraph 70 of the main body). Where measures are Non-Regulatory Provisions, this column includes facts and figures that support the benefit/cost impacts. All calculated NPV and EANDCB/H figures use financial year 2024/25 as the base and price year, and cover a 10-year appraisal period.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
2	<p>Strengthen the role of education in safeguarding (inclusion of childcare and education agencies in local safeguarding arrangements)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more effective safeguarding system for professionals and children and families • positive impact on safeguarding partners because stronger involvement of education will mean a more effective system, enabling better decision making <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible costs and time implications on LAs to set up new infrastructure, depending on how well involved and represented they are already - the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet these duties • time implications on some education leaders to engage with systems that they may not have previously been involved in to ensure their inclusion, which is part of their responsibilities to safeguard the children in their settings 	<p>-</p> <p><i>All benefits and costs could be applicable to more safeguarding partners in future, due to secondary legislation which provides a power for the Secretary of State to make regulations designating additional childcare or education relevant agencies.</i></p>
3	<p>Multi-agency child protection teams (MACPTs)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive effect on multi-agency child protection assessment, decision-making and service provision to improve the outcomes of children where there is a likelihood of or actual significant harm • more control for LAs in meeting their child protection duties and sharing the balance of responsibility across a wider partnership approach <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a potential new burden for LAs and other local partners – local authorities, police and health already have safeguarding duties, including for child protection. New duties may increase resource requirements, and the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet these duties 	<p>-</p> <p><i>Benefits and costs depend on secondary legislation, which include regulations about how MACPTs will operate, therefore enabling the impacts, e.g., powers in relation to the support provided by MACPTs and requirements for members of MACPTs.</i></p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
4	<p>Information Sharing Duty and Single Unique Identifier for children (Information Sharing and Consistent Identifiers)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> greater consistency from a single clear legal basis on which to share information for the purposes of safeguarding or promoting the welfare of children strengthened information sharing practices that are more accurate, cost effective, and support more seamless and collaborative working between agencies with a duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> likely behavioural change for professionals in routine contact with children across health, education and justice likely impact on operational activities and resource in agencies and, for departments in routine contact with children, their operational activities will also change 	<p>-</p> <p><i>For the consistent identifier only (i.e., not the information sharing duty), estimated impacts would entirely follow secondary legislation – which includes a power to specify the description of the consistent identifier and persons required to use it – and assume that changes are implemented successfully across all relevant agencies and that the information sharing duty is being met.</i></p>
5	<p>Confer a power on the Secretary of State to make regulations in relation to child employment and other changes to the regulation of child employment in England.</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removal of the current restriction on Sunday working which could be a possible savings for sectors that currently get permits for multiple children to work on a Sunday to cover their needs allow children to work for an hour before school and for an hour later in the evening which could allow more children and young people to be able to work subject to detailed legislation and regulations; and balanced with a child's right to education, their desires to take up hobbies, pursue interests and to be a child <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> resource implications from our expectation that public sector organisations will want to update any advice or guidance they already have on child employment 	<p>-</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation will ensure that children are not exploited by employers, but detailed guidance and restrictions on the types of employment will be set out in regulations as well as on the face of the bill. The regulations will deal with the technical implementation of the policy.</i></p>
6	<p>Kinship local offer requirement</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> likely positive impact on current kinship carers and those considering taking on the role, through improved understanding and awareness of what becoming a kinship carer may entail enhance the well-being and stability of children who cannot live with their birth parents <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local authority time, however we think it is a low impact as a similar requirement has been set out in statutory guidance since 2011 	<p>-</p> <p>-</p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
7	<p>Virtual School Heads (VSH) (‘promoting educational achievement’)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more holistic approach to the child’s wellbeing, combining education and social care support • kinship carers will have better access to, and understanding of educational resources and support available, helping them to provide a stable and supportive environment for the children in their care <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet duties 	<p>The department has paid grant funding of £16.6 million per year to enable LAs to meet their non-statutory duty towards children with a social worker since the role came into effect in 2021, and a further £3.8 million since September 2024.</p> <p>-</p>
8	<p>Staying Close (‘provision of advice and other support’)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better supported transition to adulthood for care leavers • improved outcomes in accommodation stability, wellbeing, education, employment and training, strong relationships, networks and independent living skills • decreased cost pressure on wider public services e.g. save LAs funding on crisis housing <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new burden for LAs, by requiring ongoing funding to pay for advisers to support care leavers - the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet these duties 	<p>Evidence from pilot sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suffolk has seen 90% sustained tenancies/increased placement stability /prevention of homelessness. - NE Lincs has seen 80%; North Tyneside has seen a 55% reduction of NEET. - Portsmouth found that most 71%, care leavers involved with Staying Close were in EET, compared with 52% of care leavers nationally. - NE Lincs has seen a 76% increase in health and well-being.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
9	<p>Local offer for care leavers</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reducing the 'cliff edge' of support for care leavers turning age 18 to better support them <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAs should have these offers in place already; the firming up of these expectations will only significantly impact those who do not as they will need to create those offers and plans possible additional governance but this should be manageable within current arrangements <p>We do not believe there will be an impact on housing providers. Care leavers will continue, as they do now, to source accommodation from what is available in the local areas, through a variety of ways: via the LA (social housing or specialist housing), housing associations, and private landlords (we do not hold data on this). This measure will not change any forms of tenancy agreements.</p>	<p>More evidence is in the Measure-level IA, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The latest Children Looked After in England data for 2022-23 showed that 38% of care leavers aged 19-21 are Not in Education, Employment and Training, compared to 13% of young people in the general population; only 6% are in higher education and only 2% are on apprenticeships compared to 47% in HE based on all other pupils. Research has shown that care leavers are over-represented in the adult prison population and in homelessness / rough sleeping data. They are also more likely to experience loneliness and poor emotional health and well-being.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
10	<p>Accommodation to deprive children of liberty</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better support for children with multiple, complex needs, recognised to be a response to complex and ongoing trauma • placements better suited to children's needs and that maintain their community ties, which will deliver better outcomes for these children • parents and guardians of children will benefit from a clearer, statutory, system • impacts on children's home providers are expected to be positive. In Secure Children's Homes, we expect waiting lists may decrease due to the creation and expansion of other registered provision where children can be legally deprived of their liberty. In Open Children's Homes, the complex legal situation of the current approach of placing a child under a DOLO will lessen. More information is provided in the measure-level IA <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usage of unregistered provision will decrease. As unregistered placements are operating unlawfully, we believe this to be justifiable and beneficial to children's outcomes 	<p>A survey of councils by the Local Government Association³⁹ showed that the number of children's social care placements costing £10,000 or more per week has risen in from approximately 120 placements in 2018/19 to over 1,500 in 2022/23. The highest cost placement was £63,000 a week and for most councils the highest cost is between £9,600 and £32,500.</p> <p><i>The clause includes a regulation making power to extend existing powers to more 'relevant accommodation', so some of the same impacts in column 3 will apply to different types of accommodation after/if this is exercised.</i></p>
11	<p>Ofsted powers for breaches of the Care Standards Act and linked Regulations</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ofsted will have greater powers to act swiftly for breaches of the law, and can ensure the quality of services and suitability of those delivering services • Ofsted will have a greater deterrent against the provision of unregistered settings, increasing the oversight and quality of care children and young people receive <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some stakeholders have suggested that action against unregistered providers would result in increased prices (i.e. from increasing prices because of the threat of fine), or them leaving the market (and pushing up prices of registered places), however this practice is unlawful and should not be happening 	<p>-</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary and secondary legislation, to set out the framework for the issuing of civil (monetary) penalties.</i></p>

³⁹ High-cost children's social care placements survey | Local Government Association

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
12	<p>Children’s social care agency workers</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction in the spend on temporary workforce, reduces the ‘agency premium’ paid by LAs, allowing re-investment in permanent workforce some workers likely to move from temporary work into permanent LA employment; those who wish to continue to work via an employment business can still do so <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAs may have reduced pool of workers for CSC, if agency workers choose to leave the workforce rather than move to permanent employment 	<p>Research by Kantar published in 2020 on behalf of the department estimated the ‘agency premium’ – the additional cost of employing an agency social worker – as approximately 53% of the average social worker salary.</p> <p><i>The clause includes a power to make regulations in respect of individuals who are agency workers, which is a key step before impacts on their reduced use materialise.</i></p>
13	<p>Legal protection for children aged 16 and 17 from ill-treatment or wilful neglect</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> positive impact on children aged 16 or 17 who will have additional legal protection from low level abuse (ill treatment or wilful neglect) <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible perception by workers of being at increased risk of criminalisation, however legal protections for 16-17-year-olds against ill treatment or wilful neglect outweighs this cost 	<p>- Under section 20 of the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015, an offence involving “social care” can only be applied where the victim is 18 years or older. In respect of children under 18, sections 20 and 21 can only be applied for persons where “health care” is being provided.</p> <p>- The Children and Young Persons Act 1933 protects against cruelty to all children under 16, including wilful assault, ill-treatment (whether physically or otherwise) and neglect by persons 16 years or older.</p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
14	<p>Regional Care Cooperatives (RCCs) ('regional co-operation arrangements')</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced LA spending on accommodation for looked after children, through harnessing LAs' collective buying power, achieving efficiencies and economies of scale Increased sufficiency of placements, contributing to better outcomes for children (being placed closer to home, reduced placement breakdown) Develop expertise in areas such as data analysis and forecasting, as well as targeted marketing, training, and support for foster carers, allowing greater innovation so that local areas are better able to deliver services for children in care <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial set-up costs. Where the Secretary of State has directed local authorities to set up an RCC, the department would expect to fund these costs²² Ongoing running costs of RCCs: since RCCs will be carrying out existing local authority functions on behalf of the local authorities in its region, we expect those local authorities collectively will meet the RCC running costs 	<p>Initial costs to set up an RCC have been estimated at approximately £1.5m per region.</p> <p><i>Regulations include a power to add to the strategic accommodation functions that can be exercised by two or more local authorities in regional co-operation arrangements. More or fewer functions would affect the size of impacts identified in column 3.</i></p>
15	<p>Children's social care Provider Oversight Regime (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> help to identify systemic issues across provider groups, as well as driving improvement in settings and agencies contribute to high-quality placements for looked after children, which will support positive wellbeing and educational outcomes <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> direct costs to providers for familiarising themselves with the regime requirements direct compliance costs to providers (e.g. time and resource to supply information to Ofsted and resolve issues) administration costs to Ofsted for scheme operation 	<p>NPV: -£1.1m⁴⁰ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.07m</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁴¹</p> <p><i>As outlined in the measure-level impact assessment; these impacts will derive from secondary legislation, with no impacts from Primary Legislation.</i></p>

⁴⁰ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁴¹ No household costs and benefits identified/ calculated.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
16	<p>Financial Oversight Scheme: Children's Social Care (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prevent disruption and instability to children's placements, which can lead to poorer wellbeing and educational outcomes avoid costs to LAs from having to secure emergency placements in the event of sudden provider failure <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> direct costs to providers from familiarising themselves with the scheme's requirements direct compliance costs for participating businesses (e.g. administration costs, fee for IBR) administration costs to the department for scheme operation 	<p>NPV: -£5.1m⁴² (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.6m</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁴³</p> <p><i>The clause includes a power to prescribe in regulations a set of conditions which, if met, may subject a registered provider of children's homes or independent fostering agencies, or their corporate owners, to the Financial Oversight Scheme. Therefore, impacts derive from secondary legislation, following the primary legislation.</i></p>
17	<p>Future children's social care profit cap (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if enacted in future, expected estimates are set out in the measure-level impact assessment in Annex B; in summary, we might expect that as profit margins are limited, the quality of provision would increase and/or the costs to LAs would reduce <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the level at which the profit cap would be set, and therefore its impact, would be determined at a later date in regulations. This will depend on a number of factors, including the level of profiteering at the time 	<p>-</p> <p><i>There will not be any immediate impact from primary legislation. Any impact on providers would only be felt by enacting the cap through secondary legislation. This will be a last resort if profiteering is not reduced by the other market intervention measures.</i></p>

⁴² This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁴³ No household costs and benefits identified/ calculated.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
18	<p>Breakfast clubs</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation which affect the impacts in column 3. (Nb, the measure does include a requirement for schools to have regard to statutory guidance and a power to designate a school as one to which the duty does not apply, but both have no parliamentary procedure).</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve children's opportunities to achieve at school reduce the financial burden on families by lowering the cost of food and before-school childcare⁴⁴ improve pupils' wellbeing help increase household incomes and support more parents in entering or staying in the workforce, by allowing parents greater flexibility to seek employment or increase their working hours⁴⁵ <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the policy involves government funding, with exact costs being finalised and agreed - the costs will then fall to schools 	<p>Prior breakfast club programmes have been found to lead to an estimated 2 months' additional progress in maths, reading, and writing for Key Stage 1 (KS1) pupils.⁴⁶ the NSBP survey of headteachers (2023) found that almost all (97%) respondents reported an improvement in pupils' wellbeing⁴⁷</p> <p><i>All impacts expected after primary legislation and full national rollout.</i></p>
19	<p>Uniform limit</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> our estimated aggregate savings to parents with children in primary school is around £21m per year, and for those with children in secondary school is around £52m per year <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While not a direct regulation on businesses, we have tried to quantify the level of impact we think the uniform limit will have on the sector from available evidence. We currently estimate there are in the region of one to two thousand 'schoolwear' businesses operating in England (mostly microbusinesses <10 employees; <£2m turnover). We do not have information on which to determine the proportion of their business represented by branded schoolwear and the proportion represented by branded clothing/uniforms for other groups/sectors or businesses. The exact impact of the measure on these businesses is therefore uncertain and will also not be equally distributed. It will depend on factors outlined in the measure-level Impact Assessment. <p>Nb, the limit will not apply to the independent schools sector so uniform sales associated with them will not be impacted (hence why this measure was not considered a Regulatory Provision).</p>	<p>Our estimates are that just over a third of primary schools (35%) will have to make changes to their uniform policy, with 18% needing to remove 1-2 branded items, 7% needing to remove 3-4 items and 10% needing to remove 5 or more. Our estimates are that 71% of secondary schools would have to remove branded items, with 30% needing to remove 1-2 items, 22% needing to remove 2-4 items and 19% needing to remove 5 or more.</p> <p>-</p>

⁴⁴ A Kellogg's report using YouGov survey data found that on average, families can save up to £35.20 per week on childcare costs by utilising breakfast clubs.

⁴⁵ The same survey (⁶) found that breakfast clubs enabled parents to do 97.5 additional hours of employed work annually.

⁴⁶ Education Endowment Foundation (2019) Magic Breakfast: Evaluation Report.

⁴⁷ NSBP (2023) Headteacher Survey Report.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
20	<p>Children Not in School (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This measure includes 10 delegated powers in secondary legislation (all outlined in the Bill's Delegated Powers Memorandum), which means this is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved identification and safeguarding of children improved ability to ensure children not in school are receiving suitable education, and associated attainment benefits better identification/ support for some electively home-educating households <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarisation costs for households, schools and out-of-school education providers costs to out-of-school education providers (e.g. tutors, tuition centres, etc.) from having to collect, store and, if necessary, provide information to the register time costs to households providing information to the register a new burden for LAs - the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet these duties⁴⁸ 	<p>NPV: -£13.8m⁴⁹ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.1m</p> <p>EANDCH: £0.9m⁵⁰</p> <p><i>The secondary legislation will help to operationalise the policy but the powers in primary legislation will lead to the impacts above. We will revisit and revise these figures if necessary, ahead of the introduction of the secondary legislation.</i></p>
21	<p>IESS - Power of suspension for independent schools (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction of safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> costs to all independent schools from familiarising themselves with new legislation disruption costs to households with children in suspended schools costs to LAs from duty to provide board to students displaced from suspended boarding schools 	<p>NPV: -£6.9m⁵¹ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.0m⁵²</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁵³</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only.</i></p>

⁴⁸ As per the new burdens doctrine, the department will submit new burdens assessments to MHCLG.

⁴⁹ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁵⁰ Benefits to households have not been monetised.

⁵¹ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁵² The EANDCB figure for this measure rounds to zero in the IA calculator.

⁵³ It has not been possible to monetise household costs and benefits.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
22	<p>IESS - Material Changes (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction of education and safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> direct costs to all independent schools from familiarising themselves with new legislation compliance costs in the form of new administrative costs for schools required to seek Secretary of State approval 	<p>NPV: -£0.5m⁵⁴ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.1m</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁵⁵</p> <p>Roughly 50% of these costs will be derived from primary legislation and 50% from secondary legislation, as half of the familiarisation time/costs will be expended on changes from primary only (reporting additional use of premises changes) and half on changes requiring secondary legislation (reporting SEND provision changes).</p>
23	<p>IESS - enforcement powers: appeals (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved educational outcomes for children reduction of safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> costs to all independent schools from familiarising themselves with new legislation disruption costs to teachers employed at deregistered schools disruption costs to households with children in deregistered schools 	<p>NPV: -£16.4m⁵⁶ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.0m</p> <p>EANDCH: £1.9m⁵⁷</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only.</i></p>

⁵⁴ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁵⁵ Household costs and benefits have not been monetised.

⁵⁶ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁵⁷ Household benefits have not been monetised at this stage.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
24	<p>IESS - due diligence and standard setting (fit and proper person test) (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction of education and safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarisation costs to prospective independent school proprietors subject to the test 	<p>NPV: -£0.9m⁵⁸ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.1m</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁵⁹</p> <p><i>The secondary legislation will help to operationalise the policy but the powers in primary legislation will lead to the impacts above. We will revisit and revise these figures if necessary, ahead of the introduction of the secondary legislation</i></p>
25	<p>IESS - Changes in Ofsted's powers with regards to investigating criminal activity (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction of education and safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> indirect costs to currently unlawful settings now having to allow inspections and potentially having to register and meet ISS, or to close disruption costs to teachers employed at unlawfully operating schools required to close following investigation disruption costs to households with children in impacted schools additional inspection and associated costs to Ofsted 	<p>NPV: -£2.0m⁶⁰ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.0m</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁶¹</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only.</i></p>
26	<p>IESS - Registration Requirements (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are not dependent on secondary legislation, which will only be required if needed.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved educational outcomes for children reduction of safeguarding risks <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarisation costs for impacted independent schools compliance costs for independent schools now having to register and meet ISS/ having to adjust their business model to comply with the new regulation (e.g. by changing to part-time provision) disruption costs to households with children in impacted schools 	<p>NPV: £0.0m⁶²</p> <p>EANDCB: £0.0m⁶³</p> <p>EANDCH: n/a⁶⁴</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only in the first instance. If secondary legislation is required we will revise this going forward.</i></p>

⁵⁸ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁵⁹ Household costs and benefits have not been monetised.

⁶⁰ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁶¹ Household costs and benefits have not been monetised.

⁶² This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁶³ The EANDCB figure for this measure rounds to zero in the IA calculator.

⁶⁴ Household costs and benefits have not been monetised.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
27	<p>IESS - Ofsted information sharing</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> more efficient information sharing between Ofsted and the Independent School Inspectorate 	<p>-</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only.</i></p>
28	<p>Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime (Regulatory Provision)</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduced safeguarding risks to children and young people maintain public confidence in the teaching profession uphold standards of conduct <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarisation costs for settings brought in scope and not already complying (i.e. FE colleges, Special Post 16 Institutions, Independent Training Providers, and online education settings) additional compliance costs for settings (e.g. from performing checks when hiring) 	<p>NPV: -£0.4m⁶⁵ (monetised costs only)</p> <p>Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost to Business (EANDCB): £0.0m⁶⁶</p> <p>Equivalent Annual Net Direct Cost to Households (EANDCH): n/a⁶⁷</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation only in the first instance. If secondary legislation is required we will revise this going forward.</i></p>

⁶⁵ This NPV figure is negative because it has not been possible to monetise the benefits at this stage.

⁶⁶ The EANDCB figure for this measure rounds to zero in the IA calculator.

⁶⁷ No additional costs to households are anticipated.

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
29	<p>School teachers' qualifications and induction</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on induction. Impacts are wholly dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • parents and pupils likely to benefit from the rising standards of having more qualified teachers who have successfully completed statutory induction in the classroom • more transparency to the training that teachers have had <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for schools that appoint a teacher who is working towards QTS, costs associated with training and time off timetable for the trainee and their mentor(s) – the department provides grant funding to support this and if the teacher is training through an apprenticeship route, the school is able to access the apprenticeship levy <p>Given that most academies already choose to offer induction, the overall impact of this element of the measure is considered to be neutral</p>	<p>From September 2026, we estimate this could affect around 700-1,250 potential entrants to teaching profession per annum. We estimate that between 500 and 850 of these entrants could enter as unqualified entrants with a degree and would be eligible to undertake either assessment only (AO) or a postgraduate (PG) ITT route to gain QTS. AO typically takes 12 weeks to complete once accepted and a typical PGITT route, is around 9 months-1 year. We assume a minority would take a post graduate student fee-based ITT course.</p> <p><i>The clause extends existing delegated powers, so that requirements that apply to maintained schools about teachers' qualifications and induction can be made in respect of specified primary and secondary academies.</i></p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
30	<p>Curriculum</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pupils and parents may benefit from greater consistency, clarity and assurance of core curriculum content across different schools • reduce inconsistencies in education standards and opportunities <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some academies may be particularly affected if their current curriculum differs significantly from the new national curriculum, but many already follow the current national curriculum; where they do not, we anticipate small additional costs • additional or specialised training to deliver the curriculum in affected academies • possible adjustments to resources, materials and facilities in affected academies, and recruitment of additional staff 	<p>n/a</p> <p><i>This clause expands the existing regulation-making power that allows for the Secretary of State to make assessment arrangements for national curriculum foundation subjects in respect of Key Stages 1-3. This will ensure the national curriculum assessment arrangements operate in the same way for academies as they do for maintained schools, so the extent of impacts are dependent on this. Ministers will consider evidence of impacts when they make decisions on changes to the national curriculum in the light of recommendations from the Curriculum and Assessment Review.</i></p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
31	<p>Academy schools: educational provision for improving behaviour</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistency for affected pupils and parents, carers and guardians, through academy schools being subject to the same statutory requirements as maintained schools in their use of off-site direction 	<p>According to the AP School Census collection, as of January 2024, 55.3% of placements (14,587 out of 26,400 pupils) in school arranged AP were due to off-site placements for behavioural support.</p> <p><i>Neutral impacts expected after primary legislation, on maintained schools, academy schools, alternative provision (AP) providers (this includes independent and unregistered AP) whether they are commissioning placements or receiving pupils on placements to improve their behaviour. This is because academy schools can already arrange off-site provision under their general powers.</i></p>
32	<p>Academy intervention / direction making power</p> <p><i>This measure confers on the Secretary of State the power to issue a direction to an academy trust when the academy trust is not complying with a legal duty or complying with a duty in an unreasonable way or exercising a power in an unreasonable way. This, as normal, is not subject to parliamentary procedure, so all impacts derive from the primary legislation power.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> allow the Secretary of State to be able to enforce a number of other measures in the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Bill, for example admissions, the curriculum, or teachers in academies to have qualified teacher status (nb, the Secretary of State already has the power to give directions to a LA or the governing body of a maintained school) <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible impact on trustees and trust boards - in the most extreme circumstances of non-compliance the Secretary of State would be able to apply to a court for a mandatory order enforcing a direction (the Secretary of State already has a similar power in respect of maintained schools, set out in s496 Education Act 1996, which has been used extremely rarely) 	<p>n/a</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation.</i></p>

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
33	<p>Duty to issue Academy Orders</p> <p><i>This measure expands an existing discretionary power to make an academy order in respect of schools that are 'eligible for intervention' to include schools in a 'category causing concern'. This is an administrative procedure, so all impacts derive from the primary legislation power.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> more flexibility to improve schools' educational performance complementary to the introduction of Regional Improvement Teams (RITs), to support schools to improve under their existing management and leadership (where it has capacity) <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible extra burden on LAs (financial and administrative) to support struggling schools who would previously have joined an academy trust – the department will continue to review funding for LAs to ensure that they receive sufficient funding to enable them to meet duties impacts on academy trusts if fewer maintained schools convert into sponsored academies, however it would not impact on trusts' current operations and being sponsored by a high quality MAT will continue to be an appropriate option for some underperforming schools 	<p>There were 35 LA maintained schools that were judged Inadequate and were issued with a directive Academy Order in the academic year 2023/24. 28 of these were schools were in Special Measures, with 7 having Serious Weaknesses.</p> <p><i>Impacts from primary legislation.</i></p>
34	<p>Teachers' pay and conditions in maintained schools and academies.</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a core and guaranteed pay offer for teachers through the STPCD spreading good practice and innovation to all schools by remitting the School Teachers' Review Body to consider changes to the STPCD to enable healthy competition and innovation for <u>all</u> schools. prevents academies from offering worse pay, due to the introduction of a floor on pay, and the requirement to have regard to the STPCD will mean academies can only diverge where they have good reason to do so. <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible resource for some academy trusts and larger multi-academy trusts who divert from the STPCD to show they have had regard to it. 	<p><i>Impacts expected after primary legislation and secondary legislation (as remuneration and other conditions set out in regulations).</i></p>
35	<p>School admissions: duties to co-operate regarding admissions and place planning</p> <p><i>On introduction of the Bill, this measure does not include secondary legislation. All impacts derive from primary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> time children and parents are likely to benefit from improved co-operation between schools and LAs regarding admissions and place planning <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> time spent by LAs and schools to act in a co-operative way e.g., engaging each other earlier in decision-making and sharing information 	n/a

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
36	<p>School admissions: LA direction powers</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> likely positive impact on children and families, especially those with a vulnerability or additional need or who cannot secure a school place for other reasons, e.g. a shortage of local school places more streamlined and transparent direction process easier for LAs to fulfil their duties and to support children effectively <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This might result in a small increase in Adjudicator workload and therefore resource, as it will involve Adjudicators receiving appeals against direction decisions from both maintained schools and academies. However, this is likely to be offset by the reduction in advice cases the Adjudicators currently receive from the Secretary of State (schools Adjudicators currently provide advice to the Secretary of State on all direction requests from local authorities before deciding whether or not to issue a direction to academy). 	n/a
37	<p>School admissions: published admission numbers (PANs) and objections to the Schools Adjudicator</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include secondary legislation on introduction. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the needs of parents and pupils will be better accounted for across an area help LAs to better manage the school estate and meet their sufficiency duty, potentially including cost savings from reducing unnecessary building work if schools do have capacity to admit more pupils a more holistic approach to setting school PANs will contribute to financial health of schools, especially in areas of surplus determinations following upheld objections to the Schools Adjudicator result in clear decisions, avoiding prolonged and burdensome negotiations <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> schools may feel their determined PANs do not reflect their preferred arrangements (i.e. they may desire to expand, or to take fewer pupils) 	n/a

	Measure descriptors	Impacts: benefits and costs (qualitative)	Evidence ³⁸
38	<p>Opening new schools</p> <p><i>This is one of several measures that does include powers to make secondary legislation. Impacts are partially dependent on secondary legislation.</i></p>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better aligns LAs' powers and responsibilities to ensure there are enough school places • promotes a diverse school system, supporting parental choice <p>Costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we do not expect there to be any additional costs to LAs – it will be each LA's choice whether to put forward their own proposals and we expect the costs of developing proposals to be manageable from within existing administrative resources • LAs will continue to receive funding via the Basic Need capital grant and via the Local Government Finance Settlement for administration costs • possible concern among academy trusts that there will be fewer opportunities for growth but proposals for new academies will continue to be invited and considered; academy trusts will continue to be a key partner with LAs, schools, dioceses and others in pupil place planning 	<p>- The latest national pupil projections show the nursery and primary school population peaked in 2019 and the overall growth in the population over the last decade includes a decrease between 2019 and 2024 of 2%. The secondary school population is still increasing slowly and the peak is projected to be in 2026 and 2027. This suggests there will not be a need for a significant number of new schools in the near-term, however we expect pupil growth to continue (and therefore need for new schools) in some parts of the country.</p>

6. Regulatory scorecard for the Bill⁶⁸

Part A: Overall and stakeholder impacts

(1) Overall impacts on total welfare		Directional rating
Description of overall expected impact	We anticipate the overall impact on society to be positive. The relatively small additional costs to business and households from the provisions within the Bill are anticipated to be offset by the positive safety, wellbeing, education and financial benefits to children and families.	<p>Positive</p> <p>Based on all impacts (incl. non-monetised)</p>

⁶⁸ **Acronyms** used throughout the regulatory scorecard include: Net Present Value (NPV) and Net Present Social Value (NPSV), Equivalent Annual Net Direct Costs on Business (EANDCB), and Equivalent Annual Net Direct Costs on Households (EANDCH).

(1) Overall impacts on total welfare		Directional rating																																
Monetised impacts	<p>The total NPSV for all Regulatory Provisions within the Bill is:</p> <p>£-47.1m (-£160.8m to -£4.7m)</p> <p>It should be noted that NPV is negative because of substantial unmonetised benefits, discussed below.</p> <p>The breakdown of this NPSV is:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>All figures £millions</i></th> <th>Central scenario</th> <th>Low</th> <th>High</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Financial oversight</td> <td>-5.1</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provider oversight</td> <td>-1.1</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Profit cap</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CNIS</td> <td>-13.8</td> <td>-65.6</td> <td>-2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IESS</td> <td>-26.7</td> <td>-87.1</td> <td>-2.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teacher misconduct</td> <td>-0.4</td> <td>-8.1</td> <td>-0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>-47.1</td> <td>-160.8</td> <td>-4.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High	Financial oversight	-5.1	-	-	Provider oversight	-1.1	-	-	Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a	CNIS	-13.8	-65.6	-2.5	IESS	-26.7	-87.1	-2.0	Teacher misconduct	-0.4	-8.1	-0.2	Total	-47.1	-160.8	-4.7	<p>Negative</p> <p>Based on likely £NPSV</p>
<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High																															
Financial oversight	-5.1	-	-																															
Provider oversight	-1.1	-	-																															
Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a																															
CNIS	-13.8	-65.6	-2.5																															
IESS	-26.7	-87.1	-2.0																															
Teacher misconduct	-0.4	-8.1	-0.2																															
Total	-47.1	-160.8	-4.7																															

<p>Non-monetised impacts</p>	<p>This section covers key unmonetised benefits and costs. We have rated the balance between unmonetised benefits and costs as positive.</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>The Bill is expected to deliver a broad range of benefits at primary legislation and secondary legislation stage which are either non-monetisable or have not been monetised at this stage. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions in children starting their school day hungry, which will equip students, especially those from low-income families, with the tools they need to thrive academically and socially • Ensuring a consistent, high-standard curriculum across all state-funded schools, leading to more consistent opportunities and outcomes for students across different types of state-funded schools • Upholding of trust, standards and confidence in the teaching profession • Improved safeguarding in educational settings, leading to reduced child maltreatment risk • Better support for LAs to meet their school and children’s social care sufficiency duties, ensuring children have access to the right placement for their needs • Reduced frictions in school system operations • Improved consistency and transparency for teachers in regard to pay and conditions • Improved quality and stability in placements for looked after children, leading to better wellbeing and educational outcomes • Improved functioning of the market for children’s social care placements • Improved strategic oversight and join-up in operational child protection and safeguarding, leading to reduced child maltreatment and harm and improved intervention to tackle child maltreatment and harm <p>Costs</p> <p>The Bill will also entail some additional unmonetised costs for businesses, households and publicly funded organisations. Business and household costs are discussed in the relevant scorecard section below. Some costs are non-monetisable. Other costs will be developed as specific measures move through secondary legislation to implementation. Key unmonetised costs include:</p>	<p>Positive</p>
-------------------------------------	---	------------------------

(1) Overall impacts on total welfare	Directional rating
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional costs to the department and Ofsted for enhanced regulation duties in respect of educational and CSC settings. We are working closely with Ofsted on impacts of the Bill • Marginal costs to academies subjected to a LA direction to admit a child • Time costs to LAs and schools from enhanced cooperation duties
<p>Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>We do not anticipate adverse distributional impacts beyond those discussed in the business and household sections of the scorecard below. We have rated this element of the scorecard as neutral for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the measures in the Bill are anticipated to impact positively on income distribution • Any adverse distributional effects are likely to be offset to an extent by the overall benefits to society from the Bill • The department will, where feasible and appropriate to do so, endeavour to mitigate any adverse distributional impacts

(2) Expected impacts on businesses

Description of overall business impact

The regulatory provisions within the Bill, as well as the overall Bill, are expected to directly impact some businesses in the following sectors:

- Private providers of Children’s Social Care foster, supported accommodation and residential placements
- Independent education institutions
- Out-of-school education providers, e.g. private tutors
- Further Education Colleges (impacted by changes to the teacher misconduct regime only)
- Special post-16 institutions (impacted by changes to the teacher misconduct regime only)
- Independent Training Providers (impacted by changes to the teacher misconduct regime and provider duty for children not in school registers)
- Online educational settings (impacted by changes to the teacher misconduct regime and provider duty for children not in school registers)

Impacted businesses will incur the following broad types of direct costs (noting that these will differ across measures, with the detail for each individual IA is provided in the annexes):

- In-scope businesses will incur costs from familiarising themselves with requirements
- Impacted businesses will also face a range of additional costs related to ensuring compliance with the new regulations. These vary across the measures, but key examples include: performing additional checks when hiring staff; collecting, storing and providing additional information on children in their care; costs associated with registering for inspection and meeting Independent School Standards for the first time; costs from mandatory participation in a new oversight scheme.

Negative

(2) Expected impacts on businesses

<p>Monetised impacts</p>	<p>The regulatory provisions within the Bill have been calculated as having the following business impacts.</p> <p>Total EANDCB £1.0m (£0m to £2.4m)</p> <p>The breakdown of this EANDCB is:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="400 461 1141 878"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>All figures £millions</i></th> <th>Central scenario</th> <th>Low</th> <th>High</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Financial oversight</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provider oversight</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Profit cap</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CNIS</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>1.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IESS</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teacher misconduct</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>2.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There may be pass through⁶⁹ to households from some of the measures in the Bill, particularly those that incur costs for independent schools and education providers, but these pass-through costs have not been estimated or deducted from the EANDCB figures.</p>	<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High	Financial oversight	0.6	-	-	Provider oversight	0.07	-	-	Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a	CNIS	0.1	0.0	1.4	IESS	0.2	0.0	0.6	Teacher misconduct	0.0	0.0	0.4	Total	1.0	0.0	2.4	<p>Negative</p> <p>Based on likely business £NPV</p>
<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High																															
Financial oversight	0.6	-	-																															
Provider oversight	0.07	-	-																															
Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a																															
CNIS	0.1	0.0	1.4																															
IESS	0.2	0.0	0.6																															
Teacher misconduct	0.0	0.0	0.4																															
Total	1.0	0.0	2.4																															
<p>Non-monetised impacts</p>	<p>This section covers key examples of unmonetised benefits and costs to businesses. We have rated the balance between unmonetised benefits and costs as uncertain. Where it is possible to do so, we will look to improve estimates as the measures move through secondary legislation and/or path to implementation.</p> <p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing benefits to businesses newly in scope of the teaching regulatory body <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs to independent schools from deregistration not already monetised (e.g. redundancies for staff or contract exit costs) 	<p>Uncertain</p>																																

⁶⁹ Where costs are passed to households by businesses in the form of e.g., higher prices.

(2) Expected impacts on businesses

Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?	We have identified one possible adverse distributional impact. Based on our current understanding, the Independent Schools Standards: Registration Requirements measure is expected to disproportionately impact some religious or faith-based schools. Where in scope of the new regulation, these schools may have to meet the Independent School Standards, which may entail costs.	Negative
---	--	-----------------

(3) Expected impacts on households

Description of overall household impact	We anticipate the overall impact on households to be positive. The relatively small additional costs to households from the provisions within the Bill are anticipated to be more than offset by the positive safety, wellbeing, education and financial benefits to children and families.	Positive																																
Monetised impacts	<p>The regulatory provisions within the Bill have been calculated as having the following monetisable household impacts; significant benefits exist and have been described but we have been unable to monetise them at this stage.</p> <p>Total EANDCH £2.8m (£0.3m to £7.2m)</p> <p>The breakdown of this EANDCH is:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="403 1283 1137 1697"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>All figures £millions</i></th> <th>Central scenario</th> <th>Low</th> <th>High</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Financial oversight</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provider oversight</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Profit cap</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CNIS</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>3.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IESS</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>3.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teacher misconduct</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>7.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High	Financial oversight	0.0	-	-	Provider oversight	0.0	-	-	Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a	CNIS	0.9	0.3	3.3	IESS	1.9	0.0	3.9	Teacher misconduct	0.0	-	-	Total	2.8	0.3	7.2	Negative Based on likely household £NPV
<i>All figures £millions</i>	Central scenario	Low	High																															
Financial oversight	0.0	-	-																															
Provider oversight	0.0	-	-																															
Profit cap	n/a	n/a	n/a																															
CNIS	0.9	0.3	3.3																															
IESS	1.9	0.0	3.9																															
Teacher misconduct	0.0	-	-																															
Total	2.8	0.3	7.2																															

(3) Expected impacts on households

Non-monetised impacts

Alongside the child wellbeing, safeguarding and educational benefits set out in Section A1 (Overall impacts on total welfare), listed below are key unmonetized benefits and costs to households. We have rated the balance between unmonetised benefits and costs as positive, reflecting broadly an offsetting effect between costs and benefits.

Benefits

- [CNIS] Fewer children in unsafe or unsuitable home education environments
- [CNIS] Greater LA oversight of vulnerable children not in school, informing improved multi-agency support and protection wherever needed.
- [CNIS] Better information on home-educated children and families to support future policy development
- [Teacher Misconduct] Greater confidence for households from improved regulation of teachers and educational settings.
- [CSC Financial Oversight] Advance warning to LAs (as corporate parents of looked after children) of likely financial distress/ failure and cessation of service of placement providers

Costs

- Where Powers of Suspension or Deregistration appeals lead to temporary or permanent school closure, this may result in disruption costs to affected households (e.g. parents requiring time off work)

Positive

(3) Expected impacts on households

<p>Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?</p>	<p>We have identified one potential, positive distributional household impact from the Children Not in Schools Register (CNIS) measure. It includes a duty on LAs to offer support to home-educating families. The support duty may be more likely to benefit middle and lower income families. Parents who choose to home educate bear the financial responsibility for doing so since a state school place (or state-funded place) is available for their child. Middle and lower income families may find this financial responsibility more burdensome than those in higher income brackets. Therefore, the new requirement on local authorities to provide advice and information to assist with home education may support middle and lower income families to access resources and information that they would otherwise be unable to due to their financial situation (for example, where families may currently not have the funds to get access to information that is only available through subscriptions to third-party websites or resource hubs).</p>	<p>Positive</p>
--	--	------------------------

Part B: Impacts on wider government priorities

Category	Description of impact	Directional rating
<p>Business environment: Does the measure impact on the ease of doing business in the UK?</p>	<p>Overall we expect a neutral impact on this domain. Some of the measures in the Bill will entail additional costs for businesses, but this is offset by positive business or market impacts alongside benefits to children and families.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>International Considerations: Does the measure support international trade and investment?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Natural capital and Decarbonisation: Does the measure support commitments to improve the environment and decarbonise?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Neutral</p>

7. Small and micro business impacts

77. Of the 38 measures in this Bill, we anticipate that eight may result in direct costs to small and medium businesses (SMBs), with any impacts likely to occur following primary legislation. For these eight measures, where available⁷⁰, a high-level account of SMB impacts is provided in the bullet points below, with further detail in the annexes.
78. **Children Not in School Registers:** it is anticipated that the majority of out-of-school education providers potentially impacted by this measure will be small and micro businesses, with the remainder medium-sized businesses. Therefore, virtually all the estimated £0.1m EANDCB for this measure applies to SMBs. Overall, the impact of this measure is anticipated to be small and outweighed by safeguarding benefits. The department previously tested the proposals with the Out-of-School Steering Group, and no significant concerns were raised. There will be a public consultation prior to implementation to establish the most appropriate level to set the threshold that brings a provider into scope of the duty, which will keep the number of businesses affected at an appropriate level.
79. **Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime:** the changes under this measure may impose greater costs on small and micro settings, which may have limited pre-existing HR and hiring practices. However, while there are costs to businesses from this change, these are minimal administrative costs and, in the main, these costs will already be absorbed by impacted businesses under pre-existing funding agreements with the department. Furthermore, the revised regulatory regime this legislative change will apply to all teachers in England who are in jurisdiction of the TRA's regime; it is not possible to quantify impacts on different size organisations because evidence does not exist to be able to estimate which teachers, in which locations, will in future commit serious misconduct and receive regulatory action as a result of these changes.
80. **IESS: Power of suspension for independent schools:** these powers are expected to be used very infrequently; the central estimate is that they will affect 5 schools per year. Some of these may be SMBs but it is not possible to quantify this because the department does not collect data on size of independent educational institutions or the size of those that have faced suspension regulation before, and if we did it would not be possible to extrapolate from those that have faced suspension regulation before because the threshold for this regulation is markedly different to the existing approach (hence the need for intervention). The Measure-level Impact Assessment outlines this in more detail.
81. **IESS: material change regime:** the impact estimates assume that a total of 400-500 schools per year will be impacted by this measure, and that impacts will be relatively low cost. It has not been possible to estimate the administrative burden placed specifically on SMBs due to proportionality considerations and resource constraints.
82. **IESS: enforcement powers: appeals:** similarly to Powers of Suspension, these powers are expected to be used very infrequently; with a central estimate of 5 schools per year affected. Again, whilst some of the impacted schools may be SMBs it has not been possible to develop separate impact estimates for SMBs.
83. **IESS: due diligence and standard setting:** as before, these powers are expected to impact a limited number of schools/proprietors overall (our central estimate based on existing number of

⁷⁰ In determining proportionality in assessing impact, the Department has drawn on the document Regulatory Policy Committee (undated) *Proportionality guidance for departments and regulators*.

proprietor applications is 400). Whilst some of the impacted schools may be SMBs it has not been possible to develop separate impact estimates for SMBs.

84. **IESS: Changes in Ofsted’s powers with regards to investigating criminal activity:** the overall costs of this measure are estimated to be very low (EANDCB of £0.0m when rounded down to the nearest hundred thousand) and separate estimates have not been developed for SMBs due to resource constraints and proportionality considerations.
85. **IESS: registration of full-time settings:** the central estimate is that fewer than 20 settings will be impacted by this measure. It is likely that some of these will be SMBs but it has not been possible to develop a separate impact estimate for this group.
86. Across all eight IESS measures, it has been deemed inappropriate to exempt SMBs from the regulations, either because the new burdens are relatively limited (e.g. it is likely that businesses already collect and hold the information) and/ or because exempting SMEs would run contrary to the safeguarding objectives of the measures.

8. Wider Impacts

87. This section outlines wider impacts of the Bill’s measures. An Equalities Impact Assessment will be published alongside this document on the Bill’s introduction. Where required for each measure, we have also carried out Environment Principles Assessments, New Burdens Assessments, Data Protection Impact Assessments including Article 36, Child’s Right Impact Assessments, the Justice Impact Test, and The Family Test.
88. For measures that aim to keep families together and children safe:
- a. The Family Group Decision Making measure is also anticipated to have a positive impact on courts. Impact evidence from the randomised control trial by Foundations⁷¹ has shown that when families were offered Family Group Conferences (FGCs), children were less likely to have care proceedings issued compared to those who were not offered FGCs. A reduction in care proceedings should alleviate some pressure on the courts and bring Public Law Outline closer to the recommended 26 weeks target, reducing the backlog of cases in family courts⁷². The families that will be engaging with FGDM can sometimes have certain characteristics overrepresented. For example, while we do not have data on families at pre-proceedings, we understand that black children are more likely to be looked-after than children of other ethnicities⁷³. Due to the family-led and co-operative approach of FGDM, we believe that there will be a positive impact on fostering good relations between people with protected characteristics and these key stakeholders involved in the children’s social care system. Further details on overrepresented characteristics in this cohort, and the equalities impact on the people with certain protected characteristics, are set out in the accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment.
 - b. Strengthening the role of education in multi-agency safeguarding arrangements will result in better join-up between education, children’s social care, police, and health services and will also contribute to better information sharing practice and agreements, and better responses to serious incidents.
 - c. In the ten multi-agency child protection team pathfinder areas, multi-agency front-line child protection practitioners from the LA, police and health and other relevant agencies are

⁷¹ Family Group Conferencing at pre-proceedings stage - Foundations

⁷² Family Court Statistics Quarterly: October to December 2023 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

⁷³ What Works Centre, 2022 report - Understanding Formal Kinship Care Arrangements in England (whatworks-csc.org.uk)

working together in a much more integrated way with day-to-day responsibility for protecting children from harm.

- d. Improved information sharing and the single unique identifier (known as a consistent identifier in legislation) is intended to support the sharing of information across all agencies with functions relating to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children. This is expected to have the benefit of removing the need for children and families to have to re-tell their stories and improved relationships with children and families.

88. Many of the measures that aim to support children with care experience to thrive are likely to result in benefits to other public sector bodies that safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

- a. The requirement on LAs to have a kinship local offer will promote transparency to ensure kinship families are informed about their rights and the resources available to them. Ultimately, by supporting kinship carers, this measure aims to improve the overall wellbeing and stability of children who cannot live with their parents.
- b. Based on existing trial evidence, the Virtual School Heads measure is expected to give rise to benefits including: improved attendance, reduction in children not in education, employment or training and reduction in suspensions and permanent exclusions, and improved wellbeing and resilience. This is likely to have positive knock-on effects on the available workforce and public sector expenditure.
- c. Regarding care leavers, we know that care leavers are overrepresented in the homelessness system. 10% of care leavers aged 17-20 and 8% of those aged 21+ are homeless. Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN) data for Q3 2020 show that 11% of all rough sleepers aged 25 and under in London are care leavers. Based on existing evidence, measures such as Staying Close and protocol on support for care leavers when they transition to independent living are likely to result in improved outcomes in accommodation stability, wellbeing, EET, strong relationships and support network and independent living skills. This will then have a subsequent decreased cost pressure on wider public services. These cost savings will mainly come from reductions in the costs of homelessness, unemployment and mental health needs. For example, from Staying Close, Suffolk has seen 90% sustained tenancies/increased placement stability /prevention of homelessness. This will also benefit tenancy and stable accommodation providers who will see a decline in rent arrears and the need for evictions.

89. For measures that aim to make the care system child-centred:

- a. There will be impacts of new community provision from Deprivation of Liberty Orders (DOLOs) on High Courts. DOLOs via the High Court's Inherent Jurisdiction are a last resort option and do not offer the safeguards that a statutory scheme would through mandated regular review points and a clear legal framework. Legislation would return High Court Deprivation of Liberty Orders back to their intended purpose.
- b. Ofsted will acquire oversight of group providers of children's social care services through a system of enforcement against those individuals or agencies who fail to comply with requirements to engage or develop plans to improve quality.

90. For the two measures that aim to remove barriers to opportunity in schools:

- a. Beyond the classroom, Breakfast Clubs can create an opportunity for children to socialise in a relaxed setting before lessons begin, helping to develop social skills and a sense of community enabling them to achieve their full potential from the start of the school day. Furthermore, as outlined in Section 5, this can support parents' working hours with possible knock-on economic benefits from increased working, income and output.

- b. A possible impact of the school uniform limit is increased donations to second hand school uniform schemes, so schools should continue to ensure that parents can acquire second-hand uniforms.

91. For the measures that aim to drive high and rising standards for every child:

- a. The three admissions measures are likely to have economic benefits for the LA, especially in areas where they are struggling to provide enough places, as Adjudicator decisions will result in a clear outcome without room for negotiation and dispute. Coupled with proposed changes to regulations we intend to make to extend the ability for LAs to object to the Adjudicator, where admission authorities are setting their PAN below their capacity this may support LAs to open up places in existing schools with capacity by objecting to the adjudicator and receiving a clear outcome about the number of places that school must offer, rather than having to create new capacity. Likewise, if surplus space could be more effectively managed it could be used to increase nursery provision or SEND units, supporting wider departmental priorities. Children with additional needs and vulnerable children may particularly benefit from the admissions and place planning co-operation duties as they can be disproportionately affected by poor co-operation e.g. related to in-year admission – this is outlined in greater detail in the Equalities Impact Assessment.
- b. There could be impacts on apprenticeships from the mandatory QTS measure, if schools appoint a teacher who is working towards QTS and if the teacher is training through an apprenticeship route.
- c. From the national curriculum change, trusts may need to hire additional or specialist teachers for any subjects not currently delivered or underrepresented in existing curricula.

3. Monitoring and Administrative/Compliance Costs

9. Monitoring and evaluation of preferred option

92. As required in the Guide to Making Legislation, we will conduct a post-implementation review to capture the actual impact of the implemented policy and assess any modifications to the policy objectives or its implementation recommended as a result of the review. The outcome of this review will be published on legislation.gov.uk.
93. Bespoke reviews of policies will likely be conducted at a Measure-level or grouped Measure-level, depending on which is most appropriate for each measure given their different objectives, metrics. We expect that this evaluation will be carried out within the first five years of the legislation coming into force.
94. Details about how we will assess impacts of measures are outlined in the individual impact assessments annexed to this document. We will continue to develop and, where necessary, adjust our plans during the Bill's passage. We have also provided a high-level summary of planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements for each of the regulatory provisions, and then non-regulatory provisions, within the Bill below.
- a. **Children's Social Care Financial Oversight Scheme:** the scheme will not have a trial or experimentation period; however, legislation will allow for periods of review and any necessary amendments to be made to the scheme, e.g. so it can remain fit for purpose in line with any changes in the market.
 - b. **CSC Provider Oversight:** we expect provider oversight to be implemented by Ofsted from April 2026, subject to parliamentary process and the Bill receiving Royal Assent. Impact will be monitored through the collection of data by Ofsted, which will track the volume of enforcement activity at provider level, demonstrating how many services this action has the potential to influence.
 - c. **Children Not in School:** a post-implementation review will be undertaken after the first year of full CNIS implementation/data collection.
 - d. **Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime:** The TRA and the department will work together to monitor whether the policy change has had a disproportionate impact on types of settings or groups of individuals.
 - e. **IESS: Power of suspension for independent schools:** The expectation is that this power will be used very infrequently. Currently, we routinely evaluate and internally review the adequacy of our approach following each use of our existing power under s120 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 and will do so following each use of our new power.
 - f. **IESS: enforcement powers: appeals:** the expectation is that this power will be used very infrequently. Currently, we routinely evaluate and internally review the adequacy of our approach following each use of our existing power under s120 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 and will do so following each use of this new power. Reviews are informed by, among others, views of legal counsel often hired to assist in preparing cases to the appeal Tribunal.
 - g. **IESS: registration of full-time settings:** impact will be monitored via informal consultation with stakeholder groups in impacted communities alongside the relevant LAs.

- h. **IESS: material change regime:** current arrangements, whereby we review the working of our regulatory regime following high-profile or complex cases, will continue once the legislative change is made. This will be supplemented with informal consultation with independent schools' representative bodies.
 - i. **IESS: due diligence and standard setting:** as currently, we will continue to monitor applications and due diligence checks. Post-implementation, this monitoring will help identify numbers failing to meet the new test, and whether the thresholds we set are adequate.
 - j. **IESS: Changes in Ofsted's powers with regards to investigating criminal activity:** we will use pre-existing monitoring arrangements with Ofsted to monitor the impact of these proposals and test our assumptions that (a) they will lead in all cases to a determination about whether unlawful activity is being undertaken and (b) these powers will be actually used infrequently since in most cases those subject to inspection cooperate with inspectors. Inspections of independent schools believed to be acting unlawfully are sufficiently rare to justify a review of our process in each case.
 - k. **Strengthening the Teacher Misconduct Regime:** the TRA and the department will work together to monitor whether the policy change has had a disproportionate impact on types of settings or groups of individuals.
95. For measures that aim to keep families together and children safe, we will continue ongoing review and learning to determine if changes effectively address issues or if further action is needed.
- a. On Family Group Decision Making, Foundations (What Works Centre for Children and Families) are an organisation funded by the Department for Education and run a programme of work to promote the evidence on Family Group Conferences.
 - b. To strengthen the role of education in multi-agency safeguarding arrangements, we expect each local area to tailor their multi-agency response according to their specific safeguarding needs and continue to monitor whether children and families are receiving the right support at the right time.
 - c. Regarding multi-agency child protection teams, we expect the statutory safeguarding partners to review and monitor the effectiveness of multi-agency child protection teams through their multi-agency safeguarding arrangements (MASAs). The National Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel also has a role in this through their oversight of MASAs and in reviewing local child safeguarding practice reviews. Safeguarding partners are inspected by their respective inspectorate bodies (Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services) and jointly through Joint Targeted Area Inspections (JTAs). Therefore, we are not proposing to make any changes to accountability and monitoring.
 - d. Regarding Information Sharing and the Single Unique Identifier, we will carry out further policy development to address barriers to information sharing.
96. We will also monitor the impact of the Virtual School Head extension through the continued evaluation and against the longer-term anticipated outcomes from the Theory of Change, which are anticipated to be evidenced by the end of 2024/25. Furthermore, the department currently operates Staying Close as a grant funding scheme which began as a pilot in 2018 with 8 initiatives and has now expanded to 47 LAs. We are currently undertaking an evaluation to further assess the existing Staying Close grant funding scheme's impact and we will use these findings to support LAs in complying with these new duties.
97. For measures that aim to make the care system child-centred, we will further increase our understanding of the issues around designing, commissioning and delivering suitable provision for these children, including through independent research. We will publish a CSC Dashboard with indicators linked to the outcomes to support LAs to understand their progress towards

achieving the transformation needed, and for evaluation purposes. Lastly, we will develop and pilot evidence-based models of commissioning safe, therapeutic care that delivers integrated, consistent, and collaborative practices for relevant children and young people.

98. For measures that tackle profiteering in children's social care, we are committed to curbing profiteering and will monitor the impact of the other children's social care market intervention measures to inform whether the profit cap needs to be implemented as a last resort if other measures are not proving effective enough in curbing profiteering on their own. We have already set up an evaluation programme for Regional Care Co-operatives, which will aim to collect robust and reliable evidence to understand both the impact and the causes of any impact on the care placements system e.g., sufficiency needs, planning, forecasting, and commissioning of placements. Potential metrics for RCCs will include reduction in cost of placements to LAs, increased sufficiency of placements within region, reduction in use of out of area placements. On the agency workers measure, we are introducing a new quarterly data collection under section 83 of the Children Act 1989 and section 251(1)(b) of the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009. The quarterly collection of data will provide a consistent evidence base of agency use and costs in relation to social workers, to support LAs with workforce planning and bolster the development of regional and national workforce strategies. This will allow the department to monitor compliance with the current statutory guidance and any subsequent regulations to enable the development and implementation of support and/or enforcement measures.
99. For the two measures that aim to remove barriers to opportunity in schools, we will be working with 750 early adopter schools of breakfast clubs from April 2025 to better understand capacity and likely take up of a free breakfast club offer. The uniform limit is expected to come into effect from September 2026, so we will plan how to continue to analyse the macro impact before then, although it will be difficult to quantify the impact on individual schools because we do not collect information on individual school's commercial contracts.
100. For the high and rising education standards measures, we will continue to monitor the extent to which the policies are achieving their intended objectives through targeted stakeholder engagement, including localised engagement with a sample of school and trust leaders that are most likely to be impacted. We believe the new checks and balances included with the proposed new LA direction powers will help reassure those who have such concerns that it will be an appropriate power with little room for it to be misused, but we will continue to monitor this. In relation to the QTS measure, we will continue to assess the impact on accredited Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers and providers of Early Career Framework-based induction training also needing to be aware. Monitoring changes from the national curriculum measure will be aligned with implementation of the new national curriculum following the Curriculum and Assessment Review, which aims to publish an interim report early in 2025 setting out its interim findings and plans to publish the final report with recommendations in Autumn 2025, though it will take several years after that for its recommendations to be implemented. On the duty to academy order, we will conduct local engagement to ensure all key stakeholders are made aware of the direct support that is being offered to the school, and why this is the better option in the circumstances. Lastly, in relation to the measure for opening new schools, we will continue to monitor data on new schools, as illustrated in the respective Measure-level IA in Annex B.

10. Minimising administrative and compliance costs for preferred option

101. We intend to minimise the administrative burdens of complying with CSC measures in the following ways:

- a. We plan to delay commencement of putting multi-agency child protection teams on a statutory footing, so we can include specific expectations in regulations to ensure they are informed by findings from the evaluation of the Families First for Children Pathfinder programme and provide areas with time to prepare. We will also use this time to engage extensively with all sectors we intend to be part of the multi-agency child protection teams.
- b. The Single Unique Identifier ('consistent identifier' in the legislation) regulation will be delayed until conclusion of the SUI pilots that aim to better understand the impact of using a unique identifier and other operational requirements needed to implement it successfully.
- c. We have made sure that the legislative changes on child employment are straightforward and minimal, so the impact on charities and other third-party organisations is expected to be negligible.
- d. Regarding Virtual School Heads, various guidance documents are likely to be amalgamated into a single document.
- e. We will work collaboratively with MHCLG on statutory guidance that will need to be amended to support LAs with the delivery of the care leavers changes, as it will be closely interlinked with housing teams in LAs.
- f. New enforcement powers for Ofsted to tackle breaches of the Care Standards Act, will allow Ofsted to better tackle noncompliance, including against unregistered settings in a proportionate, effective and efficient manner, reducing compliance and administrative costs, as opposed to prosecution which is very resource intensive.
- g. The agency workers measure will increase compliance as LAs will not be able to depart from regulations and Ofsted would look at compliance with regulations during inspections. However, this is far outweighed by the costs of the 'do nothing' option, which would likely continue to rise, restricting LAs' ability to invest in permanent workforce and stabilise the CSC system.
- h. Regarding Regional Care Co-operatives, we are working with two pathfinder areas, in Greater Manchester and the South East to test our approach. This has already informed the scope of the strategic accommodation functions that are defined in the Bill. Lessons will be applied to minimise administrative and compliance impacts.
- i. We will consult publicly before a profit cap is implemented, if the cap is deemed necessary in the future. This would include specific questions about implementation.

102. We intend to minimise the administrative burdens of complying with the measures in the first three groups affecting schools and children in the following ways:

- a. We will be working with 750 early adopter of breakfast clubs from April 2025 to March 2026, and will share guidance informed by this test and learn phase with all schools before national rollout. The timing of national rollout is to be confirmed after the Spending Review, but will be ensure school have adequate notice and support. The uniform cap until the academic year 2026/27, in both cases to give a lead-in time for stakeholders to understand and prepare for the changes.
- b. The Curriculum and Assessment Review's terms of reference state that the Review "will seek to ensure that the curriculum and assessment system does not place undue burdens on education staff and, wherever possible, supports manageable and sustainable workloads for teachers, lecturers, support staff and leaders". The government is committed to

supporting all schools through the transition period, ensuring sufficient lead-in time to implement the changes effectively.

- c. Regarding the duty to academy order measure, structural intervention can be complex, expensive and disruptive for pupils, parents and staff. Permitting alternate interventions may support in reducing this.
- d. Regarding the teacher pay measure, the government will introduce a new power for the Secretary of State to determine minimum levels of pay for teachers in academy schools and alternative provision academies. These academies will also be required to have regard to the rest of the STPCD once we have made changes to it, through secondary legislation, to encourage innovation and healthy competition for all schools. These changes will build in more flexibility for all schools ensuring compliance is only required after these reforms, therefore it will reduce the risk of nugatory administrative costs for academy schools and alternative provision academies.
- e. The opening new schools measure will better align LAs' ability to open new schools with their responsibility to secure sufficient school places in their area. We do not expect there to be additional costs for LAs. There may be some minimal resource implications if they decide to put forward proposals themselves for a new school but whether to do so will be the LA's choice and LAs will continue to receive funding to create new places via the Basic Need capital grant and via the Local Government Finance Settlement for administration costs.

Declaration

Department:

Department for Education

Contact details for enquiries:

Legislation.division@education.gov.uk

Minister responsible:

Minister McKinnell

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed:

Sign here

Catherine McKinnell

Date:

Date

28.01.25