



Glasgow City Council
City Administration Committee

Item 2

20th June 2024

Report by Councillor Christina Cannon, City Convener for Education, Skills and Early Years

Contact: Douglas Hutchison, Executive Director Ext: 74551

REVIEW OF MCR PATHWAYS

Purpose of Report:

To update Committee on the review of MCR Pathways and confirm funding amounting to £311,300 for the revised model of delivery for 24/25 and to build future funding into next year's budget.

Recommendations:

The committee is asked to:

- Approve the preferred option of delivery for MCR Pathways which is Option 4.
- Approve funding of £311,300 for 2024-25
- Approve building future years funding into next year's budget.

Ward No(s):

Citywide: ✓

Local member(s) advised: Yes ☐ No ☐ consulted: Yes ☐ No ☐

1 Background

- 1.1. As part of the budget agreed at Council on 15th February, 2024 a review of the delivery and funding of the MCR Pathways programme was undertaken. Options explored are set out below.
- 1.2. The costs associated with the programme are staffing costs for the MCR Pathways coordinators who carry out a range of activities which include group work at S1 to S3; training, matching and supporting the role of individual mentors for young people at S4 to S6.
- 1.3. The review proposes a revised operating model which involves MCR Pathways moving under the umbrella of Glasgow's Virtual School. The move ensures closer articulation with work to support our care experienced children and young people. It also allows greater efficiency in management structures.

2 Engagement with staff and stakeholders

- 2.1. The process of reviewing the service has been challenging for staff involved. The overall aim has been to ensure the service continues to focus on the young people in greatest need while maintaining as many posts as possible and delivering a highly efficient service.
- 2.2. Discussions have taken place with trade unions; with staff directly; with MCR Pathways; and with head teachers. A range of views were expressed and the final proposal represents the best available option balancing the need to address budget challenges while maintaining an efficient service. The proposals also take account of the changes in schools since the programme was first introduced, meaning an increase in partners working with schools to support young people. The increase in partners supporting schools is largely paid for using Pupil Equity Fund.

3 Service Re-Design and Future Income Generation Political Oversight Group

- 3.1 A Review of the role of GCC MCR coordinators has been carried out. The review was presented in full to the Service Redesign and Future Income Generation Political Oversight Group (SRFIGPOG) on Thursday 13th June.
- 3.2 There was no agreement at the SRFIGPOG about which option should be presented, so the administration is presenting what was Option 4 as the preferred model of delivery.

All options presented included:

- Structural change of our work, with the MCR Pathways organisation moving under the umbrella of Glasgow's Virtual School.
- The posts being referred to as Pathways Coordinators. The currently named MCR Pathways Coordinators posts are GCC employees, unlike other Third

Sector organisations and schools work with. As will be seen in some of the options, a number of schools would like to use their Pupil Equity Fund (PEF) to contribute towards these posts. Many do this in relation to DYW coordinators and we are clear that the school will determine the role of the DYW coordinator within the element they fund which is dependent on the school context. This would be similar for those schools who want to contribute their PEF to create a 1fte role for a Pathways coordinator.

- All options envisage a reduction in the number of coordinators, however 12 schools do want to continue to have a full-time Pathways coordinator and we have tried to respond to this in Options 4. For all other schools, the options allow the key role of the Pathways Coordinator to focus more specifically on and support the mentor relationships to continue. There would also be a review of each school's allocation of time to reflect the number of care experienced young people.
- Finally, since Pathways Coordinators have a background in engaging with employers through the Talent Taster opportunities and have a good skill set in working directly with young people, some of them may support vacancies in the DYW coordinator posts (dual role in one school).

4 Potential Options for Reform.

4.1 The Options included:

- 1 - To move under Glasgow Virtual School and remove Grade 8 post
- 2 - Remove Grade 8 post and reduce number of co-ordinator posts
- 3 - Combine DYW and MCR posts, this option is unable to be progressed.
- 5 – Complete withdrawal of service – this option was not recommended for progression.

5. Preferred Option (4)

This proposal combines a number of the previous options and has arisen following consultation with schools. Some schools wish to retain their MCR Pathways Coordinators and are content to make a funding contribution. Some schools wish to contribute towards keeping their DYW coordinators full-time and did so this session. Some schools wish to make contributions towards both, although this is a small number. A few schools do not want to make contributions since they have already fully allocated PEF. For schools who wish to make contributions to either posts, it is often, but not always, on the basis of keeping a particular person with whom they have built up positive relationships over time.

- The option would be to provide a baseline 0.5 fte (or less depending on need*) Pathways Coordinator post to all schools and schools can increase this further through PEF. Schools who are unable to fund extra would have their Pathways Coordinator shared between two schools. Some schools will have a dual role Pathways Coordinator as outlined earlier. Although this means different scenarios for different schools, it is arguably goes further to reflect the needs of schools. There will be continued engagement and review throughout the process and as the new model is implemented.

Proposed New Structure:	One Year	32 Weeks	20 Weeks
2 X Grade 6s	95,000	58,500	36,500
15 X MCR Co-Ordinators	587,500	361,500	226,000
12 x 0.5 MCR Funded by PEF	<u>235,000</u>	<u>144,600</u>	<u>90,400</u>
Total One Year Cost from August	917,500	564,600	352,900
Funding Available:			
1 Grade 8	69,800	43,000	26,800
2* Grade 6s	95,000	58,500	36,500
12 x 0.5 MCR Funded by PEF	<u>246,600</u>	<u>151,800</u>	<u>94,800</u>
Total One Year ED Funding	411,400	253,300	158,100
Requested from Budget Support	506,100	311,300	194,800

7. Policy and Resource Implications

Resource Implications:

Financial: Funding of £311,300 for 2024-25 will be met from the budget support fund. The full year cost of the preferred option of £506,100 will be built into future years budgets.

Legal: There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

Personnel: Following agreement of the paper, further engagement will take place to ensure matching of staff to posts.

Procurement: There are no procurement implications arising from the proposals.

Council Strategic Plan: Grand Challenge 2, Mission 3: Meet the learning and care needs of children and their families before and through school

Equality and Socio-Economic Impacts:

Does the proposal support the Council's Equality Outcomes 2021-25? Please specify.

The proposals support outcome 14: Glasgow City Council (Education Services) has continued to improve outcomes in relation to attainment and achievement for children and young people including those experiencing socio-economic disadvantage, those for whom English is not their first language, those who identify as black and minority ethnic and disabled children and young people.

What are the potential equality impacts as a result of this report?

The impact of the proposals are positive in that they maintain a mentoring service to care experienced and vulnerable young people. An initial EQIA on the proposal has been [completed](#).

Please highlight if the policy/proposal will help address socio-economic disadvantage.

As indicated in relation to equalities outcomes, the programme is aimed at addressing the impact of socioeconomic disadvantage.

Climate Impacts:

Does the proposal support any Climate Plan actions? Please specify:

n/a

What are the potential climate impacts as a result of this proposal?

n/a

Will the proposal contribute to Glasgow's net zero carbon target?

n/a

Privacy and Data Protection Impacts:

Are there any potential data protection impacts as a result of this report

No

8. Recommendations

8.1 The committee is asked to:

- Approve the preferred option of delivery for MCR Pathways which is Option 4.
- Approve funding of £311,300 for 2024-25
- Approve building future years funding into next year's budget.