

# Public Document Pack

**To: Forum Members:** Reverend Mark Bennet, Patricia Brims, Fadia Clarke, Jeanette Clifford, Paul Dick, Reverend Mary Harwood, Jon Hewitt, Kate House, Peter Hudson, Brian Jenkins, Catherine Morley, Sheilagh Peacock, Derek Peale, Chris Prickett, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Clive Rothwell, Graham Spellman, Suzanne Taylor, John Tyzack, Keith Watts, Stacey Williams and Charlotte Wilson

**Councillors:** Councillor David Allen and Councillor Irene Neill

**Officers:** Cathy Burnham, Shannon Coleman-Slaughter, Carolyn Loosen, Ian Pearson, Jane Seymour and Claire White

---

## SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Monday, 9th March, 2015

5.00 pm in the Shaw House Church Road Newbury RG14 2DR

---

Item and Presenting Officer	Page No.
1 Apologies	
2 Minutes of previous meeting dated 19th January 2015	1 - 8
3 Actions arising from previous meetings	9 - 12
4 Declarations of Interest	
5 Membership	

### Items for Decision

6 DSG Budget 2015/16 - Final Proposals <i>Ian Pearson, Claire White</i>	13 - 18
7 High Needs Budget Proposals 2015/16 <i>Cathy Burnham, Jane Seymour</i>	19 - 50
8 PRU Budget Proposals 2015/16 <i>Cathy Burnham</i>	51 - 54
9 Early Years Budget Proposals 2015/16 <i>Janet Scott</i>	55 - 60
10 Balance Control Scheme for Nursery, Special and PRU Schools <i>Claire White</i>	61 - 64
11 Work Programme for 2015/16 <i>Claire White</i>	65 - 66

### Items for Discussion

None

## Items for Information

- 12 **DSG Monitoring 2014/15 - Month 10** *Shannon Coleman-Slaughter,  
Ian Pearson* 67 - 70
- 13 **Update from the SE Directors of Children's Services Group**

## Any Other Business

### Next Meeting:

**Date: Monday 4th June 2015**

**Time: 5pm**

**Venue: Shaw House**

# Agenda Item 2

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Schools Forum Monday 19<sup>th</sup> January 2015 Shaw House

<b>Present:</b>	Katharine Andrews (substitute)	Primary Schools	School Business Manager	Curridge School
	Jon Hewitt	Special Schools	Headteacher	The Castle School
	Kate House	Primary Schools	Headteacher	The Ilsleys Primary School
	Peter Hudson	Primary Schools	Governor	Mortimer St John's Infant School
	Catherine Morley (arrived item 6)	Primary Schools	Headteacher	Theale Primary School
	Chris Prickett	Primary Schools	Headteacher	Streatley Primary School
	Chris Prosser	Secondary Schools	Headteacher	The Downs School
	David Ramsden	Secondary Schools	Headteacher	Little Heath School
	Clive Rothwell	Secondary Schools	Governor	John O'Gaunt School
	Bruce Steiner (substitute)	Academies	Governor	St Bartholomew's School
	Suzanne Taylor	Nursery Schools	Headteacher	Hungerford Nursery School
	John Tyzack	Primary Schools	Governor	Falkland Primary School
	Stacey Williams (arrived item 7)	Pupil Referral Units	Headteacher	Reintegration Service
	Councillor Irene Neill		Executive Portfolio for C&YP	
	Cathy Burnham		Social Inclusion Manager	
	Shannon Coleman-Slaughter		CYP Finance Manager	
	Carolynn Loosen		Schools' Forum Clerk	
	Ian Pearson		Head of Education	
	Jane Seymour		SEN Service Manager	
	Maria Shepherd		Early Years Manager	
	Claire White		Schools' Finance Manager	
<b>Observer:</b>	Jacquie Davies		Headteacher Alternative Curriculum	
	Ann Kells		Schools' Accountant	
	Rod King		Chair PRU Finance Management Board	

---

				<u>Action</u>
<b>1. APOLOGIES RECEIVED</b>				
Councillor David Allen		Shadow Portfolio Holder for C&YP		
Reverend Mark Bennet	Academies	Governor	Kennet School	
Patricia Brims	Primary Schools	Governor	Brimpton Primary School	
Jeanette Clifford	Academies	Governor	St Bartholomew's School	
Fadia Clarke		FE Representative	Newbury College	
Paul Dick	Academies	Headmaster	Kennet School	
Reverend Mary Harwood		Church of England Representative	Oxford Diocese	
Brian Jenkins		Early Years PVI Representative	Jubilee Day Nursery	
Sheilagh Peacock	Primary Schools	School Business Manager	The Winchcombe School	
Derek People	Academies	Headteacher	Park House School	
Graham Spellman		Roman Catholic Representative	Portsmouth Diocese	
Keith Watts		Union Representative		
Charlotte Wilson	Academies	Headteacher	Trinity School	

## **2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2014**

The minutes of the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> December were approved.

## **3. ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

All the action points that were due for completion from the last meeting have been completed / in progress or are on this meeting's agenda with the exception of the election of the Maintained Primary Headteacher vacancy which will be progressed at the next Primary Heads Forum.

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **5. MEMBERSHIP**

Reverend Mark Bennet has been appointed to the vacant Academies Governor Representative post.

The vacancy for a Maintained Schools Primary Headteacher Representative will be on the agenda at the next Primary Heads Forum meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

## **6. DRAFT DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT BUDGET 2015/16 – OVERVIEW**

Claire White presented the report on the DSG 2015/16 and draft budget. The DfE announced the DSG settlement 2015/16 on 17<sup>th</sup> December.

### **The Schools' Block**

West Berkshire has received a small increase in the per pupil rate of £9 from £4,359 to £4,368, after taking into account the deduction for the carbon reduction commitment, which results in an increase of grant of £198k using the October 2014 census pupil numbers. The increase in per pupil rate is due to the Government allocating additional funding to the least fairly funded local authorities, whereby West Berkshire fell just below average.

The total DSG funding overall has increased by £966k to £96.093m. It is assumed that there will be no carry forward from 2014/15 to 2015/16 as the under spend on the falling rolls fund and growth fund will offset the £166k over spend carried forward in 2014/15. The budget estimate is £95.740m resulting in £353k headroom. The Heads Funding Group recommended that the headroom is to be allocated to schools on a per pupil basis, rather than incorporated into the High Needs Block, particularly as many of the High Needs savings will

require schools and early years' establishments needing to purchase more services if required.

**DECISION: The Schools Forum agreed that the schools block headroom be allocated out to schools.**

### **The Early Years Block**

The funding rate for the early years block will remain the same in 2015/16. For the first time 2 year olds will be funded on a pupil count (5/12ths January 2015 census and 7/12ths January 2016 census). The initial 2015/16 budget is based on forecast numbers and funded hours as the January census data is not yet available.

There is likely to be a significant under spend in 2014/15 (currently estimated at £762k) due to low take up of two year old places. The Early Years Steering Group will be requesting a carry forward of the 2014/15 under spend to maintain funding rates and provide a contingency for the volatility of funding and place take up. The final decision will need to be made at the March meeting.

The current estimate of early years DSG funding 2015/16 is £7.934m and the budget estimate is £7.560m resulting in £374k headroom in 2015/16. This will be updated at the next meeting once data is received from the January 2015 census.

The recommendation from the Heads Funding Group is to retain the early years' headroom to offset any shortfall in both the early years and high needs blocks in 2015/16.

**ACTION: The early years' block 2015/16 will be further considered at the next HFG and a decision will be made at the Schools' Forum meeting in March.**

HFG

### **The High Needs Block**

The High Needs Block has been fixed at the 2014/15 level plus an additional £144k from national headroom and £17k for the full year effect of increases in the 2014/15 academic year places. The bid for funding for additional places in 2015/16 was unsuccessful and will now need to be found from existing grant allocation. It is estimated that £200k will remain of the contingency budget to carry forward into 2015/16. The total High Needs DSG funding is £17.911m and the budget estimate is £18.961m resulting in a shortfall of £1.050m. The savings to be considered in agenda items 8 and 9 amount to £843k which would still mean a shortfall of £207k. The HFG agreed in principle with the savings proposals but asked for further information on outcomes for each service and impacts of the proposed cuts.

**ACTION: The high needs block 2015/16 will be further considered at the next HFG and a decision will be made at the Schools' Forum meeting in March.**

J Seymour /  
HFG

## 7. FINAL SCHOOL BUDGET 2015/16

Claire White presented the report on the primary and secondary school formula and school budget for 2015/16. It was proposed that £767k is recommended for central retention in 2015/16; £250k for the Growth Fund, £40k for the Falling Rolls Fund, £126k for licences, £42k for Schools' Forum and £309k for School Admissions.

The Heads Funding Group recommended that the £767k of Schools' Block funding be centrally retained and that the schools' block headroom of £353k be allocated to schools on a per pupil basis, at £18 per pupil.

**DECISION: The Schools' Forum agreed that £767k should be centrally retained and the schools' block headroom of £353k should be allocated to schools on a per pupil basis. The final pupil rates in the formula will be £2,937 primary and £4,364 secondary. All other rates to remain the same as 2014/15.**

**ACTION: Schools to be notified of their budget allocations for 2015/16.**

C White

## 8. HIGH NEEDS BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/16

Jane Seymour presented the report on the High Needs budget proposals 2015/16.

At the last Schools' Forum the high needs budget proposals were estimated to be £1,931k over the expected funding in 2015/16. It is now expected to be £1,050k following a review of the budget projections using the latest costs and pupil information. The report contained proposed savings of £843k to the proposed budgets 2015/16 which leaves a shortfall of £207k.

The proposed savings are:

Language & Literacy Centres	£67k
Specialist Inclusion Support Service	£36k
SEN Pre School Children	£10k
Cognition & Learning Team	£80k
Equipment for SEN pupils	£13k
Early Intervention	£27k
Medical Support	£5k
PRU Outreach	£80k
Home Tuition	£29k
Vulnerable Children	£20k
Pupil Referral Units (see item 9 on the agenda)	£476k
<b>Total</b>	<b>£843k</b>

Top up funding is statutory and demand driven. Peter Hudson asked Jane Seymour if she could quantify the risk of reducing the non maintained and independent special schools budget estimate by £311k. Jane Seymour stated that it was difficult to predict tribunals and failure of fragile placements but that the previous proposed budget had been too pessimistic.

The Language & Literacy Centres savings proposals could be achieved by rationalising the provision.

The SISS budget could be reduced by reducing the level of support provided or by charging schools for certain aspects of the service.

The SEN Pre School Children budget saving would mean fewer children would be supported, or children receive a lower level of support.

The Cognition and Learning Team would achieve their proposed savings by charging schools for certain services and setting an income target.

The equipment for SEN pupils could be achieved if equipment was only purchased for pupils attending mainstream schools. Special schools would fund the equipment from their own budgets.

The early intervention budget supports the Early Years Language Project but this is not a statutory service so the project could be ceased.

The Medical Support budget has had no spend against it during the last year and therefore the proposal is to delete it.

The PRU Outreach saving could be achieved by reducing the number of outreach sessions pupils receive on re-entering mainstream school with more of the support coming from the school itself.

The Home Tuition saving could be achieved by offering more e-learning packages and reducing external support packages.

The Vulnerable Children Fund is used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency short term basis. The saving could be achieved by changing the criteria either limiting it to primary schools or shortening the term of the support.

The members asked whether merging teams and functions had been investigated. Structural change had not been considered due to cost and time constraints. Joint commissioning of therapy services with other Berkshire authorities is being discussed but this would not affect 2015/16.

**ACTION: Although these proposals were accepted in principle the proposals will be further discussed at the next Heads Funding Group meeting where they will be reconsidered in the light of the further**

J Seymour /  
HFG

**information on quality and outcomes for each service and return to the Schools' Forum for decision on 9<sup>th</sup> March.**

## **9. PRU BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/16**

Cathy Burnham presented the report on the Pupil Referral Units budget proposals 2015/16.

Currently there are four funding bands which are based on the pupil's needs and the staffing ratio requirement.

For pupils in the Reintegration Service primary schools only pay 50% of the lowest band for a maximum of 12 weeks and secondary schools pay the lowest band but for a maximum of 6 weeks. In both primary and secondary the difference between the payment by the school and the band is paid by the High Needs Block.

Where a pupil is in the KS4 Alternative Curriculum the school pays £1500 a term, which is the equivalent of the AWPU, for a maximum of 2 years and the High Needs Block pays the difference between the AWPU and the actual band.

The effect on the High Needs Block is a forecast over spend of £400k in 2014/15 and for this pressure to remain in 2015/16.

The PRUs delegated budgets are forecasting a combined surplus of £400k (Alternative Curriculum £265k and Reintegration Service £135k), which is comprised mostly of contingency for potential running costs.

Ian Pearson read out the comments from Paul Dick and Charlotte Wilson regarding the PRUs surplus balances and questioned the recommended 2% increase in their budgets.

In the short term it is proposed that in the financial year 2015/16 the four current bands are averaged and a single band is used therefore the schools pay a greater proportion of the real costs and also reducing the bureaucracy involved in agreeing which band a pupil should be funded on.

The long term proposal from 2016/17 is that the PRU top up funding budget be delegated to the schools who directly commission services from the PRUs, alternative providers or develop their own resources.

Stacey Williams, Headteacher of the Reintegration Service, spoke on behalf of the PRUs. Stacey stated that there had been no discussion regarding a single band and there were other options including a return to the methodology used in 2013/14. Currently SEN top up funding comes out of the PRU top up funding. Stacey felt that the proposal represented the LA position from the high needs funding point of view, but did not look at how much the PRUs needed to

function. It is the view of the PRUs that the proposal needs more modelling which takes time.

David Ramsden and other members felt that schools should be consulted on these proposals as they also supported the PRUs financially and that these should be examined at the next HFG.

**ACTION: Schools consultation document to be produced on the longer term PRU proposal of delegating the budget from 2016/17.**

**ACTION: Impact data to be produced for HFG and Schools Forum. Report to return to the next Schools' Forum.**

C Burnham /  
HFG

## 10. EARLY YEARS BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/16

Claire White and Maria Shepherd presented the report on the draft early years funding and budget 2015/16.

The current forecast for 2014/15 is an under spend of £762k, which currently includes the estimated January 2015 census and take up during the Spring term. This forecast will be updated at the next Schools Forum once the January census data is available. The under spend is due to the slow take up of 2 year old children compared with the funding provided. The under spend is partly offsetting the over spend on 3 and 4 year old funding.

It is proposed that the overall early years under spend be ring fenced to the early years block and carried forward to continue to plug the shortfall in 3 and 4 year old funding, which will enable funding rates to stay the same in the short term.

Assuming the carry forward from 2014/15 remains in the block the estimated funding for 2015/16 is £7,934k but this will be updated once the January 2015 census data is available.

**ACTION: Final proposals will be presented at the next Schools Forum meeting.**

C White / M  
Shepherd

## 11. UPDATE ON GROWTH FUND AND FALLING ROLLS FUND

Claire White presented the report on the growth fund and falling rolls fund.

Following the October 2014 census all schools were invited to make a funding request if they felt that their circumstances met the growth fund criteria. Six schools (Calcot Junior, John Rankin Infants, Purley, Spurcroft, Theale Primary and The Willows) met the criteria and payments of £148k have been made leaving an unspent balance of £102k in the growth fund.

No schools were eligible for the falling rolls fund as in order to qualify the school needs to have a good or outstanding Ofsted report. The under spend is £120k.

The total under spend of £222k will be carried forward and has been added to the schools block estimate of funding for 2015/16.

## **12. DSG MONITORING 2014/15 – MONTH 9**

Shannon Coleman-Slaughter presented the report on the DSG monitoring 2014/15 as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014.

As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014 the forecast DSG under spend is £193k of which £192k is in the high needs block, although there are areas of pressure within the high needs block; special schools top up funding £104k, academy schools top ups £125k and PRUs £400k. The early years block is forecasting on budget and the schools block is forecasting an under spend of £1k.

## **13. UPDATE FROM THE SE DIRECTORS OF CHILDREN SERVICES GROUP**

This item was carried forward to the next Schools' Forum on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

**I Pearson**

## **14. FORWARD PLAN JANUARY TO MARCH 2015**

Any further items for the forward plan should be sent to Claire White.

**ACTION: Reminder to HFG members regarding requirement to attend the 26<sup>th</sup> February meeting.**

**C Loosen / C White**

### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no items under any other business.

Meeting closed 6.30 p.m.

**Date of next meeting: Monday 9<sup>TH</sup> March 2015**

**Time: 5pm**

**Venue: Shaw House**

# Agenda Item 3

## ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS SCHOOLS' FORUM MEETINGS 2014/15

Ref No.	Date – Item No.	Action	Officer	Comment / Update
1	03/03/14 - 7	Report on investing in West Berkshire high needs provision to further reduce the use of more expensive out of county provision.	J Seymour	To be presented at the HFG on 1st July and SF on 14 <sup>th</sup> July
2	03/03/14 - 8	Mid-year review of PRU funding arrangements.	C Burnham	On SF Agenda 8/12/14
3	03/03/14 - 12	Capita School Funding Conference materials to be emailed to all Schools' Forum members.	C Loosen	Complete – emailed on 7/3/14
4	03/03/14 - 14	Trade Union facility time annual report to be added to the Schools' Forum work programme.	C Loosen	On SF Agenda for 14 <sup>th</sup> July
5	03/03/14 - AOB	Trade Union facility time proposals for the arrangement and budget in 2015/16 to be brought to Schools' Forum.	K Watts & J Milone	To be presented at the HFG on 1st July and SF on 14 <sup>th</sup> July
6	03/03/14 - AOB	Schools' Forum Regulations 2012 (updated) to be emailed to Schools' Forum members.	C Loosen	Complete – emailed on 7/3/14
7	09/06/14 - 5	Election to be held to fill the Primary School Business Manager vacancy.	C Loosen	Complete – appointment made on 30 <sup>th</sup> June
8	09/06/14 - 6	Each school with an excess balance to be informed of the Schools Forum decision.	C White	Complete – each school informed by e-mail on 10 <sup>th</sup> June
9	09/06/14 – 6b	Investigate what other LAs do and determine what should be a reasonable excess surplus balance limit for special schools and PRUS	C White	On SF Agenda 9/3/15
10	09/06/14 - 7	Amendments to be made to the DSG budget as set out in minutes.	C White	Complete – DSG budget updated
11	09/06/14 - 8	Primary schools in financial difficulty money to be made to The Ilsleys	C Loosen	Complete – payment made on 17 <sup>th</sup> June
12	09/06/14 - 9	The scheme for financing schools to be circulated and posted on the West Berkshire website	C Loosen	Complete – posted on website and e-mailed to schools on 17 <sup>th</sup> June

13	09/06/14 - 10	Provide Claire with their opinions on the allocation of the additional DSG funding and any adjustments required to the local formula factors by 20 <sup>th</sup> June.	All SF members	Deadline now passed - 2 members responded
14	09/06/14 - 11	SVFS questions to be taken up with Laura King on behalf of the Schools' Forum	C White	Complete – answers e-mailed to SF members on 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2014
15	14/07/14 - 6	Nominations for Chair to Claire White and Carolynn Loosen	All SF members	Due September meeting
16	14/07/14 - 7	Primary School in Financial Difficulty Funding to Bradfield Primary School	C Loosen	Complete – payment made 17/7/14
17	14/07/14 - 8	2015/16 funding arrangements to be communicated to schools once received from the DfE	C White	Complete – e-mailed to schools on 21 <sup>st</sup> July 2014
18	14/07/14 - 8	Schools to be informed that the consultation with schools will be emailed to the Headteacher the week before the start of the Autumn Term	C White	Complete – consultation e-mailed to schools on 26 <sup>th</sup> August
19	14/07/14 - 13	Funding for Therapy Services detailed report including costings	J Seymour	HFG 25/11/14 SF 08/12/14
20	14/07/14 - 14	Engaging Potential £49k to be vired from the High Needs Block contingency to 90577	S Coleman-Slaughter	
21	14/07/14 - AOB	TU Facilities finance plan	K Watts	Taken to HFG 18/09/14
22	14/07/14 - AOB	Appointment of new Academies Governor Representative	Academy members	Reverend Mark Bennet, the Chair of Governors at Kennet School has been appointed from December 2014
23	29/09/14 - 7	Exceptional Premises Factor submission to be made to the EFA	C White	Submitted to the EFA – approval received from EFA on 10/10/14

24	29/09/14 - 7	Schools Funding Formula 2015/16 to be recommended to the Council's Executive	C White & Irene Neill	Recommendations agreed by the Council's Executive on 9/10/14
25	29/09/14 - 8	Update to be provided on the recruitment of a Portuguese Support Officer by EMS	I Pearson	IP reported on 8/12/14 that Recruitment process has commenced
26	29/09/14 - 8	Properly costed and concise Trade Union de-delegation report to be taken to the HFG 25/11/14	S Coleman-Slaughter & I Pearson	HFG 25/11/14 SF 08/12/14
27	08/12/14 - 5	Primary Heads Forum to appoint a replacement representative	I Pearson	To go to PHF on 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2015
28	08/12/14 - 6	HFG to investigate options to balance the high needs block and make recommendation to SF	HFG	HFG 8/1/15 SF 19/1/15
29	08/12/14 - 9	Budget estimates for high needs block to be reviewed and provide impact analysis against each service	J Seymour	HFG 8/1/15 SF 19/1/15
30	08/12/14 - 10	More detailed report on PRU budget proposals to be produced	C. Burnham	HFG 8/1/15 SF 19/1/15
31	08/12/14 - 14	Sub group to be formed to put together ideas for SEND funding reform – call for evidence	J. Seymour	
32	08/12/14 - 15	Reminder to HFG members regarding importance of 8 <sup>th</sup> January meeting	C White	Excellent attendance at 8 <sup>th</sup> January meeting
33	08/12/14 - AOB	Update to be brought to next meeting following discussion at SE DCS group on concern about school funding	I Pearson	To SF on 9/3/15
34	19/1/15 - 6	Decision on EY block carry forward to be further considered by HFG	HFG	Considered by HFG on 26/2/15
35	19/1/15 – 6 & 8	HNB savings to be further considered by HFG	HFG & J. Seymour	Considered by HFG on 26/2/15
36	19/1/15 - 7	All schools to be notified of their 2015/16 budget allocation	C. White	Schools e-mailed on 21/1/15
37	19/1/15 - 9	PRU budget proposals impact data to be produced for next HFG/SF	C. Burnham	HFG 26/2/15 SF 9/3/15

38	19/1/15 - 9	Consult schools on longer term proposals for PRUs	C. Burnham	
39	19/1/15 - 10	Final proposals on EY budget to be brought to next SF	C. White & EY Manager	SF 9/3/15
40	19/1/15 - 14	Remind HFG members to attend next HFG meeting	C. White & C. Loosen	

<b>West Berkshire Schools' Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget for 2015/16 – Final Proposals</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Claire White</b>
<b>For Decision</b>	

## 1. School Funding Settlement 2015/16

1.1 The Department for Education (DfE) announced the provisional school funding (DSG) settlement for 2015/16 on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014. DSG funding is split into 3 funding blocks – schools, early years and high needs, each calculated in a different way. Although the blocks are not ring fenced, they provide a guideline on how the total funding should be allocated, and where possible the aim should be to maintain this. A breakdown showing the calculation of each funding block is provided in Appendix A and a detailed explanation of each figure was provided in the report which came to the last meeting.

1.2 **Schools Block.** The DSG allocation for 2015/16 is now fixed by the DfE, though the funding available may change if there is any carry forward from the current financial year to next. The total allocation for the year is £96.093m, and it has been assumed there will be no carry forward of funds

1.3 **Early Years Block.** The current allocation received from the DfE is based on the three and four year olds counted in the January 2014 census, whereas the final allocation will be based 5/12 on the January 2015 census and 7/12 on the January 2016 census of two, three and four year olds. The 2015/16 budget has been based on the January 2015 census and assumes an in-year increase in funding of two year old funding due to the probable increase in numbers of two year olds accessing the free entitlement. The allocation is calculated as £6.109m for 3 and 4 year olds and £0.823m for two year olds. The latest forecast for 2014/15 indicates an underspend of £0.722m and this figure has been added to the estimated resources. The Early Years Steering Group is requesting a carry forward of the total sum as one-off funding in order to maintain funding rates to providers in 2015/16.

1.4 **High Needs Block.** The High Needs block funding for 2015/16 is now fixed at £17.711m. It is currently assumed there will be a carry forward of £200k to 2015/16 as one-off funding, meaning an overall reduction in funding in this block.

## 2. Final Budget Proposal for 2015/16

2.1 The following table summarises the DSG allocations per block compared to the proposed expenditure. The schools budget was agreed and set at the last meeting of the Schools' Forum. The balance is due to the licences cost now

notified by the DfE being slightly lower than estimated. The Early years block has been updated following receipt of January 2015 census data and now shows it close to balance. There has been few change made to the High Needs proposals though further information is now provided on these proposals. A detailed breakdown of the budget, split between the three blocks is shown in Appendix B.

	<b>DSG Funding £'000</b>	<b>Budget Proposed £'000</b>	<b>Headroom/ (Shortfall) £'000</b>	<b>Proposals £'000</b>	<b>Net Position £'000</b>
<b>Schools Block</b>	96,093	96,090	3		3
<b>Early Years Block</b>	7,729	7,715	14		14
<b>High Needs Block</b>	17,911	18,951	(1,040)	835	(205)
<b>Total</b>	<b>121,733</b>	<b>122,756</b>	<b>(1,023)</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>(187)</b>

2.2 The detailed budget proposals for the early years and high needs blocks is set out in separate reports on this agenda, which include savings proposals for the high needs block.

**Recommendation from Heads Funding Group:**

1. Agree all the High Needs savings EXCEPT for the Language and Literacy Units (LAL) of £67,300.
2. Agree the Early Years budget.
3. The shortfall balance of £254k will likely be met from the current year under spend in the High Needs Block.

**Appendices**

Appendix A – Estimated DSG Funding 2015/16

Appendix B – Proposed DSG Budget 2015/16

## Appendix A

<b>Estimated DSG Funding 2015/16 as at 20th FEBRUARY 2015</b>			
1		Final 2014/15	Estimate 2015/16
2		Oct 2013 census	Oct 2014 census
3	<b>SCHOOLS BLOCK</b>		
4	Pupil Numbers		
5	School Census - Mainstream	21,922.0	22,062.0
6	Add: Reception Uplift	46.0	49.0
7	Less: Pupils/Places in Resource Units	-119.0	-119.0
8	<b>Total Pupil numbers</b>	<b>21,849.0</b>	<b>21,992.0</b>
9			
10	DSG Guaranteed Unit of Funding	£4,359.00	£4,367.93
11	DSG based on pupil numbers	£95,239,791	£96,059,517
12			
13	Plus: Adjustment for NQT	£33,115	£33,115
14	Less: Reduction for Carbon Reduction Commitment	-£123,140	
15			
16	ADD Carry Forward from Previous Year	-£23,050	£0
17			
18	<b>Total Schools Block including Academies</b>	<b>95,126,716</b>	<b>96,092,632</b>
19			
20	<b>EARLY YEARS BLOCK (Provisional)</b>	<b>Jan 2014 census</b>	<b>Jan 2015 census</b>
21	Pupil Numbers (FTE)		
22	School Census - Mainstream	421.0	422.0
23	Early Years Census	1,114.0	1,140.0
24	Adjustment for universal provision	0.0	0.0
25	<b>Total Pupil numbers</b>	<b>1,535.0</b>	<b>1,562.0</b>
26			
27	DSG Guaranteed Unit of Funding	£3,911.00	£3,911.00
28	DSG based on pupil numbers	£6,003,385	£6,108,982
29			
30	Difference in provision for DSG due in previous year:		
31	Provision for estimated DSG	-£170,090.00	
32	Actual DSG	£175,680.00	
33			
34	Two Year Old Funding 14/15	£1,316,928	
35	DSG Guaranteed Unit of Funding 2 Year Olds 15/16 (FTE)		£5,092.00
36	Estimated number of 2 year olds per counts (FTE)		162
37	DSG based on estimated number of 2 year olds		£823,224
38			
39	Plus Indicative Early Years PPG		£74,590
40			
41	ADD Carry Forward from Previous Year	£530,114	£722,400
42			
43	<b>Total Early Years Block</b>	<b>7,856,017</b>	<b>7,729,196</b>
44			
45	<b>HIGH NEEDS BLOCK</b>		
46	Previous Year High Needs Budget	16,587,354	17,550,154
47	Adjustments:		
48	Less NMSS grant in previous year	-40,974	
49	Add NMSS grant in current year	43,254	
50	Funding Adjustment	446,218	17,000
51	Place number review adjustments	17,007	
52	Additional Funding	489,977	144,000
53	Additional PRU post 16 place	7,318	
54	ADD Carry Forward from Previous Year	999,890	200,000
55			
56	<b>Total High Needs Block</b>	<b>18,550,044</b>	<b>17,911,154</b>
57			
58	<b>TOTAL DSG FUNDING AVAILABLE</b>	<b>121,532,777</b>	<b>121,732,981</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed DSG Budget 2015/16 as at 20th February 2015

4	B Description	C Cost Centre	D Agresso 2014/15 Original	E In Year Virements	F Remove "one-off" Budgets	G add back SSRs	H add back HN 6th form & academy	I add back De- Delegation	J Base Budget 2015-16	K Budget Adjustments	L Change to Budget Submitted	M Draft Budget 2015-16	N Proposals	O Final Budget 2015-16	P DSG Grant	Q Balance Under / (Over) spend	R Adjustments for Budget Book/Agresso						
																	R SSR's Remove	S De- delegations Approved by SF	T Balance of Funding to Contingency	U Academy & HN 6th Form Recoupment	V Council DSG Budget		
5	<b>Schools Block</b>																						
6	Primary Schools (excluding nursery funding)	90020	46,433,670					458,150	46,891,820		932,680	47,824,500	186,490	48,010,990				-553,230				47,457,760	
7	Academy Schools Primary	DSG top slice	0				1,881,610		1,881,610		20,160	1,901,770	8,770	1,910,540								1,910,540	0
8	Secondary Schools (excluding 6th form funding)	90025	16,621,740					42,950	16,664,690		-7,640	16,657,050	54,390	16,711,440				-60,950					16,650,490
9	Academy Schools Secondary	DSG top slice	0				28,941,010		28,941,010		-351,640	28,589,370	104,070	28,693,440								28,693,440	0
10	Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools)	90230	115,470	115,680	-115,680			-115,470	0			0		0								115,110	115,110
11	Trade Union Costs Primary	90112	24,960					-24,960	0			0		0								29,080	29,080
12	Trade Union Costs Secondary	90117	11,880					-11,880	0			0		0								14,000	14,000
13	Support to Ethnic minority & bilingual Learners	90255	168,130			19,800		-187,930	0			0		0						22,200		244,210	222,010
14	Behaviour Support Services	90349	142,060			18,800		-160,860	0			0		0						19,240		211,780	192,540
15	School Contingency - Growth Fund/Falling Rolls Fund	90235	370,000	-166,110					203,890	166,110	-80,000	290,000		290,000								2,522	292,522
16	CLA/MPA Licences	90583	76,120						76,120		46,290	122,410		122,410							0		122,410
17	Servicing of Schools Forum	90019	42,220						42,220			42,220		42,220						5,380		42,220	36,840
18	School Admissions	90743	180,450			128,620			309,070			309,070		309,070						126,180			182,890
19	<b>Schools Block Total Expenditure</b>		<b>64,186,700</b>	<b>-50,430</b>	<b>-115,680</b>	<b>167,220</b>	<b>30,822,620</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95,010,430</b>	<b>166,110</b>	<b>559,850</b>	<b>95,736,390</b>	<b>353,720</b>	<b>96,090,110</b>	<b>96,092,632</b>	<b>2,522</b>	<b>173,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,522</b>	<b>30,603,980</b>			<b>65,315,652</b>
20																							
21	<b>Early Years Block</b>																						
22	Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	90010	809,470						809,470		-740	808,730		808,730									808,730
23	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	90037	1,112,950						1,112,950		-32,850	1,080,100		1,080,100									1,080,100
24	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	90036	4,308,760						4,308,760		417,710	4,726,470		4,726,470									4,726,470
25	Early Years Funding - Contingency	90051	354,540	-96,330	-258,210				0			0		0								14,486	14,486
26	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	NEW									209,590	209,590		209,590									209,590
27	2 year old funding	90018	1,267,230						1,267,230		-457,230	810,000		810,000									810,000
28	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	90017	72,300			27,090			99,390		-19,570	79,820		79,820						32,140			47,680
29	<b>Early Years Block Total</b>		<b>7,925,250</b>	<b>-96,330</b>	<b>-258,210</b>	<b>27,090</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,597,800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>116,910</b>	<b>7,714,710</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,714,710</b>	<b>7,729,196</b>	<b>14,486</b>	<b>32,140</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,486</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>7,697,056</b>
30																							
31	<b>High Needs Block</b>																						
32	Special Schools - Place Funding Pre 16	90540	2,860,000	25,000					2,885,000	-25,000		2,860,000		2,860,000									2,860,000
33	Special Schools - Place Funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0				456,700		456,700	3,300		460,000		460,000								460,000	0
34	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	90539	2,465,120						2,465,120	265,820		2,730,940		2,730,940									2,730,940
35	Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	90548	663,900						663,900	71,340		735,240		735,240									735,240
36	Resource Units - Place Funding Maintained Pre 16	90584	500,000	12,500					512,500	-12,500		500,000		500,000									500,000
37	Resource Units - Place Funding Academies Pre 16	DSG top slice	0				677,500		677,500	12,500		690,000		690,000								690,000	0
38	Mainstream - Place funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0				30,000		30,000	6,000		36,000		36,000								36,000	0
39	Academies - Place Funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0				128,670		128,670	-8,670		120,000		120,000								120,000	0
40	Resource Units - Top Up Funding Maintained	90617	335,060						335,060	-5,830		329,230		329,230									329,230
41	Resource Units - Top Up Funding Academies	90026	252,610						252,610	167,120		419,730		419,730									419,730
42	Non WBC Resource Units - Top Up Funding	90618	15,300						15,300	12,560		27,860		27,860									27,860
43	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Maintained	90621	572,830						572,830	-62,850		509,980		509,980									509,980
44	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	90622	161,940						161,940	51,300		213,240		213,240									213,240
45	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	90624	50,700						50,700	11,450		62,150		62,150									62,150
46	Pupil Referral Units - Place Funding	90320	672,000						672,000	168,000		840,000		840,000									840,000
47	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	90625	1,205,500	7,320	-7,320				1,205,500	-168,000	500,000	1,537,500	-476,500	1,061,000									1,061,000
48	Non WBC PRU's - Top Up Funding	90626	0						0			0		0									0
49	Non Maintained Special School Place Funding pre 16	DSG top slice	0				156,660		156,660	-26,660		130,000		130,000								130,000	0
50	Non Maintained Special School Place Funding post 16	DSG top slice	0				70,980		70,980	29,020		100,000		100,000								100,000	0
51	Non Maintained Special School Top Up	90575	889,740						889,740	15,580		905,320		905,320									905,320
52	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	90579	1,476,030						1,476,030	107,820		1,583,850		1,583,850									1,583,850
53	Further Education Colleges Top Up	90580	1,345,340						1,345,340	-355,300		990,040		990,040									990,040
54	Contingency for in year Top Ups	90237	1,500,780	-721,860	-778,920				0			0		0								-204,306	-204,306
55	LAL Funding	90555	134,600						134,600			134,600	-67,300	67,300									67,300
56	HN Outreach Special schools	90585	105,650						105,650			105,650	-35,650	70,000									70,000
57	HN Outreach PRU	90582	197,000						197,000			197,000	-80,000	117,000									117,000
58	Applied Behaviour Analysis (APB)	90240	138,630						138,630	-27,900		110,730		110,730									110,730
59	Sen Pre School Children	90238	50,210			20,724			70,934	1,596		72,530	-10,000	62,530						22,320			40,210
60	Special Needs Support Team	90280	318,300			131,379			449,679	38,981		488,660	-80,000	408,660						146,710			261,950
61	Sensory Impairment	90290	227,440			93,877			321,317	7,223		328,540		328,540						101,100			227,440
62	Home Tuition	90315	282,000						282,000	46,500		328,500	-28,500	300,000									300,000
63	Equipment For SEN Pupils	90565	38,470			15,879			54,349	-4,249		50,100	-30,100	20,000						0			20,000
64	SEN Commissioned Provision (Engaging Potential)	90577	459,110			189,501			648,611	39,159		687,770	32,000	719,770						179,510			540,260
65	ASD Teachers	90830	119,950			49,510			169,460	11,800		181,260		181,260						53,320			127,940
66	Early Intervention	90957	33,510			13,831			47,341	-5,591		41,750	-34,200	7,550						0			7,550
67	Vulnerable Children	90961	80,000						80,000			80,000	-20,000	60,000						0			

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>West Berkshire Schools' Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>High Needs Budget Proposals 2015-16</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Jane Seymour, Cathy Burnham</b>
<b>For Decision</b>	

## 1. Background

- 1.1 This report sets out existing 2014-15 High Needs budgets and budget proposals for 2015-16.
- 1.2 Budget proposals for 2015-16 were originally considered by the Heads' Funding Group in November 2014 and again in January 2015.
- 1.3 Due to a number of factors including there being no increase in the High Needs Block, a smaller carry forward than in previous years and pressure in specific areas of expenditure, the HNB budgets proposed in November 2014 significantly exceeded HNB income.
- 1.4 Further work has been done to bring down budget projections where possible. In addition, a number of possible savings were put forward for consideration at the January meeting of the HFG, together with information on the impact of services and the potential consequences of making savings in specific areas.
- 1.5 HFG Members asked for additional information on the impact of services to inform decision making, which has been provided in this report.
- 1.6 This report does not deal with Pupil Referral Units which are the subject of a separate report.

## 2. Mainstream Schools - STATUTORY

- 2.1 There budget proposed for mainstream top ups has not changed since the November report to HFG.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>

90621	Mainstream top up (maintained)	572,830	509,980	509,980
90622	Mainstream top up (academies)	161,940	213,240	213,240
	TOTAL	734,770	723,220	723,220

### 3. Resourced Units attached to Mainstream Schools - STATUTORY

3.1 Resourced unit top up budget proposals have been reviewed and some anomalies have been identified. It has been possible to set revised 15-16 budgets which are lower than the 15-16 budgets proposed in November.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90584	Resource units place funding	512,500	535,833	500,000
90617	Resource units top up maintained	335,060	332,366	329,228
90026	Resource units top up academies	252,610	451,876	419,730

### 4. Special Schools - STATUTORY

4.1 More detailed work has been done on the special school place and top up requirements for 2015-16. It has been possible to set revised budgets which are lower than the original 15-16 proposed budgets.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90540	Special schools place funding (pre 16)	2,885,000	2,885,000	2,860,000
90539	Special schools top up funding	2,465,120	2,744,827	2,730,942

### 5. Non West Berkshire Mainstream, Resourced and Special Schools - STATUTORY

5.1 The non West Berkshire mainstream and resourced school top up budget proposals remain the same.

5.2 The non West Berkshire special school top up budget proposal has been reviewed. It has been possible to set a revised 15-16 budget which is lower than the 15-16 budget proposed in November.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
90624	Non WBC mainstream top up	50,700	62,150	62,150
90618	Non WBC resource unit top up	15,300	27,860	27,860
90548	Non WBC special school top up	663,900	825,025	735,240

## **6. Non maintained and Independent Special Schools - STATUTORY**

6.1 The proposed budget for non maintained and independent special school placements in 2015-16 was originally based on a number of assumptions including the possibility of several currently fragile placements breaking down and all current Tribunal cases being lost, that is, it was based on a fairly pessimistic view of likely new placements.

6.2 These assumptions have been reviewed and a revised figure has been identified which is lower than the original proposed budget.

6.3 There are some risks in setting the budget at this level as it is impossible to predict which pupils will need out of area placements, but the original budget proposed budget was based on a worst case scenario position which is probably unlikely to be reached.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
90575	Non maintained special school top up			
90579	Independent special school top up			
	<b>Combined budget</b>	2,365,770	2,800,000	2,489,170

## **7. FE College Placements - STATUTORY**

7.1 The proposed budget for FE College placements has not been changed since the November HFG report.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
90580	FE College top up	1,345,340	990,040	990,040

## **8. Language and Literacy Centres (LALs) – NON STATUTORY**

- 8.1 This budget funds the primary LALs at Theale and Winchcombe schools. The LALs provide intensive literacy support for primary children with severe specific literacy difficulties. 48 places per year are available across the two LALs.
- 8.2 It would be possible to close one LAL as the teacher in charge has resigned and has not yet been replaced. This would achieve a saving of £67,300.
- 8.3 See Appendix 1 for information on the impact of LALs and the possible impact / risks if LAL provision were to be reduced and also Appendix 11 for detailed feedback from parents on the service.
- 8.4 Referrals for LAL places usually exceed places available by approximately 24 per year. For September 2015 we have identified 70 possible LAL candidates, so there would be an excess of referred pupils to places of 22 pupils if LAL capacity remains the same at 48 places. If one LAL is closed, there could be 70 referred pupils competing for just 24 places, leaving 46 children without LAL provision.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90555	Language and Literacy Centres	134,600	134,600	67,300	67,300

## **9. Specialist Inclusion Support Service – NON STATUTORY**

- 9.1 This service provides outreach support from West Berkshire's special schools to mainstream schools to support the inclusion of children with learning and complex needs in their local mainstream schools.
- 9.2 This budget could be reduced by a proposed amount of £35,650 if either a lower level of service were to be offered or if schools paid for certain aspects of the service.
- 9.3 See Appendix 2 for information on the impact of the SISS Service and the possible impact / risks if SISS provision were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90585	Specialist Inclusion Support Service	105,650	105,650	70,000	35,650

## **10. Applied Behavioural Analysis (ABA) and Other Educational Programmes - STATUTORY**

- 10.1 This budget supports a small number of statemented children for whom the Authority has agreed an ABA programme as part of their statement. ABA is an intensive intervention programme for children with autism which aims to modify behaviours which are typical of ASD in order to allow children to function more successfully in school and in society.
- 10.2 This budget also covers the cost of statemented children accessing other “miscellaneous” educational programmes, such as The Lighthouse Project etc where this is the most appropriate and cost effective way of meeting their needs.
- 10.3 The proposed budget for 2015-16 has not changed since the November HFG report. The predicted budget requirement is based on existing children with Statements of Special Educational needs who will still be in their placement in 2015-16 and therefore funding cannot be withdrawn or reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
90240	Applied Behavioural Analysis	138,630	110,730	110,730

## **11. SEN Pre School Children – NON STATUTORY**

- 11.1 This budget provides one to one support to enable children with SEN to access non maintained and voluntary pre- school settings.
- 11.2 If fewer children were supported or children were offered lower levels of support, it could be possible to make a reduction in this budget of £10,000.
- 11.3 See Appendix 3 for information on the impact of this funding and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90238	SEN Pre School Children	50,210	50,210	40,210	10,000

## **12. Cognition and Learning Team (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team) – NON STATUTORY**

- 12.1 The Cognition and Learning Team (CALT) provides advice, support and training to mainstream schools to help them to meet the needs of children with SEN.
- 12.2 A reduction in this budget of £80,000 could be made by charging schools for certain aspects of the service and setting an income target.
- 12.3 See Appendix 4 for information on the impact of the Cognition and Learning Team and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced and charging were to be implemented.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90280	CALT Team	318,300	341,950	261,950	80,000

## **13. Sensory Impairment – STATUTORY / NON STATUTORY**

- 13.1 Support for children with hearing, visual and multi sensory impairments is purchased from the Berkshire Sensory Consortium Service. This includes support from qualified teachers of HI and VI, audiology and mobility support. The service supports both stated and non stated children.
- 13.2 West Berkshire Council has a contract with the Sensory Consortium Service which is due for renewal in April 2016, so it is not possible to reduce this budget in 2015-16 but it may be possible to explore savings for 2016-17.
- 13.3 See Appendix 5 for information on the impact of the SCS and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

90290	Sensory Impairment	227,440	227,440	227,440
-------	--------------------	---------	---------	---------

#### 14. Equipment for SEN Pupils - STATUTORY

- 14.1 This budget funds large items of equipment such as specialist chairs and communication aids for statemented pupils.
- 14.2 This budget could be reduced by £13,000 if equipment was only purchased for children attending mainstream and resourced schools and special schools were expected to fund these large items of equipment from their own budgets.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90565	Equipment for SEN pupils	38,470	33,000	20,000	13,000

#### 15. Engaging Potential - STATUTORY

- 15.1 Engaging Potential is a commissioned service providing alternative educational packages for 14 young people in Key Stage 4 with statements for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties whose needs cannot be met in any other provision. An increase in this budget was agreed during 2014-15 because of the need for the project to employ more specialist teaching staff as the group dynamics are such that several students need to be taught on a one to one basis rather than in small groups. Premises costs have also increased since the project was moved to more suitable accommodation.
- 15.2 West Berkshire Council's contract with Engaging Potential has been varied to reflect the higher level of funding agreed in 2013-14. It is therefore not possible to reduce this budget prior to July 2015 when the current contract is due for renewal.
- 15.3 The tendering process is currently underway for a new contract starting in August 2015 which may create opportunities for negotiating a lower price.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	459,110	540,260	540,260

## 16. ASD Advisory Service – NON STATUTORY

- 16.1 The ASD Advisory Service provides advice, support and training for mainstream schools on meeting the needs of children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder.
- 16.2 It is not recommended that any reductions are made in this budget due to the significant increase in ASD diagnosis and the pressure for specialist placements for children with ASD.
- 16.3 See Appendix 6 for information on the impact of the ASD Service and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90830	ASD Advisory Service	119,950	127,940	127,940

## 17. Early Intervention – NON STATUTORY

- 17.1 This budget funds the Early Years Language Project. The project supports early intervention for children in pre schools, Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1 with speech and language difficulties, including training for staff in settings and schools and for parents.
- 17.2 Whilst the project has been well received over a number of years, its provision is not a statutory requirement so the project could be ceased if funds are not available for it to continue.
- 17.3 For historical reasons, a proportion of the salary of one of the ASD advisory teachers is charged to this budget, amounting to £7,550 per annum. This sum needs to be retained and vired to the ASD Service budget (see section 16 of this report above).
- 17.4 A saving of £19,300 could be made if the Early Years Language Project were to cease.
- 17.5 There would be no redundancy costs as project staff are on temporary contracts.
- 17.6 See Appendix 7 for information on the impact of the Early Years Language project and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be lost.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
-------------	-------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

90957	Early Intervention	33,510	26,850	0	19,300
-------	--------------------	--------	--------	---	--------

### 18. SEN Inclusion – NON STATUTORY

18.1 This budget supplements the Cognition and Learning Team budget (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team).

18.2 No changes to this specific budget are proposed, though a savings target for the main CALT team budget is included in Section 12 of this report.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90965	SEN Inclusion	28,780	29,320	29,320

### 19. Medical Support – NON STATUTORY

19.1 This budget has historically been used to fund support for children in mainstream schools with medical needs.

19.2 There were no requests from schools for funding from this budget last year.

19.3 It is proposed that the budget is deleted.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Jan 15	Possible saving
	Medical Support	0 (in DSG)	5,000	0	5,000

### 20. Therapy Services – STATUTORY

20.1 Therapy Services for children with SEN who have speech therapy or occupational therapy in their Statements are currently funded from the Education Service budget.

20.2 A report was brought to the Heads' Funding Group and the Schools' Forum in November / December to request that therapy services be funded from DSG, in line with the practice in the majority of Local Authorities, given the need for significant savings in the Education Service budget.

20.3 It is not recommended that there is any reduction in this budget as therapy services are provided by the Authority solely to children who have

the need for a service stipulated and quantified in their Statement, and therefore any reduction in service would be unlawful and likely to lead to litigation including judicial reviews.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>
	Therapy Services	0 (in DSG)	315,430	315,430

## **21. PRU Outreach – NON STATUTORY**

- 21.1 The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy / outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the Reintegration Service and are starting to attend a mainstream school.
- 21.2 Savings could be made to this budget if schools were prepared to support pupils on reintegration into their schools, or reduce the number of outreach sessions they received.
- 21.3 See Appendix 8 for information on the impact of the PRU Outreach Service and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90582	PRU Outreach Service	197,000	197,000	117,000	80,000

## **22. Home Tuition – STATUTORY**

- 22.1 The Home Tuition Service is a statutory service providing home tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full time school.
- 22.2 It might be possible to reduce this budget if the Home Tuition Service offered more e-learning packages and reduced external support packages.
- 22.3 See Appendix 9 for information on the impact of the Home Tuition Service and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------

			<b>Nov 14</b>	<b>Feb 15</b>	
90315	Home Tuition	282,000	328,500	300,000	28,500

### 23. Vulnerable Children – NON STATUTORY

- 23.1 The Vulnerable Children Fund is a small budget used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short term basis.
- 23.2 It would be possible to reduce this budget if the number of schools able to access it were reduced (eg. primary only) and / or if the criteria were tightened, for example, funding given for shorter periods, no funding extensions.
- 23.3 See Appendix 10 for information about the impact of this funding and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

<b>Cost centre</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>2014/15 budget</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Nov 14</b>	<b>15-16 budget proposed Feb 15</b>	<b>Possible saving</b>
90961	Vulnerable Children	80,000	80,000	60,000	20,000

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – Language and Literacy Centres (LALs)**

The two LALs in West Berkshire (at Theale and Winchcombe schools) provide intensive literacy support for 48 primary children per year who attend for half a day per week for two and a half terms in Year 5.

#### **Activity Data**

48 children per year attend for half a day per week for two and a half terms in Year 5.

On average, over the last four years, there have been 24 children per year who were referred for a LAL place but were not allocated one as places are limited to 48.

#### **Impact of Service.**

- Over the last 3 years, children attending LAL have made the following progress in reading and spelling:  
Salford Reading Test: between 16 and 78 months progress.  
WRAT Reading Test: between 6 and 72 months progress.  
Helen Arkell Spelling Test: between 15 and 81 months progress.
- In the 13-14 academic year, children who attended the LALs made average gains in reading and spelling of:  
Salford Reading Test: 21 months gain  
WRAT Reading Test: 14.5 months gain  
HAST Spelling Test: 16.8 months gain  
(Measured over an 8 month period)
- An example of parent feedback on LAL provision for the 2013-14 academic year is attached at Appendix 11.

### **Value for money**

The annual cost of the LALs is £134,600. 48 children attend per year, therefore the unit cost per LAL place is £2804. This equates to an hourly cost of approximately £29 per hour including overheads.

### **Options / Recommendations**

- It would be possible to close one LAL in April 2015 as the teacher in charge is due to retire. Saving £67,300

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

- LAL capacity would reduce by 50%
- Children who do not get LAL places may not have their needs fully met in their primary schools
- Funding pressure on primary schools to provide more specialist dyslexia support from their own SEN budgets (this can cost in excess of £60 per hour if bought in)
- Schools would need additional support and training
- Parental dissatisfaction and complaints
- Possible increase in requests for Education, Health and Care Plans
- Possible increase in appeals to the SEN Tribunal
- Increase in transport costs to the one remaining LAL

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – Specialist Inclusion Support Service (SISS)**

The SISS Service (provided by Castle and Brookfields Schools) provides support to children in mainstream schools who have significant learning difficulties and may have other associated difficulties. Advice is given on teaching strategies and resources to enable children to access the mainstream curriculum.

### **Activity Data**

The service supported 90 children during the course of the 2013-14 academic year.

49 schools used the service in the 2013-14 academic year.

### Impact of Service

- Feedback from mainstream schools is as follows:
  - Overall satisfaction with service:*
    - 43% excellent
    - 29% good
  - Quality of advice:*
    - 50% excellent
    - 25% good
  - Progress of pupils:*
    - 8% excellent
    - 58% good
    - 34% satisfactory
- The table below shows progress made by children on the SISS caseload of one special school, *based on those who are still on the caseload in 2014-15* (hence the low numbers in previous academic years as some children will have come off caseload during that time).

### SISS Progress data: for pupils on current caseload (2014-15)

Year	Subject	Average gain in sub levels across the year	Data based on this number of pupils and other comments
<b>2010-11</b>	Number	1.0	5
	Space, shape, measures	0.8	4
	Using and applying	1.0	5
	Reading	1.0	5
	Writing	1.0	5
<b>2011-12</b>	Number	1.2	5
	Space, shape, measures	0.6	5
	Using and applying	0.5	2
	Reading	0.6	5
	Writing	0.8	5
<b>2012-13</b>	Number	1.0	9
	Space, shape, measures	1.2	9

	Using and applying	1.0	1
	Reading	1.9	8
	Writing	0.4	4
<b>2013-14</b>	Numeracy	0.9	11 (From 2013, combined score for numeracy is used)
	Reading	1.2	11
	Writing	1.1	11

### Value for money

The annual cost of the service is £105,650. 90 children were supported during the 2013-14 academic year, giving a unit cost per child of £1173.88. Levels of involvement can vary from a one off assessment to more sustained intervention and support.

### Options / Recommendations

- It would be possible to either reduce the capacity of the service or charge schools for all or certain aspects of the service
- Reduce budget to £70,000. Saving of £35,650.

### Possible impact of savings / risks

- Increase in demand for other services such as the ASD Mainstream Service and the Cognition and Learning Team
- Increase in EHC Assessment requests
- Increase in demand for special school places
- Financial impact on schools if charges are levied
- Inequity of access to the service for children depending on which schools are able to pay

## APPENDIX 3

### HNB Savings 2015-16 – SEN Pre School Children

This budget provides funding for one to one support to allow children with significant SEN to access early years settings and take up their 15 hours Government funded pre school provision.

### Activity Data

In the 2012-13 financial year, 41 children accessed funding.

In the 2013-14 financial year, 42 children accessed funding.

In the 2014-15 financial year, so far 48 children have accessed funding.

### **Impact of Service**

- 100% of the children who accessed funding were able to attend a pre school setting and would not have been able to do so without the one to one support funded from this budget as early years settings do not have delegated SEN budgets. All children who access funding have a SEN / disability of a severity which would render their attendance unsafe or impractical without 1 to 1 support.
- Most of these children are known to the Pre School Teacher Counsellor Service. Their progress towards targets in their individual plans is monitored by the Pre School Teacher Counsellor and the early years setting at the PSTC's regular monitoring visits.
- Early intervention provided through this budget can help to avoid the need for a Statement / EHC Plan. Of the 27 children who accessed funding in 2013-14, 44% went on to have a Statement / EHC Plan.
- Early intervention provided through this budget can help to avoid the need for specialist placements in resourced or special schools. The % of children who accessed funding from this budget and who went on to specialist placements in 2013-14 was just 11%.
- The Council received no complaints and no disability discrimination claims in respect of children with disabilities being unable to take up their free early years entitlement due to lack of one to one support to enable them to access it.

### **Value for money**

The budget for one to one support in early years settings was £33,510 in 2014-15 and so far 48 children have accessed funding, giving a unit cost of £698 per child.

### **Options / Recommendations**

- A small reduction in this budget could be made of £10,000 by reducing the number of children supported or reducing the amount of support available to each child
- It is not possible to make savings by reducing the hourly rate as support staff are paid minimum wage

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

- Some children with SEN may not be able to access early years education as they would not get any or enough support
- Children would therefore be ill prepared for their move in to school and may be more likely to need a special school placement
- More pressure on the PSTC Service as the service currently discharges children after a set period of time in an early years setting. Children would need to remain on caseload if they did not go in to an early years setting, increasing waiting times for other children to be allocated a Pre School Teacher Counsellor.

- Possible increase in requests for EHC assessments in order to access support through this route and therefore also additional pressure on the mainstream top up budget
- The Council could be vulnerable to claims of disability discrimination as some children with SEN could be prevented from accessing early years education.

## **APPENDIX 4**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – Cognition and Learning Team (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team)**

The CALT Team consists of 4.7 FTE SEN teachers and provides support and training for schools in relation to SEN provision and practice. Activities include support for SENCOs, modelling intervention programmes, training and assessments.

#### **Activity Data**

In 2013-14 the team undertook 727 school visits (637 primary, 76 secondary and 14 PRUs). This averages as 10 visits per year per primary school and 8 visits per year per secondary school.

#### **Impact of Service**

- Feedback from schools shows high levels of satisfaction:
  - Overall quality of service:*
  - 96% Excellent*
  - 4% Good*
  - Quality of reports:*
  - 85% Excellent*
  - 15% Good*
  - Quality of training:*
  - 87% Excellent*
  - 13% Good*
  - Impact on pupil progress:*
  - 8% Excellent*
  - 59% Good*
  - 33% Satisfactory*
- The Team supports schools with implementation of specific literacy and numeracy programmes, including modelling teaching strategies, training staff including TAs and carrying out pre and post intervention assessments of children. For example, in 2013-14, 29 schools participated in the Catch Up Literacy Programme, with a total of 340 pupils on the programme. The average gain in word reading accuracy per pupil per month was 3.31 months. The average gain in reading comprehension per pupil per month

- was 3.33 months. Overall, the average total gain in literacy skills was 19 months over the course of an x month programme.
- Similarly, the team supported schools with implementation of the Fischer Family Trust Wave 3 (SPRINT) programme in 2013-14. 17 schools participated in the programme which is targeted at children in Year 1 working at level 1C or below. The average gain in reading accuracy per pupil per month was 4.5 months. The average gain in reading comprehension per pupil per month was 3.3 months.
  - The Team supported 6 schools with the SNAP Programme (Maths intervention) in 2013-14. 87 pupils participated in the programme. During the course of the 14 week programme, the average NC sub level gain per pupil was 1.8.
  - Feedback from centrally delivered training in 2013-14 was consistently graded 4 or 5 (good or excellent). Pre and post training confidence scores have shown increases in confidence between 2 and 7 points on a 0 to 10 scale.

### **Value for money**

The budget for the CALT Team includes the salary of the Learning Support Services Manager and also the Elective Home Education Monitoring Teacher. When these sums are removed, the actual cost of the team, including Support Service Recharges, is £256,036. It is not possible to provide a unit cost per child as much of the team's work supports schools' general SEN provision rather than individual pupils. Expressed as a cost per annum per mainstream school it represents £3325 per school.

### **Options / Recommendations**

- Reduce budget by £80,000 and set a £80,000 income target. Charge schools for assessments and possibly some other aspects of support such as in school training.

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

- Possible redundancy implications / costs if income target cannot be reached.
- Increase in EHC Assessment requests / Tribunals
- Financial impact on schools if charges are levied
- Inequity of access to the service for children depending on which schools are able to pay.

## **APPENDIX 5**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – Sensory Consortium Service**

<p>The Sensory Consortium Service is a pan Berkshire Service providing support for children with hearing impairment and visual impairment. The service provides qualified HI and VI teachers, audiology support and mobility officer support for</p>
--

sensory impaired children in mainstream, resourced and special schools.

### **Activity Data**

In 2013-14 academic year there were 197 children on the SCS caseload, 42 with visual impairment and 155 with hearing impairment.

### **Impact of Service**

- In the 2013-14 academic year, 89% of children on caseload fully met their individual targets and 11% partially met their targets.
- National data (from NATSIP) shows that the achievement of HI and VI pupils in Berkshire, both in terms of progress from KS2 to KS4 and also the percentage scoring 5 A\* to C at GCSE including English and Maths, compares very favourably with the national average performance of children with HI and VI.
- For example, the gap in reading attainment at KS2 between HI and non HI pupils nationally is 10.7% but in Berkshire the gap is 5.3%.
- Similarly, the % of HI children in Berkshire who achieved 5 or more A\* - C grades at GCSE in English and Maths in 2012-13 was 66.7% compared to 44.1% of HI children nationally.

### **Value for money**

The annual cost of the contract in 2014-15 was £227,440. On average, approximately 200 children are supported each year, giving a unit cost of £1137 per child per annum. Levels of intervention can vary from termly monitoring to weekly direct support.

### **Options / Recommendations**

- It is not possible to make any savings on this budget in 2015-16 as the current contract runs to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.
- Discussions are being held with the Sensory Consortium Service to identify potential efficiency savings which could be made to reduce the cost of the service from 2016-17. However, as the majority of the costs are teaching costs it is unlikely that significant savings could be made without eroding the levels of support which children receive from the service.

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

- Reduction in the amount of support available to children with HI and VI and to the staff who support them in school.
- Increased requests for EHC Assessments for those children on caseload who do not already have a Statement.
- Complaints from parents
- Possibility of litigation if HI or VI children with Statements are not receiving the level of support stipulated in the Statement
- Increase in requests for specialist placements in resourced schools and independent / non maintained special schools

## **APPENDIX 6**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – ASD Advisory Service**

The ASD Advisory Service provides support to mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with autistic spectrum disorder

#### **Activity Data**

460 children are currently on the caseload. The caseload has been increasing significantly due to the rise in ASD diagnoses.

#### **Impact of Service**

- *Feedback from schools:*
  - Overall rating:*
    - 46% excellent*
    - 38% good*
  - Quality of reports:*
    - 34% excellent*
    - 62% good*
  - Training*
    - 80% excellent*
    - 20% good*
  - Impact of service on pupil outcomes*
    - Excellent 64%*
    - Good 36%*
- The service helps to retain children with ASD in mainstream schools. The number of children who were moved to independent, non maintained or free special schools for children with ASD in 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively were 1, 1 and 6. The higher number in 2013-14 was due to our ASD resourced units reaching their capacity and the opening of The Thames Valley Free School. It is notable that numbers moving to independent provision prior to 2013-14 were so low given the significant rise in numbers of children with ASD.
- The number of exclusions of children with ASD since 2010/11 is shown below. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from this data. Numbers of exclusions of ASD children appear to be increasing, but this is likely to reflect the higher incidence of ASD in mainstream schools rather than any reduction in the ability of schools to meet the needs of children with ASD. It is possible that the number of exclusions of children with ASD would be higher if schools were not able to access support from the ASD Advisory Service. The service is often brought in by schools to give support in crisis situations and can help schools to avoid exclusions.

Academic Year	Type	Exclusions	Pupils
---------------	------	------------	--------

2010/11	FIXD	19	13
2011/12	FIXD	42	21
2012/13	FIXD	38	21
2013/14	FIXD	49	23
2014/15	FIXD	42	18 (so far)
2014/15	PERM	1	1

### **Value for money**

The budget for this service was £119,950 in 2014-15. 460 children are on caseload, therefore the unit cost is £260 per child per annum. However, the service is very stretched and input for some children can be at a very low level as resources tend to be targeted at cases which are problematic.

### **Options / Recommendations**

It is not recommended that any savings are made to this particular budget due to the high likelihood of additional pressure for expensive independent or non maintained special school placements.

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

The number of children diagnosed with ASD in mainstream schools has been increasing very significantly in recent years. It can be challenging for mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with ASD. If this service were to be reduced, there would be a number of risks:

- Increased requests for EHC assessments for children who currently have their needs met without a Statement / EHC Plan
- Possible exclusions of children with ASD
- Greater pressure for limited places in resourced ASD units at Theale Primary and Theale Green Secondary.
- Greater pressure for children to be placed in independent and non maintained special schools for ASD.

## **APPENDIX 7**

### **HNB Savings 2015-16 – Early Intervention**

This budget funds the Early Years Language Project. The project is staffed by a part time teacher and a part time speech and language therapist and delivers training on meeting the needs of children with speech and language difficulties to early years settings, Key Stage One staff and parents.

### **Activity Data**

KS1 training (teachers and TAs) had 20 participants in 2012-13.  
Let's Get Talking (Preschool staff) had 40 participants in 2012-13.

KS1 training (teachers and TAs) had 19 participants in 2013-14.  
Let's Get Talking (Preschool staff) had 20 participants in 2013-14.

### **Impact of Service**

- Training for teachers and TAs in 2012-13 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2.27 and 3.05 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for pre school staff in 2012-13 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2.9 and 2.93 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for teachers and TAs in 2013-14 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 1.75 and 2.75 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for pre school staff in 2013-14 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2 and 3 on a 1-10 scale
- Feedback from parent sessions run at Children's Centres showed an increase in confidence to identify difficulties and support difficulties of average 2.15 on a 1 to 10 scale and an overall rating for the training of 4.5 on a 0-5 scale.
- The number of children statemented with a primary need of speech and language difficulties is decreasing:

2010	117
2011	112
2012	115
2013	106
2014	96

One of the objectives of the Early Years Language Project was to improve early intervention for young children with speech and language difficulties. Whilst it is not possible to prove a direct link, the reduction in statements for this group could be seen as evidence of success.

- The Speech and Language Therapy Service reports a reduction in what they consider to be inappropriate referrals to speech and language therapy during the life time of the project. This could be attributed in part to early years settings and schools having a better understanding of normal language development and being better placed to provide interventions themselves as a result of engagement in the Early Years Language Project.

### **Value for money**

The annual cost of the project is £19,300. The number of participants in training over a two year period was 99, so the unit cost per delegate was £389.

### **Options / Recommendations**

- Cease the project at the end of 2014-15 financial year, giving a saving of £19,300.

### **Possible impact of savings / risks**

- No redundancy costs as the teacher's post is fixed term and the speech therapy input is part of a contract with Health which can be renegotiated for 2015-16.
- Reduced access for early years settings and Key Stage One staff to training on meeting the needs of children with speech and language difficulties (a high incidence need)
- Possible increased pressure for speech and language therapy

## **APPENDIX 8**

### **High Needs Block Savings 2015–16 - PRU Outreach**

The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy/outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the Reintegration Service and are starting to attend a mainstream school.

#### **Application and impact this year so far:**

- A designated tutor for LAC pupils to ensure rapid entry into the PRU for new admissions into the LA.

*Cathy Burnham to provide updated information.*

Savings could be made to this budget if schools were prepared to support pupils on reintegration into their schools, or reduce the number of outreach sessions they received. There are staffing implications.

#### **Potential Impact of savings:**

- i. Reduction in support for vulnerable pupils re-attending mainstream schools.
- ii. Potential increase in failed placements leading to an increased pressure on places at PRUs.
- iii. No additional support for Fresh Starts.
- iv. Pressure on other support teams.

#### **Recommendations**

1. A reduction to the budget of £80,000. This would include the sickness cover which was only required in 2013/14, and some reduction in staffing capacity. Retain the LAC Post to ensure LAC support. Remainder of budget to be

incorporated into the base RS budget and used flexibly according to total number of students in RS i.e. when bases are not full. Or

2. A total removal of budget and an expectation that Outreach will only be provided when there is 'flex' in the admissions of students to the RS, or purchased by schools on an individual student basis.

## **APPENDIX 9**

### **High Needs Block Savings 2015-16 - Home Education on medical grounds**

The Home Education Service is a statutory service providing Home Tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full-time school.

#### **Application and impact this year so far:**

*Cathy Burnham to provide updated information.*

#### **This is a needs-led budget.**

- The number of sick pupils requiring Home Tuition on medical grounds has increased and therefore there is a pressure due to increased supply/casual teachers.
- The statutory guidance has changed to require more than the previous 5hrs teaching time. The new rules state that pupils should have 25hrs education per week if they are able to access it, and should be increasing their education gradually.
- It may be possible to reduce the expenditure on external providers of £15,000. However, this is an important part of reintegration and it may cost more to provide casual teachers than the cost of the external providers.
- Some Local Authorities may be recouping funding from schools at a rate of one thirty-eighth of the AWPU per week.

#### **Recommendations**

1. No change to this budget, or
2. Consider recouping some costs from schools as above, or
3. Reduce by £28,500 (arbitrary amount) and request the Home Tuition Service investigate further e-learning packages and reduce external packages. Numbers may be lower next year but we have no way of forecasting.

## **APPENDIX 10**

## High Needs Block Savings 2015-15 - Vulnerable Children's Fund

The Vulnerable Children Fund is a small budget used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short-term basis.

### Application and impact this year so far:

- 39 schools accessing fund (33 primary, 6 secondary)
- 59 pupils receiving support (50 primary, 9 secondary)
- Actual and estimated costs primary (£65,016) secondary (£13,816)
- Use of support:
  - Additional TA (91% of total)
  - External packages (4%)
  - Specialist holiday scheme (0.76%)
  - Medical support (3.6%)
  
- Pupils supported include those with:
  - Challenging behaviour
  - Unstable diabetes
  - In-year admissions with SEN or behaviour difficulties
  - Bereavement needs
  - early intervention in Foundation stage for those not 'school ready.'
  - 2 primary unaccompanied asylum seekers from Afghanistan
  - LAC pupils moving into the LA

Savings could be made to this budget up to the full amount of £80,000. There are no staffing implications.

### Potential Impact of savings:

- v. Increase in permanent exclusions due to lack of additional TA support (and an increased pressure on places at PRUs)
- vi. No additional funding support for Fresh Start
- vii. No additional funding for unexpected admissions
- viii. No additional funding for pupils with challenging behaviour prior to an EHC assessment and plan
- ix. No additional early intervention support

A blanket reduction of this budget would affect small primary schools disproportionately.

### Recommendations

3. A reduction to the budget of £20,000. Remainder (£60,000) used to support Primary Schools only. Or

4. A reduction to the budget of £20,000. Remainder (£60,000) used to support all schools, but with stricter criteria e.g. funding given for shorter periods, no funding extensions. Or
5. A total removal of budget.

## **APPENDIX 11**

### **Feedback from parents of children who attended LAL in 2013-14:**

What would you change about LAL?

Parent 1- 'Nothing except going on for longer'

Parent 2-

-'for it to continue through Year 6 until secondary school. From experience of my eldest (who is now at ACE) in year 6 he didn't get any support once LAL had finished until he arrived at secondary school. He felt like he had been left throughout year 6'

Parent 3- 'to be introduced at an earlier stage to have /get more benefit from it-to start a child at LAL in year 5 is maybe too late on in school'  
She has come a long way since being in LAL.

Parent 4-'It would be better to have a monthly update in person rather than via books'

Parent 5-'I think X has made great progress, it has worked perfect and don't feel it needs to change'

Parent 6- 'It would be great if LAL could have continued up to the end of the school year'

Parent 7- ' more of it..would be brilliant and teachers trained up to LAL standard in all schools'

Parent 8- 'to be honest nothing, what LAL has done for X is great, she has come a long way and for me homework is an easier task now, not like before she started to come to LAL'

Parent 9- 'more sessions'

Parent 10- 'longer teaching. As a parent I am worried how X is going to progress next year'

Parent 11- 'nothing really, good feedback but maybe the chance to see it all working... would be amazing to watch'

Parent 12 –‘nothing’

If you had the chance would you continue with LAL?

Parent 1-‘it would be good if X could continue with LAL’

Parent 2-‘the progress X has made in the time at LAL has been brilliant. I would definitely continue from the progress made.’

Parent 3-‘Yes, I am really pleased with how LAL has helped X’

Parent 4- ‘yes, it makes a huge difference’

Parent 5- ‘I feel strongly about this as I fear for her falling behind again as she will not have this routine each week after LAL finishes’

Parent 6 – ‘X is a little disappointed that it is ending’

Parent 7 – ‘I think a longer time at LAL my child would progress to be at the same level as his peers’

Parent 8 –‘Although X has made great improvements I feel it would benefit her to carry on’

General comments

‘ I am very pleased with LAL happy for my child, it was the best thing for her.’

‘Very pleased and grateful for all the help we have had-many thanks!

‘LAL has been absolutely amazing for X. It has been very interesting and informative meeting with you and completing the Dyslexic Action form. Can’t thank you enough.’

X has struggled for a very long time and we have tried all sorts of ways to get him help but we were always told ‘ but he is improving’ the problem was- so were his peers and Lewis was getting more and more frustrated as the gap with his peers was growing. By going to Lal we have seen the gap can reduce.

## **APPENDIX 8**

### **High Needs Block Savings 2015–16 - PRU Outreach**

The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy/outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the Reintegration Service and are starting to attend a mainstream school.

#### **Activity Data**

	<b>Primary</b>	<b>KS2/3 Transition</b>	<b>KS3</b>	<b>KS4</b>
<b>2013-14</b>	The Oaks were only able to provide a limited Outreach Service to schools as they were full. Two part time members of staff have been employed for 14/15	11	21	21
Schools using Outreach Service		8 out of 10 secondary schools		
<b>2014 (Autumn Term only)</b>	4	5	16	8
Schools using Outreach Service		9 out of 10 secondary schools		

In order to provide an outreach service for primary schools and to stay within budget, all schools are offered 6 weeks of reintegration support free of charge. If the school feels that the student would benefit from further support, then additional outreach can be purchased. Since April 2014 some schools have taken up this offer. In addition, there have been requests for outreach only support rather than just reintegration support. Where possible we have fulfilled these requests. They have included outreach provided in schools in the form of ELSA and counselling.

In addition, LAC support is offered in both primary and secondary schools where a LAC is at risk of exclusion. Currently this is done with advice from the LACES team.

#### **Impact**

*To be provided by Stacey Hunter*

### **Value for money**

Dividing number of pupils supported this term by a third of the total budget:

£197k divided by 3 (autumn term only) divided by 33 pupils = £1989 unit cost per pupil

Savings could be made to this budget if schools were prepared to further support pupils on reintegration into their schools, or reduce the number of outreach sessions they received. There are staffing implications.

### **Options/Recommendations**

1. A reduction to the budget of £80,000 resulting in some staffing reductions. Retain the LAC Post to ensure LAC support. Remainder of budget to be incorporated into the base RS budget and used flexibly according to total number of students in RS i.e. when bases are not full.  
Or
2. A total removal of budget and an expectation that Outreach will only be provided when there is 'flex' in the admissions of students to the RS, or purchased by schools on an individual student basis.

### **Potential Impact and risks of savings:**

- i. Reduction in support for vulnerable pupils re-attending mainstream schools.
- ii. Some redundancy costs.
- iii. Potential increase in failed placements leading to an increased pressure on places at PRUs and mainstream schools.
- iv. No additional support for Fresh Starts.
- v. Pressure on other support teams.

## **APPENDIX 9**

### **High Needs Block Savings 2015-16 - Home Education on medical grounds**

The Home Education Service is a statutory service providing Home Tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full-time school.

<b>2013-14</b>	<b>Autumn</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of students with HEd	13	25	30	
New Students	6	13	5	24
Reintegrated/off roll (figure shown is the result of the previous term)	1	0	2	3
Y11	3	9	9	

<b>2014-15</b>	<b>Autumn</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>summer</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of students with HEd	33			
New Students	8			
Reintegrated/off roll (figure shown is the result of the previous term)	14			
Y11	9			

**Impact data**

*To be provided by Stacey Hunter*

**This is a needs-led budget.**

- The number of sick pupils requiring Home Tuition on medical grounds has increased so there is a pressure due to increased supply/casual teachers.
- The statutory guidance has changed to require more than the previous 5hrs teaching time. The new rules state that pupils should have 25hrs education per week if they are able to access it, and should be increasing their education gradually.
- It may be possible to reduce the expenditure on external providers of £15,000. However, this is an important part of reintegration and it may cost more to provide casual teachers than the cost of the external providers.
- Some Local Authorities are recouping funding from schools at a rate of one thirty-eighth of the AWPU per week.

## **Value for money**

Total budget divided by no. of pupils supported:

£282k divided by 3 (autumn term only) divided by 33 pupils = £2848 unit cost per pupils

## **Recommendations**

1. No change to this budget, or
2. Consider recouping some costs from schools as above, or
3. Reduce by £28,500 (arbitrary amount) and request the Home Tuition Service investigate further e-learning packages and reduce external packages.  
Numbers may be lower next year but we have no way of forecasting.

## **APPENDIX 10**

### **High Needs Block Savings 2015-15 - Vulnerable Children's Fund**

The Vulnerable Children Fund is a small budget (£80k) used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short-term basis.

#### **Activity this year so far:**

- 40 schools accessing fund (34 primary, 6 secondary)
- 74 pupils receiving support (65 primary, 9 secondary)
- Actual and estimated costs primary (£66,016) secondary (£13,700)
- Use of support:
  - Additional TA (91% of total)
  - External packages (4%)
  - Specialist holiday scheme (0.76%)
  - Medical support (3.6%)
- Pupils supported include those with:
  - Challenging behaviour
  - Unstable diabetes
  - In-year admissions with SEN or behaviour difficulties
  - Bereavement needs
  - early intervention in Foundation stage for those not 'school ready.'
  - 2 primary unaccompanied asylum seekers from Afghanistan
  - LAC pupils moving into the LA

#### **Impact**

- No primary permanent exclusions this year
- No permanent exclusions of pupils supported by VCG
- All Fresh Start pupils supported by VCG

Savings could be made to this budget up to the full amount of £80,000. There are no staffing implications.

**Potential Impact and risk of savings:**

- vi. Increase in permanent exclusions due to lack of additional TA support with increased pressure on places at PRUs and mainstream schools
- vii. No additional funding support for Fresh Start
- viii. No additional funding for unexpected admissions
- ix. No additional funding for pupils with challenging behaviour prior to an EHC assessment and plan
- x. No additional early intervention support

A blanket reduction of this budget would affect small primary schools disproportionately.

**Recommendation**

A reduction to the budget of £20,000. Remainder (£60,000) used to support all schools, but with stricter criteria e.g. funding given for shorter periods, no funding extensions.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>West Berkshire Schools Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>PRU Funding</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Cathy Burnham</b>
<b>For Decision</b>	

## 1. Background

The way our two PRUs (Reintegration Service and Alternative Curriculum) receive their funding changed in April 2013 in line with the Government's school funding reforms for High Needs pupils. Schools were briefed about the financial changes for 2013/14 and in Nov 2013 and July 2014 were consulted again on alterations to the arrangements to fund Top Ups. The Schools Funding Forum requested a mid-year review to consider the impact of these alterations, with a further request for details with specific reference to the pressure on the High Needs Block. (for previous information on PRU funding see Nov 2014 HFG paper).

## 2. Current funding methods for Top Up only

The current funding arrangements (previously agreed with schools) are as follows:

- Four bands £74.69 - £160.72 per day
- Banding based on staffing ratio (e.g. Band 2: teacher 1:6, TA 1:6, + 25% 1:1)

**Figure 1: Agreed Funding Arrangement**

	Cost to school	Duration of payment	Cost to High Needs Block
Primary – Reintegration Service	50% Lowest banding only	12 weeks maximum	Difference between lowest banding and actual banding. Difference between 12 weeks and actual duration of placement.
Secondary – Reintegration Service	Lowest banding only	6 weeks only	As above – 6 weeks.
Secondary – KS4 Alternative Curriculum	£1500 per term pro rata. (Equivalent to AWPU)	Maximum of 2 years	Difference between AWPU and actual banding.

### 3. Forecast Year End Outturns for The Pupil Referral Units and the High Needs Block PRU Top Up Cost Centre Financial Year 2014-15

3.1. The current budget for financial year 14-15 is £1,205m. As at month end budget monitoring the PRU Top Up budget held within the High Needs Block was forecasting a year end overspend of £400k. The PRUs themselves are forecasting year end outturns of:

- Alternative Curriculum £265k surplus (Of which £138,000 from 13/14 is held for contingency to repair buildings, and £115,000 is held as contingency for potential future running costs).
- Reintegration Service £135k surplus (£120,000 is held as contingency for potential future running costs).

3.2. The following table sets out the changes to the overall PRU budgets (both the Alternative Curriculum and the Reintegration Service), from financial year 2010-11 to the current financial year 2014-15. Overall the increase to the PRU budget has been £670k.

**Figure 2: PRU Budgets Financials Years 2010-11 through to 2014-15**

Budget Book Figures		FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
90320	Pupil Referral Units	1,207,310	1,421,250	1,455,830	672,000	672,000
90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	0	0	0	812,610	1,205,500
		<b>1,207,310</b>	<b>1,421,250</b>	<b>1,455,830</b>	<b>1,484,610</b>	<b>1,877,500</b>
Change in budget year on year:			213,940	34,580	28,780	392,890

### 4. Financial Year 2015-16 Budget Proposal

4.1. A £500k increase to the 2014-15 funding level has previously been proposed for financial year 2015-16, i.e. a top up budget of £1.705m.

4.2. Amended proposals for the PRU Top Up budget are as follows:

- In order to mitigate against further pressures on the Top Up Budget a *single funding band* is proposed for all students. Actual costs per student will be calculated by the PRUs and interventions adapted accordingly. Other Local Authorities have also adopted this funding method.
- The new single daily banding rate will be **£103.25**. This is based on the average of the four banding rates, amended due to the change of base funding (from £8,000 per place to £10,000).

## **5. Recommendations**

The Heads' Funding Group to review and consider recommendation to the Schools' Forum:

- 1) For financial year 2015-16: Schools continue to pay lowest banding rate as per fig 1. A single banding to be introduced across both Pupil Referral Units for LA Top Up only. This will reduce pressure on HNB.
- 2) For financial year 2016-17 the PRU Top Up budget to be delegated to schools who can directly commission services from the PRUs, other alternative providers or develop their own resources. Further work on this proposal will continue in 2015 with Head Teachers' participation.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>West Berkshire Schools' Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Early Years Funding &amp; Budget Proposal 2015/16</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Claire White &amp; Janet Scott</b>
<b>For Decision</b>	

## 1. Budget Forecast 2014/15

1.1 Funding for the 2014/15 early years block will not be confirmed by the DfE until June 2015 due to 3 and 4 year old funding being based on 5/12 of the January 2014 census and 7/12 of the January 2015 census. However, using the January 2015 census data a reasonable estimate of funding can now be made. Payments to providers for the Spring term have now been made, therefore the only payments still to go through are adjustments where children move in or out of settings between now and the end of term. This should not vary by more than £50k either up or down.

1.2 The current forecast is summarised below

	<b>Budget 2014/15</b>	<b>Forecast 2014/15</b>	<b>Variance 2014/15</b>
2 Year old Funding	1,267,230	522,034	-745,196
3 & 4 Year Old Funding	6,231,180	6,565,167	333,987
Contingency (carry forward from 13/14)	258,210	0	-258,210
Central EY Funding	99,390	108,000	8,610
DSG EY Block Grant	-7,856,010	-7,917,615	-61,605
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-722,414</b>	<b>-722,414</b>

1.3 The funding received for 2 year olds in 2014/15 was fixed and based on a Government estimate of 254 deprived children accessing the 15 hours free entitlement in the summer term 2014, and 449 children from September 2014. The build up has been slow and in the January census there were 190 children (though the number has varied throughout the year, the average being 165). This has resulted in a significant underspend, though is as expected.

1.4 The take up of 3 and 4 year old places has grown again (as in previous years) in 2014/15. The budget was set at the 2013/14 take up level but with the knowledge that any in year growth in numbers could be met from the carry forward of the 2013/14 underspend (the contingency) and the 2 year old budget. Only a small proportion of the overspend on 3 and 4 year olds will be offset by an increase in the DSG grant (£61k).

1.5 It is proposed that the overall early years underspend be carried forward to 2015/16 in order to balance the budget next year. This will enable funding rates to remain the same for a further year rather than reduce funding going to all providers.

## 2. Estimated Funding Allocation for 2015/16

2.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2015/16 was announced on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014. The Early Years Block is calculated as follows:

- 3 & 4 year olds: the funding rate per child is the same as for 2013/14 and 2014/16 (£3,911 for West Berkshire). Initially the DfE has multiplied this by nursery numbers from the January 2014 Early Years Census. The final allocation will be based on 5/12 x January 2015 nursery numbers plus 7/12 x January 2016 nursery numbers. The January 2015 census has been used to determine the budget rather than the DfE's 2014 figure.
- 2 year olds: no indicative allocation has been provided by the DfE yet, although the funding rate per child has been fixed at the same hourly rate as for 2013/14 and 2014/15 (£5.36 for West Berkshire Council). From 2015/16 the allocation will be calculated the same as for 3 & 4 year olds using the two January census's (rather than a fixed sum allocation), though there may be an uplift in September 2015 if numbers are significantly higher than in January 2015. For the purpose of setting the budget, it has been assumed that there will be on average 270 children accessing the funding during 2015/16.
- There is an indicative amount provided for the early years Pupil Premium, which is £0.53 per hour (or £302 per child if accessing the full 15 hours for a year).

2.2 The funding calculation for the purpose of setting the 2015/16 budget is as follows:

<b>3 &amp; 4 Year old funding:</b>		
Total FTE January 2015 census	1,562.00	A
Guaranteed Unit of Funding	£3,911	B
Estimated 3 & 4 Year Old Allocation	£6,108,982	(A x B)
<b>2 Year old Funding:</b>		
Estimated number of Children FTE	161.67	C
Guaranteed Unit of Funding	£5,092	D
Estimated 2 Year Old Allocation	£823,206	(C x D)
Plus: Indicative Pupil Premium Grant	£74,590	
Plus: Carry Forward from 2014/15	£722,414	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING BUDGET</b>	<b>£7,729,192</b>	

- 2.3 It is stressed that all elements in this calculation are an estimate, and the actual funding will also be based on next year's census data, take up of pupil premium, and the final outturn for the current year for the carry forward.
- 2.4 Although the funding for each DSG block is not ring fenced it is strongly advised that where possible funding is allocated to children/pupils it is intended for. The above figures assume that the carry forward from 2014/15 remains within this block.

### **3. Budget Proposal for 2015/16 from The Early Years Steering Group**

- 3.1 It is still the Government's intention to move to a national funding formula for early years. The Group is proposing that there will be no changes to the West Berkshire early year's formula for 2015/16 in order to give settings continued stability in their funding. The formula and rates for three and four year olds is set out in Appendix A.
- 3.2 By utilising the carry forward from 2014/15, the hourly funding rates for 3 and 4 year olds can be maintained for a further year. This budget has been calculated assuming the same actual number of hours funded in 2014/15 plus the average annual increase that has been experienced in the last four years (though population statistics suggest this could be greater). On this basis there is an in-year shortfall in the 3 and 4 year old budget of £527k which will need to be met from the carry forward. The reason for the shortfall is mainly that since the current funding rates were set, there has been the removal of 3 year old population funding, with funding now based on actual participation funding (January census). The population funding basis had provided an additional £364k in 2013/14 and £728k in 2012/13. Additionally, the DSG is not keeping pace with the growth in numbers. In the meantime rates to providers have been maintained by utilising the underspend in the 2 year old funding.
- 3.3 The Group is fully aware that some very difficult decisions regarding the formula and funding rates will most likely need to be made during the next year for the 2016/17 budget, and will commence work on modelling this in the summer. This will be subject to a full consultation with providers. It is felt that to decrease funding rates now at such short notice could have a detrimental effect on the financial stability of providers. The group wish it to be noted that their costs have significantly increased over the last few years (as have schools) but with no increase to the funding rate, and a reduction in the funding rate will make it extremely difficult for some settings to continue. This appears to be a problem nationally.
- 3.4 The hourly funding rate for 2 year olds will also be maintained at £5.26, and the budget assumes that the funding received (now on a participation basis rather than population basis) will equal the actual costs.
- 3.5 It is proposed that from 2015/16 deprivation funding will mirror the methodology for the new Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) which uses similar criteria for free school meals eligibility, and paid as an additional hourly rate. The PPG rate has been set by the Government at £0.53 per hour (which equates to £302.10 per child accessing the maximum 570 hours per year). The Group propose to round this up to £1.00 by adding £0.47 from the

deprivation budget. The budget has been set at the Government's estimate for PPG plus the current level of deprivation funding paid to providers.

3.6 The centrally retained early year's budget contains the staffing costs of central support and advice for providers, and for determining eligibility of a child for early year's provision. The budget requirement for 2015/16 has gone down due to a staffing restructure.

3.7 The draft budget proposed for 2015/16 compared to the 2014/15 budget and forecast is summarised as follows:

	<b>Budget 2014/15</b>	<b>Forecast 2014/15</b>	<b>Budget 2015/16</b>
2 Year old Funding	1,267,230	522,034	810,000
3 & 4 Year Old Funding	6,231,180	6,565,167	6,615,297
Central EY Funding	99,390	108,000	79,820
Early Years Pupil Premium & Deprivation Funding			209,590
Contingency	258,210		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,856,010</b>	<b>7,195,201</b>	<b>7,714,707</b>

3.8 This currently leaves a balance of funding of £14k in this block, though the carry forward from 2014/15 will be less once all the final payments to providers for this term have gone through.

3.9 Due to the volatility of both funding and expenditure as the number of children accessing their free entitlement changes each term and is generally growing, the early years block budget is high risk and will need to be closely monitored during the year.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That the Early Years Block underspend in 2014/15 be carried forward to the Early Years Block in 2015/16
2. The Early Years budget proposals as set out in part 3 of this report are agreed

#### **Appendices**

Appendix A – West Berkshire Early Years Single Funding Formula 2015/16

## West Berkshire Early Years Single Funding Formula Information on Rates for Three and Four Year Olds 2015/16

### Base Hourly Rate

<b>Rate 1 for PVI with sole use of property (owned or rented)</b> £3.19 + £0.37 + £0.30 (8.5% RoR)	<b>£3.86</b>
<b>Rate 2 for PVI with sole use of property (owned or rented) with outdoor space over 1/4 acre</b> £3.19 + £0.46 + £0.31 (8.5% RoR)	<b>£3.96</b>
<b>Rate 3 for PVI other (Village/community Hall or similar)</b> £3.19 + £0.22 + £0.29 (8.5% RoR)	<b>£3.70</b>
<b>Rate 4 Maintained Nursery school (purpose built)</b> £3.19 + £0.16 - £0.28 (management costs included in fixed supplement)	<b>£3.07</b>
<b>Rate 5 Maintained Nursery Class</b>	<b>£3.19</b>

### Supplements for Quality

#### **Rate B £0.38**

At least 1 member of staff with level 4 / trainee EYPS

Other staff at least 50% at level 3

OR

At least 75% of staff at level 3

Adult:Child Ratio 1:8

(£3.57 - £3.19)

#### **Rate C £0.73**

At least 1 member of staff a qualified teacher or EYPS

Other staff at least 50% at level 3

Adult:Child Ratio 1:8

(£3.92 - £3.19)

#### **Rate D £0.94**

At least 1 member of staff a qualified teacher or EYPS

Other staff 50% at level 3 or above, all other staff at level 2,

Adult:Child Ratio 1:8

(£4.13 - £3.19)

#### **Rate E £1.56**

At least 1 member of staff a qualified teacher with 5 years relevant early years experience, or EYPS with with 5 years relevant early years experience.

Next member of staff a qualified teacher or EYPS

All other staff at level 3

Adult:Child Ratio 1:8

(£4.75 - £3.19)

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>West Berkshire Schools' Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Balance Control Scheme for Nursery Schools, Special Schools and Pupil Referral Units</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Claire White</b>
<b>For Decision</b>	

## 1. Background

1.1 The 'Scheme for Financing Schools' is a statutory document which sets out the financial arrangements for all maintained schools within the local authority. Any changes to the scheme must be consulted with schools and be approved by the members of the Schools' Forum representing maintained schools.

1.2 The scheme must set out the arrangements in relation to the carrying forward from one funding period to the next of surpluses. The scheme *may* contain a mechanism to clawback excess surplus balances (balance control mechanism scheme). The latest guidance states:

“Any mechanism should have regard to the principle that schools should be moving towards greater autonomy, should not be constrained from making early efficiencies to support their medium term budgeting in a tighter financial climate, and should not be burdened by bureaucracy. The mechanism should, therefore, be focused on only those schools which have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances and/or where some level of redistribution would support improved provision across a local area”.

1.3 Our current scheme applies to primary and secondary schools only. An excess surplus balance is set as 8% in primary schools and 5% in secondary schools or £20,000 whichever is greater, based on the total formula funding received by the school (excludes additional grants).

1.4 Many other local authorities no longer operate a claw back scheme at all, and it tends to be more light touch. Where they do, if it includes nursery, special and PRU schools, they tend to use 5% or 8% as the limit.

1.5 The reason for the West Berkshire Scheme excluding nursery schools, special schools and pupil referral units (PRUs) since 2013/14 is due to the change in the funding system that year, with these schools now being funded by a very different methodology compared to mainstream schools as follows:

- A lower proportion of their budget is fixed for the year, irrelevant of how many pupils access the places. The majority of their funding is based on actual take up of places during the year (top up funding in special and PRU schools), which can vary on a daily basis. In comparison, primary and secondary schools have all their funding fixed at the start

of the year and there are no uncertainties regarding their funding during the financial year.

- Due to the volatility of funding it is difficult to accurately predict in year funding and managing the overall budget in response to sudden changes in numbers of pupils being placed can be challenging. Forecasts can vary significantly from one month/term to the next.
- As the funding is based on demand for places, a large surplus can quite quickly turn into a large deficit if the number of pupils placed suddenly drops. These schools should be encouraged to carry forward surpluses in order to offset possible future deficits. Mainstream schools are funded on actual pupil numbers recorded in the previous year census and so have time to manage changes to their funding.

1.6 However, the funding of special schools and PRUs is more flexible than mainstream schools as it could be locally decided to vary the top up fees if appropriate in order to help these schools balance their budget. They do not have the limitations of formula funding as in primary and secondary schools.

1.7 At the end of 2013/14 (the first year of the new funding system for special schools and PRUs), Schools' Forum members were concerned that the balances at some of these schools seemed very high, and requested that consideration be given to the excess balance scheme also covering these schools, but adjusted accordingly to meet their circumstances.

## 2. Review and Options

2.1 The following table sets out the carry forward and funding budget for each Nursery, Special and PRU school:

School	Balance at 31/3/14	Fixed (guaranteed) Funding 2014/15	Funding Budget Set by school 2014/15 <sup>1</sup>	Fixed Funding as a % of budget set	Closing Balance as a % of Funding budget set
<b>Hungerford Nursery</b>	24,974	127,830	371,060	34%	6.7%
<b>Victoria Park Nursery</b>	50,788	127,830	443,470	29%	11.5%
<b>Brookfields Special School</b>	556,603	2,156,309	4,910,510	44%	11.3%
<b>The Castle Special School</b>	185,945	1,529,129	3,252,160	47%	5.7%
<b>Alternative Curriculum</b>	138,762	384,000 <sup>2</sup>	1,244,130	31%	11.2%
<b>Reintegration Service</b>	175,907	288,000 <sup>3</sup>	1,094,490	26%	16.1%

2.2 All these schools closed last year in surplus, some of which were significant.

<sup>1</sup> Excludes PPG & other ring fenced grants, and any carry forward from previous year

<sup>2</sup> Due to increase to £480,000 in 2015/16

<sup>3</sup> Due to increase to £360,000 in 2015/16

2.3 If the Forum wish to include all or some of these schools in the excess balance clawback scheme this should reflect the volatility of funding and be sympathetic to the issues set out in paragraph 1.4 above. However, for special and PRU schools it should also reflect the impact on the DSG high needs budget, as the surpluses for these schools have largely been generated from top up funding paid out of the high needs block that has not all been used by the school in the year. If as a result of increased top up payments these central high needs budgets overspend, this then has the perverse effect of requiring cuts to high needs services which affect all schools, whilst the special schools and PRUs keep high balances as a reserve and/or spend this money on their chosen projects.

2.4 In determining what constitutes an excess surplus for these schools given the volatility of their funding, two aspects need to be considered: should these schools require a higher percentage surplus in order to manage their budgets, and should it be based on the funding each individual school expects to receive in the coming year or their actual funding received in the previous year.

2.5 If the principle is to allow these schools to keep a higher surplus due to the volatility of their funding, their surplus at the end of the year should perhaps be measured against their actual funding received in that year and be set at 5% as a reasonable volatility reserve (with the recommendation that the school would keep the first 5% of a surplus in reserve and not spend it – it would be used to support their budget if a sudden dip in pupil numbers/top up fees occurs) plus the next 5% as a general surplus for the school to spend as it wishes. A balance greater than 10% would be deemed to be an excess surplus.

2.6 A further consideration is whether to add to the year end surplus figure any funding the school has transferred to capital in excess of £20,000 during the year, both to be more transparent and that this is in effect using surplus revenue balances during the year so shows a more accurate financial position. This may also want to be considered for inclusion in the scheme for mainstream schools.

2.7 There are then two options to consider for use of any excess balance at special and PRU schools:

- 1) These schools submit bids regarding use of this balance for investment at their school, to be reviewed by Schools' Forum and weighed up against other pressures within the high needs block. This would also include taking into account any in year proposals by these schools to use greater than £20,000 revenue funding for capital projects *prior to the school committing to such expenditure.*
- 2) Rather than claw back the excess balance, the schools are requested to reduce the top up fees accordingly (using up the excess balance) for the next financial year.

2.8 Nursery schools with an excess surplus balance would need to submit a case similar to primary and secondary schools.

2.9 An illustration based on last year's outturn is as follows:

School	Balance at 31/3/14	Revenue Contributions to Capital in 2013/14 (over £20k)	Total Funding Received by school 2013/14 <sup>4</sup>	5% Volatility Reserve	5% General Surplus	Excess Surplus Balance
<b>Early Years Block:</b>						
Hungerford Nursery	24,974		372,113	18,606	6,368	0
Victoria Park Nursery	50,788		481,059	24,053	24,053	2,682
<b>High Needs Block:</b>						
Brookfields Special School	555,510		4,659,391	232,970	232,970	89,570
The Castle Special School	183,800	17,468	3,174,975	158,749	42,519	0
Alternative Curriculum	138,762		1,177,302	58,865	58,865	21,032
Reintegration Service	175,616		1,138,084	56,904	56,904	61,808

This shows that if such a scheme had been in place for 2014/15, there would have been a potential reinvestment or saving to the high needs block of £172k.

**Action:** Schools' Forum (maintained school members only) to decide whether it wishes to bring nursery, special and PRU schools into the excess balance clawback scheme, and if so on what basis. If agreed this will be subject to consultation with all maintained schools in order to change the Scheme for Financing Schools, and then be brought back to the next meeting of the Schools' Forum for decision after reviewing any comments received from the consultation.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes PPG & other ring fenced grants, and any carry forward from previous year

**Schedule of School's Forum (SF) and Heads Funding Group (HFG)  
Work Programme 2015/16 Financial Year**

Meeting	Date	Time	Venue	Items for Consideration/Decision	Lead Officer(s)
HFG	4th June 2015 (Thursday)	3.30pm	Shaw House	Review School Funding Arrangements for 2016/17 Agree on options to be considered for 2016/17 school formula Review School Balances 2014/15	Claire White Claire White Claire White
SF	15th June 2015 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	School Funding Arrangements 2016/17: Overview, Requirements, Timetable DSG Outturn 2014/15 Update on DSG Budget 2015/16 Review School Balances 2014/15 (including excess surplus balances) School Financial Value Standard - Annual Report for 2014/15 Vulnerable Children's Fund - Annual Report for 2014/15 Trade Union Facilities Time - Annual Report for 2014/15 Scheme for Financing Schools 2015/16 for approval	Claire White Shannon CS & Ian Pearson Claire White Claire White Ian Priestley Cathy Burnham Robert O'Reilly & Ian Pearson Claire White
HFG	1st July 2015 (Wednesday)	3.30pm	Shaw House	Consider options for school formula 2016/17 Review de-delegations and Buy Back arrangements for 2015/17 Review School Budgets 2015/16 & Schools in Financial Difficulty Review PRU proposals for 2016/17	Claire White Shannon Coleman-Slaughter Claire White Cathy Burnham
SF	13th July 2015 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	Agree proposed formula for 2016/17 to go out to consultation with schools Agree proposal for dedelegations in 2016/17 to go out to consultation with Review School Budgets 2015/16 & Schools in Financial Difficulty Review & Agree Schools' Forum Membership & Constitution from September 2015 Agree PRU proposals for 2016/17 to go out to consultation with schools	Claire White Shannon Coleman-Slaughter Claire White Claire White Cathy Burnham
HFG	16th September 2015 (Wednesday)	3.30pm	Shaw House	Review formula proposals for 2016/17 following school consultation Review de-delegations for 2016/17 following school consultation Review Additional Funding Criteria Review High Needs Places & arrangements for 2016/17	Claire White Shannon Coleman-Slaughter Claire White Jane Seymour
SF	28th September 2015 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	Election of Chair & Vice Chair Agree Formula for 2016/17 to go to Council's Executive for Approval Agree De-delegations for 2016/17 Agree Additional Funding Criteria for 2016/17 High Needs Funding & Arrangements for 2016/17 DSG Monitoring 2015/16 Month 5	Ian Pearson Claire White Shannon Coleman-Slaughter Claire White Jane Seymour Shannon CS & Ian Pearson

## Work Programme 2015/16 Financial Year

Meeting	Date	Time	Venue	Items for Consideration/Decision	Lead Officer(s)
HFG	24th November 2015 (Tuesday)	3.30pm	Shaw House	Review of likely DSG Funding for 2016/17 and Draft Budget Review High Needs Budget Proposals for 2016/17 Review PRU Budget Proposals for 2016/17 Update on Schools in Financial Difficulty	Claire White Jane Seymour Cathy Burnham Claire White
SF	7th December 2015 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	Draft DSG Budget for 2016/17 - Overview Update on High Needs Budget Proposals for 2016/17 Update on Early Years Funding Budget Proposals for 2016/17 Update on PRU Budget Proposals for 2016/17 Update on Schools in Financial Difficulty School Funding Benchmarking Information DSG Monitoring 2015/16 Month 7	Claire White Jane Seymour Avril Allenby Cathy Burnham Claire White Claire White Shannon CS & Ian Pearson
HFG	13th January 2016 (Wednesday)	3.30pm	Shaw House	Review DSG funding for 2016/17 and draft budget Consider school budget and final funding rates for school formula Review High Needs budget proposals Review PRU budget proposals	Claire White & Shannon CS Claire White Jane Seymour Cathy Burnham
SF	25th January 2016 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	Overview of DSG funding for 2016/17 and draft budget for 2016/17 Agree final funding rates for School Formula and and agree school budget Review High Needs Budget Proposals Review PRU budget proposals Review Early Years budget proposals Report on funding from Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2015/16 DSG Monitoring 2015/16 Month 9 (Budgets to schools by 29th January - subject to Approval by EFA)	Claire White & Shannon CS Claire White Jane Seymour Cathy Burnham Avril Allenby Claire White Shannon CS & Ian Pearson
HFG	24th February 2016 (Wednesda	3.30pm	Shaw House	Review of Final DSG Budget proposal for 2016/17 Review final arrangements for High Needs Review final arrangements for Early Years Review final arrangements for PRUs Agree work programme 2016/17	Claire White & Shannon CS Jane Seymour Avril Allenby Cathy Burnham Claire White
SF	7th March 2016 (Monday)	5pm	Shaw House	Agree Final DSG Budget for 2016/17 Agree final arrangements for High Needs Agree final arrangements for Early Years Agree final arrangements for PRUs DSG Monitoring 2015/16 Month 10 Agree work programme 2016/17	Claire White & Shannon CS Jane Seymour Avril Allenby Cathy Burnham Shannon CS & Ian Pearson Claire White

<b>West Berkshire Schools' Forum</b>	
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>DSG Monitoring 2014-15, Month 10</b>
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	<b>Ian Pearson, Shannon Coleman-Slaughter</b>
<b>For Information</b>	

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 The main source of funding for schools is the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). It is a ring fenced specific grant and can only be used on school/pupil activity.
- 1.2 The grant is split into three funding blocks. The schools block is calculated by multiplying a guaranteed unit of funding per pupil (set by the DfE) by the actual pupil numbers from the October census count (so October 2013 census for 2014/15 budget); the early years block is calculated by multiplying a guaranteed unit of funding 5/12 from the January 2013 early years census, and 7/12 from the January 2014 early years census; the high needs block is a fixed sum based on the actual budget set by the Council in 2012/13.
- 1.3 The Local Authority is required to use national formula factors but applies local rates to distribute funding to schools.
- 1.4 Centrally Retained Overspends, unless funded from outside the DSG, are carried forward and top sliced from the following year's DSG allocation. Underspends must be carried forward to support the school's budget in future years.
- 1.5 The Authority and Schools' Forum are responsible for ensuring that the DSG is deployed correctly, and monitoring of spend against the DSG needs to take place regularly to enable decision making on overspends/underspends and to inform future year budget requirements.

## **2. Monitoring Position as at Month 10 (2014-15)**

- 2.1 At month 10 the total DSG year end forecast underspend position is £975 k across all three funding blocks. The previous reporting period for the DSG was month nine. At month nine the forecast underspend was £193k.

Figure 1: Financial Position as at Month 10 (January 2015). A further analysis per cost centre is shown in Appendix A:

	<b>Total Budget £m</b>	<b>Actual Spend Forecast Month 10 £m</b>	<b>Month 10 Forecast Outturn Variance £m</b>	<b>Month 9 Forecast Outturn Variance £m</b>
Schools Block (inc ISB)	64,302,380	64,299,930	-2,450	-1,000
Early Years Block	7,828,920	7,150,530	-678,390	0
High Needs Block	16,496,140	16,202,130	-294,010	-192,500
<b>Total Net Expenditure</b>	<b>88,627,440</b>	<b>87,652,590</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	<b>-193,500</b>
Support Service Recharges	720,890	720,890	0	0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>89,348,330</b>	<b>88,373,480</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	<b>-193,500</b>
DSG Grant	-89,348,330	-89,348,330	0	0
<b>Net Position</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	<b>-193,500</b>

2.2 The Schools Block inclusive of the ISB is forecasting a year end under spend position of a £2k. At month nine the block was forecasting a £1k overspend at year end. A £15k pressure on the Behaviour Support budget has been reported, this pressure is being offset through savings against the Servicing of Schools Forum and Admissions budgets.

2.3 The Early Years Block as at month 10 is forecasting a year end under spend of £678k, compared to an online forecast at month nine. The change is the result of the under spend requested to be carried forward into next financial year being declared within the month 10 budget monitoring. Detailed comments in respect of under and overspends generating the overall under spend are detailed in appendix A.

2.4 The High Needs Block is forecasting a year end underspend position of £294k. A £192k year end underspend was forecast at month nine. The under spend is net of a £423k pressure against the top ups budgets, a £729k under spend on the contingency budget and a £12k pressure against non top up cost centres.

2.5 The main single area of pressure within the High Needs Block is the pressure forecast against the Pupil Referral Unit top up cost centre (£410k).

2.6 Budgets with pressures at month 10 in excess of £100k are:

- £122k Academy Schools Resource Units top ups
- £410k Pupil Referral Unit top ups

2.7 £49k has been vired from the High Needs Contingency budget into the SEN Commissioned Provision budget to cover in year contractual increases. This virement was agreed at the School's Forum 14.7.2014.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – DSG 2014-15 Budget Monitoring Report as at 31<sup>st</sup> January 2015

# Appendix A

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2014-15 Budget Monitoring Month 10								
Budget manager	Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget	Actual	Variance	Comments
Ian Pearson	90020	Primary Schools	46,433,670		46,433,670	46,433,670	0	
Ian Pearson	90025	Secondary Schools	16,621,740		16,621,740	16,621,740	0	
Maxine Slade	90035	LAC Pupil Premium	0		0	0	0	
Ian Pearson	90112	Special Costs Primary	24,960		24,960	24,960	0	
Ian Pearson	90117	Special Costs Secondary	11,880		11,880	11,880	0	
Ian Pearson	90230	Schools in Financial Difficulty	115,470	115,680	231,150	231,150	0	
Ian Pearson	90235	School Delegated Contingency	370,000		370,000	370,000	0	
Maxine Slade	90255	Virtual School Service	168,130		168,130	168,130	0	
Cathy Burnham	90349	Behaviour Support - DSG	142,060		142,060	157,060	15,000	Pressure on income
Caroline Corcoran	90583	CLA/MPA Licences	76,120		76,120	76,120	0	
Ian Pearson	90019	DSG Servicing of Schools' Forum	42,220		42,220	32,220	-10,000	Supplies and Services Underspend
Caroline Corcoran	90743	Admissions	180,450		180,450	173,000	-7,450	Project monies now not likely to spent.
<b>Schools Block Total</b>			<b>64,186,700</b>	<b>115,680</b>	<b>64,302,380</b>	<b>64,299,930</b>	<b>-2,450</b>	
Ian Pearson	90010	Nursery Schools	809,470		809,470	828,740	19,270	Actual hours of take up greater than budgeted
Maria Shepherd	90017	Early Years Support Team	72,300		72,300	56,700	-15,600	Maternity leave Demand for places significantly lower than Government estimate
Maria Shepherd	90018	Expenditure on 2 year olds	1,267,230		1,267,230	495,570	-771,660	Actual hours of take up greater than budgeted
Maria Shepherd	90036	Early Years Funding for PVI	4,308,760		4,308,760	4,631,100	322,340	Actual hours of take up greater than budgeted
Ian Pearson	90037	Early Yrs Funding Maintained Sector	1,112,950		1,112,950	1,138,420	25,470	Actual hours of take up greater than budgeted
Maria Shepherd	90051	Early Years Funding - Contingency	354,540	-96,330	258,210	0	-258,210	Offsets growth in hours of provision for 3 & 4 year olds
<b>Early Years Block Total</b>			<b>7,925,250</b>	<b>-96,330</b>	<b>7,828,920</b>	<b>7,150,530</b>	<b>-678,390</b>	
Ian Pearson	90026	Academy Schools RU Top Ups	252,610		252,610	374,820	122,210	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	2,465,120		2,465,120	2,553,670	88,550	Based on current demand Increase in demand for Thames Valley Free School placements
Nicola Ponton	90548	Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	663,900		663,900	701,330	37,430	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90575	Non LEA Special School (OofA)	889,740		889,740	881,680	-8,060	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	1,476,030		1,476,030	1,525,370	49,340	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,345,340		1,345,340	1,089,750	-255,590	Costs for late Students joining Newbury College have not now been agreed
Nicola Ponton	90617	Resourced Units top up Funding maintained	335,060		335,060	305,710	-29,350	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90618	Non WBC Resourced Units - Top Up Funding	15,300		15,300	23,570	8,270	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90621	Mainstream - Top Up Funding maintained	572,830		572,830	525,080	-47,750	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	161,940		161,940	190,120	28,180	Based on current demand
Nicola Ponton	90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	50,700		50,700	70,960	20,260	2 New pupils
Cathy Burnham	90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	1,205,500		1,205,500	1,615,500	410,000	Pressure based on information received and takes into account an Autumn Term Adjustment for the AC
Jane Seymour	90237	Special Needs Delegated Contingency	1,500,780	-770,860	729,920	0	-729,920	Contingency
<b>High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total</b>			<b>10,934,850</b>	<b>-770,860</b>	<b>10,163,990</b>	<b>9,857,560</b>	<b>-306,430</b>	
Cathy Burnham	90320	Pupil Referral Units	672,000		672,000	672,000	0	
Ian Pearson	90540	Special Schools	2,860,000	25,000	2,885,000	2,885,000	0	
Rhian Ireland	90555	LAL Funding	134,600		134,600	134,600	0	
Nicola Ponton	90584	Resourced Units - Place Funding (70)	500,000	12,500	512,500	512,500	0	
Cathy Burnham	90582	PRU Outreach	197,000		197,000	197,000	0	
Jane Seymour	90585	HN Outreach Special Schools	105,650		105,650	105,650	0	
<b>High Needs Block: Place Funding Total</b>			<b>4,469,250</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>4,506,750</b>	<b>4,506,750</b>	<b>0</b>	
Ian Pearson	90038	Pupil Premium -	0		0	0	0	
Ian Pearson	90236	Managed Moves/Exclusions Contingency	0		0	0	0	
Rhian Ireland	90238	Sen Pre School Childrn	50,210		50,210	50,210	0	
Nicola Ponton	90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	138,630		138,630	113,800	-24,830	One pupil moved
Rhian Ireland	90280	Speci Needs Spprt Team	318,300		318,300	318,300	0	
Jane Seymour	90290	Sensory Impairment	227,440		227,440	227,440	0	
Cathy Burnham	90315	Home Tuition	282,000		282,000	339,000	57,000	Increase in the amount of home tutors to accommodate the influx of students.
Nicola Ponton	90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	38,470		38,470	18,720	-19,750	Based on need to date
Jane Seymour	90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	459,110	49,000	508,110	508,110	0	Additional Budget agreed by SF in respect of increased Contract costs from September 2014
Rhian Ireland	90830	ASD Teachers	119,950		119,950	119,950	0	
Rhian Ireland	90957	Early Intervention	33,510		33,510	33,510	0	
Cathy Burnham	90961	Vulnerable Children	80,000		80,000	80,000	0	
Rhian Ireland	90965	SEN Inclusion Programme	28,780		28,780	28,780	0	
<b>High Needs Block: Non Top Up or Place Funding</b>			<b>1,776,400</b>	<b>49,000</b>	<b>1,825,400</b>	<b>1,837,820</b>	<b>12,420</b>	
<b>High Needs Block Total</b>			<b>17,180,500</b>	<b>-684,360</b>	<b>16,496,140</b>	<b>16,202,130</b>	<b>-294,010</b>	
<b>Total Expenditure across funding blocks</b>			<b>89,292,450</b>	<b>-665,010</b>	<b>88,627,440</b>	<b>87,652,590</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	
<b>SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES</b>			<b>720,890</b>		<b>720,890</b>	<b>720,890</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE</b>			<b>90,013,340</b>	<b>-665,010</b>	<b>89,348,330</b>	<b>88,373,480</b>	<b>-974,850</b>	
Ian Pearson	90030	DSG Grant Account	-90,013,340	665,010	-89,348,330	-88,373,480	974,850	
<b>NET DSG EXPENDITURE</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	