

# Notice of Meeting

---

## Schools Forum

**Monday 15th October 2018 at 5.00pm**  
at Shaw House Church Road Newbury  
RG14 2DR

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 9 October 2018

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Jessica Bailiss on (01635) 503124  
e-mail: [jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at  
[www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



**Forum Members:** Reverend Mark Bennet, Ben Broyd, Anthony Chadley, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Lynne Doherty, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Reverend Mary Harwood, Angela Hay, Alan Henderson, Jon Hewitt, Lucy Hillyard, Peter Hudson, Brian Jenkins, Mollie Lock, Patrick Mitchell, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Bruce Steiner (Chairman), Suzanne Taylor and Charlotte Wilson

# **Agenda**

## **Part I**

## **Page No.**

1	<b>Apologies</b>	
2	<b>Minutes of previous meeting dated 16th July 2018</b>	1 - 10
3	<b>Actions arising from previous meetings</b>	11 - 12
4	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
5	<b>Membership</b>	

## **Items for Discussion**

6	<b>De-delegations 2019/20 (Amin Hussian)</b>	13 - 44
7	<b>DSG Budget Overview 2019/20 (Wendy Howells)</b>	45 - 52
8	<b>Schools: deficit recovery (Wendy Howells)</b>	53 - 60

## **Items for Decision**

9	<b>DSG Outturn 2017/18</b>	61 - 64
10	<b>Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (Wendy Howells)</b>	65 - 68
11	<b>Additional Funding Criteria 2019/20 Wendy Howells)</b>	69 - 78
12	<b>Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty - Bid for Funding: Lambourn Primary School (Wendy Howells)</b>	79 - 82



## **Items for Information**

- |    |  |         |
|----|--|---------|
| 13 | <b>DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 6 (Ian Pearson)</b>  | 83 - 90 |
| 14 | <b>Forward Plan</b>  | 91 - 92 |
| 15 | <b>Any Other Business</b>  |         |
| 16 | <b>Date of the next meeting</b><br><i>Monday 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2018, 5pm at Shaw House</i> |         |

Andy Day  
Head of Strategic Support

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact  
Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.

This page is intentionally left blank

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

## **SCHOOLS FORUM**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 16 JULY 2018**

**Present:** Reverend Mark Bennet, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Chris Davis, Councillor Lynne Doherty, Keith Harvey, Reverend Mary Harwood, Angela Hay, Jon Hewitt, Patrick Mitchell, David Ramsden, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Bruce Steiner (Chairman), Suzanne Taylor and Keith Watts

**Also Present:** Wendy Howells (Finance Manager: Schools), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service), Annette Yellen (Accountant for Schools Funding and the DSG), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)) and Michelle Sancho (Principal EP & Service Manager)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Ben Broyd, Councillor Anthony Chadley, Antony Gallagher, Lucy Hillyard, Brian Jenkins, Councillor Mollie Lock, Chris Prosser, Jane Seymour and Charlotte Wilson

#### **PART I**

##### **1 Minutes of previous meeting dated 18th June 2018**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018 were approved.

##### **2 Actions arising from previous meetings**

**June18 – Ac1 - Consulting with the relevant governing bodies regarding the secondary governor vacancy:** David Ramsden reported that this action was underway.

It was noted that actions Jun18-Ac2 and Ac4 were on the agenda and would be discussed later in the meeting.

**June18 – Ac3 - Effectively manging schools in financial difficulty:** Ian Pearson reported this would be managed by the standing item that would commence in October 2018 concerning deficit recovery.

##### **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

##### **4 Membership**

The Chairman reported that it was Chris Davis's last meeting of the Schools' Forum as he was due to retire. He thanked Chris Davis for his many years of contribution to the work of the Schools' Forum and wished him a long and happy retirement.

It was also noted that the Chairman's term of office had ended in July and that he would continue as a Member of the Schools' Forum for a further three year term.

##### **5 Schools' Forum Membership and Constitution from September 2018 (Jessica Bailiss)**

Jessica Bailiss introduced the report (Agenda Item 6) which aimed to review and where necessary update the Membership and Constitution of the Schools' Forum. It was

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

highlighted that there was a typographical error on page 11, section 2.1, and that the date for approval would be from September 2018.

Jessica Bailiss explained that the membership for the Schools' Forum must reflect the proportion of pupils within each sector. No schools had converted to an academy since September 2017 however, Lambourn Primary School was due to convert in September 2018 and therefore the pupil numbers for this school had been included with information for academies. Jessica Bailiss added that even with this in mind, there had not been a significant enough change to require a change to the composition of the Forum.

In terms of changes to the Constitution there was one amendment proposed under section 5.1 of the report, regarding attendance and a six month rule.

In conclusion it was recommended that the Schools' Forum approve the Membership and Constitution as set out in section 2.1 of the report. Keith Harvey proposed that the Forum approve the Membership and Constitution and this was seconded by John Chishick. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the Schools' Forum approved the Membership and Constitution from September 2018.

### **6 Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty - Bid for Funding: The Willows (Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 7) that summarised the bid that had been received from the Willows Primary School to the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty De-delegated Fund. It was noted that there was a typographical error under section 4.1 as the report did not include an Appendix A.

Wendy Howells reported that the bid was for an amount of £36,118 to cover the cost of staff restructuring and executive support following a formal warning to the school.

At its meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018, the Heads Funding Group had agreed to recommend that the Schools' Forum approve the bid in full, since the costs had already been incurred and had contributed to the deficit position. Approval of the bid would not clear the school's deficit and it would still be required to implement savings. Receipt of the funding would help repay the deficit in year as planned.

Jonathon Chishick proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the bid in full and this was seconded by Chris Davis. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the Schools' Forum approved the bid from the Willows Primary School as set out in section 2.1 of the report.

### **7 Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty - Bid for Funding: Parsons Down (Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 8) that summarised the bid that had been received from the Parson Down Partnership to the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty De-delegated Fund. The amount being bid for was £32,106 to help cover the costs of redundancy.

At its meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 the Heads Funding Group had agreed to recommend that the bid be approved in full. The school had a robust deficit recovery plan, including moving the school to a two form entry and a restructure of staffing. Approval of the bid would not clear the school's deficit and it would still be required to implement the savings in their deficit recovery plan.

Jonathon Chishick proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the bid in full and this was seconded by Chris Davis. At the vote the motion was carried.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

**RESOLVED** that the Schools' Forum approved the bid from The Parson Down Partnership as set out in section 2.1 of the report.

### 8 **Scheme for Financing Schools 2018/19 (Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the Scheme for Financing Schools (Agenda Item 9). Some statutory changes had been made to the document along with one Local Authority change, which included an amendment to the policy for schools in deficit.

Schools had now been consulted on the document including changes and no questions had been received. Therefore Wendy Howells recommended that the Schools' Forum approve the Scheme for Financing Schools for 2018/19.

Keith Harvey reported that the document had been discussed at the Primary Headteacher Forum and all had felt that the document was logical and accurate.

David Ramsden proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the document and this was seconded by Jonathon Chishick. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED** that the Schools' Forum approved the Scheme for Financing Schools 2018/19.

### 9 **DSG Outturn 2017/18 (Ian Pearson/Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 10) which set out the actual deployment of the Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG) in 2017/18, explaining the main variances and to propose the amounts to be carried forward to 2018/19.

Section 5.2 of the report detailed the options for utilising the unspent budgets and 5.3 included recommendations from the Heads Funding Group (HFG) on how this money could be used.

- 1) Primary Schools' in Financial Difficulty – it was recommended that the unspent budget of £259,099 be added to the funding available in 2018/19 to help meet restructuring costs for schools in deficit, which would provide a total budget of £379,120.
- 2) Support to Ethnic and Minority and Bilingual Learners – it was recommended that the amount of £35,170 be used to offset the cost to schools for this service in 2019/20. This would be an approximate reduction per pupil of £50.
- 3) Behaviour Support – it was recommended that the £4,500 be added to the current year budget and for it to be utilised in 2018/19.
- 4) Growth Fund – it was recommended that this be rolled into the budget already set for 2018/19, increasing the budget to £277,710.
- 5) School Improvement – It was recommended by the HFG that £5,960 of the unspent budget of £73,410 be used to offset the over spend in the Statutory and Regulatory Duties budget. The HFG had not reached a recommendation for the remainder of the money however, this would be discussed again at the HFG meeting in October 2018.

Catie Colston asked for clarification that section 5.3 listed recommendations from the HFG and Ian Pearson confirmed that this was correct. David Ramsden noted that schools had been under represented at the last meeting of the HFG and Ian Pearson confirmed that there had not been a Secondary School representative present.

David Ramsden raised a question about the unspent budget for the Primary Schools' in Financial Difficulty Fund (£259,099), regarding whether this money could be handed back to schools. Wendy Howells reported that this was not possible however, it could be used in 2019/20 to reduce the amount the pooled schools would be required to pay into the budget.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

Ian Pearson stated that there had been concern raised at the HFG that this budget could continue to rise. The approval of bids from The Willows and The Parsons Down Partnership would mean the overall budget would reduce to around £300k. The HFG had discussed a cap being applied to the budget and any money paid into the budget above the capped amount would be returned to schools through reducing costs the following year. David Ramsden was concerned that the sum of money would be left unused and Ian Pearson highlighted that schools were continuing to forecast deficits and therefore it was highly likely that there would be further calls on the fund.

Reverend Mark Bennet felt that the money needed to be viewed strategically. Schools were having to make hard decisions and this pot of funding provided schools with the confidence to make these decisions early on. Ian Pearson added that extra criteria had been added to the fund, as agreed by the Schools' Forum, that allowed it to be used for obtaining additional advice and support to schools that required it.

In reference to the options set out under 5.3, Graham Spellman asked if one unspent budget could be used to offset another. Wendy Howells confirmed that this could be done, for example £5,960 of the School Improvement unspent budget was being used to offset the over spend in the Statutory and Regulatory Duties budget.

Keith Watts speculated that schools that went into deficit used the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund as a last resort. He felt that it could be worth reversing this situation to help schools before they reached crisis point. This would however require a change in expectations amongst school leaders.

Wendy Howells stated that the Schools' Forum had agreed the criteria for accessing the fund for example, a decrease in pupil numbers. There were several criterion that a bid could be submitted against. It was not recommended however, as part of the criteria, that a school should already be in deficit. Keith Watts was concerned that schools were unaware of the process and Wendy Howells stated that the Strategy for Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty was circulated to schools on an annual basis.

*(Patrick Mitchell joined the meeting at 5:21pm)*

Reverend Mark Bennet felt that the process needed reiterating to Chairs of Governors. Ian Pearson felt that the issues needed to be approached collectively. It was important that the mismanagement of funds was not rewarded and therefore the area needed addressing carefully. Keith Watts highlighted that currently when a school failed to balance its budget, money was awarded and ideally schools needed supporting before they reached this point.

David Ramsden reiterated his concern about the amount of unspent funding in the Schools' in Financial Difficulty pot, which was nearly reaching £400k. Jonathon Chishick stated that a deficit of almost £900k was being projected for primary schools and therefore the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund should be viewed as a contingency fund. He did however, agree with the notion that the fund needed to be capped. All schools were taking steps to address their deficits however, additional support might be required.

David Ramsden stated that he disagreed with the point made by Keith Watts regarding how the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund should be used. He was aware that a large degree of deficits were a result of management issues. There was a huge amount of unspent money, which in his view could be used elsewhere.

Keith Harvey was in support of discussing the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund at the next HFG. Chris Davis added that in his view the pot of money was not increasing unacceptably and it could be argued that in the grand scheme of things, the amount of money available was relatively small. Issues could be addressed when setting the next budget and a cap could be applied. It was agreed that the area should come back to the



## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

HFG for discussion in October 2018 and in particular focus should be given to applying a cap to the fund.

David Ramsden stated that it was important to ensure that the criteria for accessing the fund was correct as there was a danger that schools would be wanting to call on it more often. Ian Pearson confirmed that there was a rigorous system in place that involved the HFG challenging schools applying for funding.

Wendy Howells moved on to talk about the High Needs Block, where £100k would be allocated for invest to save projects. This area would be discussed in more detail under Agenda Item 12.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- 1) The unspent funding in Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would be discussed in more detail at the next HFG in October 2018, with particular attention given to applying a cap.
- 2) *(Post meeting comment: Although the Forum raised no objection to the recommendations set out in section 5.3 concerning unspent budgets (for the following areas: Support to Ethnic and Minority and Bilingual Learners (£35,170); Behaviour Support (£4,500); Growth Fund (£75,710); and School Improvement (£5,960)), by omission no motion for approval was carried and therefore, these items would need to return to the Schools' Forum in October 2018 for decision).*

## **10 High Needs Block - Invest to Save Proposals (Jane Seymour)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 11), which aimed to present proposals for invest to save projects using £100k of one off funding in 2018/19 for consideration by the Schools' Forum. The High Needs Block overspend in 2017/18 was £256k less than anticipated. The Schools' Forum had agreed to use £156k of this money to reduce the deficit in 2018/19 and for £100k to be allocated to projects that would help generate savings in the High Needs Block.

Ian Pearson reported that pages 80 and 81 of the report pack detailed proposals for consideration. All the proposals added up to the total amount of £100k and it was highlighted that this would be a one off sum of money. The aim would be to reduce the pressure on the High Needs Block going forward.

It was agreed that the Schools' Forum should consider each item individually.

### **5.1 Equipment for children attending resourced schools and nursery schools – Proposal: £10,000 be set aside to meet the costs of equipment in nursery schools and schools with resourced units.**

Keith Harvey queried if the amount of £10k was the exact amount the Schools' Forum had cut the service in 2017. David Ramsden struggled to see how a one off sum of money could be used for invest to save projects.

Ian Pearson reported that since the budget had been cut in 2017, equipment costs had sent some schools with resourced units into deficit. As there was now some money available this was an area that required revisiting and the one off amount of £10k would sustain the service until a decision was taken to review the budget long term. Based on this David Ramsden stated that he was happy to support the proposal.

Suzanne Taylor asked if the £10k would be used to offset the cost of equipment in year and Ian Pearson confirmed that it would be, as some schools were unable to afford equipment. Suzanne Taylor confirmed that she was not aware of any nursery schools that would need to call on the fund. Ian Pearson confirmed that the main issue was with resourced schools as they had a disproportionately high number of children requiring resources.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

Keith Harvey suggested that the Schools' Forum consider opening up the £10k to all schools. Keith Watts stated that if the fund was made available to all schools, then the criteria would be met by resourced schools and also other schools that might suddenly require resources. Jonathon Chishick stated that when the fund had been cut in 2017 he had not realised that nurseries did not have a delegated SEN budget to pay for equipment.

Ian Pearson stated that it was within the remit of the Schools' Forum to either approve the recommendation or alternatively open the fund up to all schools.

Reverend Mark Bennet stated that he represented a school with a resourced unit that had a classroom especially for children with a hearing impairment and he stated that further funding would be particularly useful. He queried if there also needed to be money allocated specifically to new resourced units. David Ramsden was of the opinion that children with hearing impairments attended mainstream schools as well and therefore the funding should be made available to all schools, as long as certain criteria was enforced. Chris Davis added that if there was a robust system in place then the funding should be opened up to all schools and each case should be judged on its merits. Ian Pearson suggested that there should be threshold applied. Chris Davis recalled that there was once a bidding system in place.

**RESOLVED** that this should be brought back to the next round of meetings in October 2018.

5.2 Training programme for behaviour leads in schools with high exclusions – Proposal: If the bid is not successful, it would be possible to tailor the programme to be delivered for a lower amount of £78,400.

Ian Pearson reported that a bid had been submitted for funding from the Strategic School Improvement Fund for a programme of support and training for schools with high exclusions. The bid was for an amount of £167,000. If the bid was not successful, it would be possible to tailor the programme to be delivered at a lower amount.

Jacquie Davies commented that anything that could be done to help keep children in mainstream school was worth investing in. Chris Davis stated early intervention could mean that a child would less likely end up being permanently excluded.

Reverend Mark Bennet felt that the project could help address particular issues but not all. He asked how the effectiveness of the project would be monitored as it was significant project. Michelle Sancho reported that the aim would be to identify and track pupils to see what impact the project was having. Suzanne Taylor asked if there would be a focus on developing language. Michelle Sancho stated this would be included as part of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) course programme as it was recognised that the school system had a significant impact on speech and language development. Catie Colston stated that she was supportive of offering training to schools. It would not solve all issues however, was a move in the right direction.

Patrick Mitchell queried if the project was approved, if it would be accessible to schools other than the top five schools with the highest exclusion numbers. Michelle Sancho reported that this would be possible.

David Ramsden felt that the quality of the training would be a huge factor in the success of the project. He was not fully informed on the nature of the project however, did have concerns. Michelle Sancho stated that the quality of training would be high. A pack of information would also be produced and left with schools to refer to. It was an invest to save project because individuals would be trained, data would be collected so that schools could be monitored and a network of behaviour leagues would be created. Michelle Sancho added that there would be a process of engagement with schools and

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

details on how this could be implemented was detailed as part of the bid (Appendix A). Collaborative working with schools would be required.

Graham Spellman asked when it would be known if the bid had been successful. Michelle Sancho stated that they had been informed they would know by July 2018, so it was hoped that this would be known shortly.

Jonathon Chishick asked if it was a West Berkshire based initiative and if the bid was not successful in West Berkshire could the authority join with other authorities to deliver the project. Michelle Sancho confirmed that it was a West Berkshire based project and although it could be possible for West Berkshire to join with another local authority, this could cause the project to become too broad and complicated as it would be likely that another authority would have different systems in place. Michelle Sancho reminded the Forum that if the bid was refused then a slimmed down option would be required from that included in Appendix A.

Catie Colston proposed that the proposal should be approved and this was seconded by Chris Davis and at the vote the motion was carried (David Ramsden abstained from voting).

**RESOLVED that** the Schools Forum approved the allocation of £78,400 to this project if the bid was not successful

5.3 Delivery of PPEP Care Training module on ASD for schools – Proposal: This could be achieved at a cost of £10,000.

PPEP Care stood for Psychological Perspectives in Education and Primary Care. It was a nationally recognised programme which offered training. There had been a rise in complex needs including Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). The Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND) consultation had revealed that this was an area schools would like to be upskilled on. The training would be delivered by experts in the field and then staff who had been trained would be able to help roll the training out to schools.

David Ramsden stated that he had been asking for something similar for some time and fully supported the project. He however queried if £10k was enough to cover costs if all schools took up the offer. Michelle Sancho stated that the figure was based on the delivery of a number of sessions.

Angela Hay echoed David Ramsden that training was something that was needed however, was concerned if enough money was being allocated. Michelle Sancho reported that if more money was made available then more sessions could be offered. David Ramsden felt that this was something that would be worth considering if the bid for funding under item 5.2 was successful. All schools needed to be made fully aware of what was being offered as it was prestigious.

Reverend Mary Harwood was aware that there were many parents awaiting support from CAMHS professionals and asked if this situation would get worse, if these professionals were delivering the training. Michelle Sancho confirmed that CAMHS professionals would not be delivering the training but rather members of the Education and Psychology Team.

Keith Watts queried if there was an overlap between the proposals for 5.2 and 5.3 and Michelle Sancho felt that this was unlikely because 5.2 was solely focused on ASD.

Jon Hewitt proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the proposal and this was seconded by Keith Harvey. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the Schools Forum approved the allocation of £10k for this project.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

5.4 Setting up on line forum for SENCOs – Proposal: More work would need to be done to identify costings but this could be a relatively low cost initiative. The remaining £1,600 could be set aside for this purpose.

Ian Pearson reported that this was a relatively straightforward project and would involve increasing interaction between SENCOs and the sharing of good practise. Keith Watts felt that it was a good initiative however, stressed that SENCOs needed to be allocated time within the working day to be involved.

Keith Harvey was concerned that £1,600 was not enough funding to sustain the project as it could involve a phased set up and management. David Ramsden felt that success would depend on the quality of the software. Ian Pearson stated that Officers could proceed based on the initial amount and then return to the Schools' Forum if it was thought that further funding would be required.

Patrick Mitchell stated that it was important that somebody took ownership of the management of the system. Catie Colston was concerned that the danger would be that only SENCOs who were already engaged would use the system. Ian Pearson stated that there was further support available to SENCOs and the system would be put in place to enhance the support already available.

Chris Davis proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the proposal and this was seconded by David Ramsden. At the vote the motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- An update on costings should be provided to the Schools' Forum in due course.
- That the amount of £1,600 be allocated.

### 5.5 Funding for resourced schools experiencing financial pressures

Ian Pearson stated that the HFG agreed to recommend that this could not be resolved with one off funding and that a review on funding for resourced schools was required. Focus needed to be given as to whether the funding formula was fit for purpose and if it required adjusting.

**RESOLVED that** a report would be brought back to the Schools' Forum on this in due course.

## **11 School Budgets 2018/19 and Schools in Financial Difficulty (Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 12), which set out the overall position in relation to school balances. The report also highlighted some key observations and detailed the strategy that the Council intended to follow for schools in financial difficulty.

Table 1 on page 103 highlighted how many schools had a surplus or deficit budget. The number of schools forecasting a surplus had risen slightly for 2018/19 and the number of schools forecasting a deficit budget had reduced by one school.

Table 2 showed the overall balances for each sector compared to the original budget/forecast. In 2017/18 the actual revenue balances were over £2m higher than the original budget (with the main school budget outturn nearly £1.8m higher than the original budget). The main school budgets set for 2018/19 were forecasting a net surplus of £642k, which was £3.5m higher than the forecast set in 2017/18. These swings were no different to previous years and it was possible that schools were setting a "worst case scenario" budget for years two and three of their forecasts. Careful decisions and assistance from the Schools' Accountancy Team would hopefully help to manage the budget deficits down.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

Catie Colston asked in essence what the figures were showing and Wendy Howells confirmed that overall schools were being pessimistic with their forecasting for years two and three. Catie Colston queried if schools were taking this approach because they were struggling to predict that far ahead and Wendy Howells confirmed that this could be the case. David Ramsden noted that there were big gaps between forecasted figures and actual balances. Schools were trying to give realistic figures however, only had their year one budgets agreed. There was huge financial pressure on schools and therefore they needed to act cautiously. Wendy Howells highlighted that if schools were struggling then they needed to contact the Schools' Finance Team for support. Patrick Mitchell stated that pulling budgets back under control through employing lower cost members of staff was a method of the past.

Table 3 showed that seven schools were continuing a deficit from the position in 2017/18 and a further two schools closed in deficit and set a deficit budget for 2018/19. The 2018/19 balance as forecast in 2017/18 was £608,890 however, it was now known that the deficit would amount to £923k. Even though the overall position of schools had improved the situation for schools in deficit had not improved. Table 4 gave the overall three year forecast for the main school budget for each sector. It was expected that most schools would manage to improve their deficit.

Wendy Howells moved onto page 106 of the agenda, which gave details on the West Berkshire Strategy for Schools in Financial Difficulty. The Strategy had not changed since 2017/18 and was very dependent on staffing levels. The schools that required intervention immediately included John Rankin, The Willows, The Willink and Westwood Farm as all had significant deficits.

David Ramsden asked how the Strategy was applied within individual schools. Ian Pearson stated that meetings were set up involving a 'task force', which would review a school's budget and staffing structure, and determine options to repay the deficit and make recommendations. A plan would be put in place and if the school deviated from this plan then further conversations would be required. David Ramsden commented that it was extremely difficult to move out of deficit once a school had found itself in this position.

Keith Harvey asked at what point a 'notice of concern' was raised. Wendy Howells confirmed that this was applied if a school was in deficit and was not working with the Schools Finance Team.

David Ramsden noted that there were a number of federated schools in deficit. Ian Pearson stated that a project was underway looking into how federated schools operated. These schools had access to two lump sums. Leadership costs at the beginning of the process were a consistent issue. Keith Watts was curious about this point because it had been assumed initially that the restructure of leadership would reduce costs. Ian Pearson explained that expanded structures had often resulted in increased leadership costs.

Chris Davis noted that all but one school had now submitted their budgets and asked if the Schools' Forum should be concerned about this particular school. Wendy Howells confirmed that all schools had now submitted their budgets.

Catie Colston asked if Governors were included in meetings with schools facing financial difficulty and Wendy Howells confirmed that they were always invited to be involved.

**RESOLVED that** the Schools' Forum noted the report.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 16 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

### 12 DSG Monitoring Month 3 (Ian Pearson)

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 13), which set out the current financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

Ian Pearson added that the report was for monitoring purposes and at this stage was just for information. There would be a better indication of the position later in the year at months six and nine.

**RESOLVED that** the Schools Forum noted the report.

### 13 Forward Plan

**RESOLVED that** the Schools' Forum noted the Forward Plan.

### 14 Any Other Business

The Chairman stated that he would need to give his apologies for the next meeting of the Schools' Forum in October and therefore Vice-Chairman Graham Spellman would chair the meeting.

### 15 Date of the next meeting

The next meeting would take place on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2018, 5pm at Shaw House.

*(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 6.21 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

# Agenda Item 3

## Actions from previous meeting

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
July18 - Ac1	16/07/18	DSG Outturn 2017/18	The unspent funding in Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would be discussed in more detail at the next HFG in October 2018, with particular attention given to applying a cap.	Wendy Howells	This was discussed at the HFG at its meeting on the 2nd October.
July18 - Ac2 (a)	16/07/18	High Needs Block - Invest to Save Proposals. 5.1 Equipment for children attending resourced schools and nursery schools – Proposal: £10,000 be set aside to meet the costs of equipment in nursery schools and schools with resourced units.	This should be brought back to the next round of meetings in October 2018.	Jane Seymour	A verbal update will be provided at the Schools' Forum meeting.
July18 - Ac2 (b)	16/07/18	5.4 Setting up on line forum for SENCOs – Proposal: More work would needed to be done to identify costings but this could be a relatively low cost initiative. The remaining £1,600 could be set aside for this purpose.	An update on costings should be provided to the Schools' Forum in due course.	Jane Seymour	A verbal update will be provided at the Schools' Forum meeting.
July18 - Ac2 (c)	16/07/18	5.5 Funding for resourced schools experiencing financial pressures	A report would be brought back to the Schools' Forum on this in due course. The report would consider a review on funding for resourced schools.	Jane Seymour	This is on the Work Programme for the HFG in November and Schools' Forum in December.

## Ongoing Actions

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Jun18 - Ac1	18th June 2018	Membership	Chris Prosser and David Ramsden to consult with the relevant governing bodies regarding the secondary governor vacancy.	Chris Prosser / David Ramsden	

This page is intentionally left blank



## De-delegation Proposals 2019/20

**Report being considered by:** Schools' Forum  
**On:** 15 October 2018  
**Report Author:** Amin Hussain, Ian Pearson  
**Item for:** Decision **By:** All Maintained Schools Representatives

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out the details, cost, and charges to schools of the services on which maintained school representatives are required to vote (on an annual basis) whether or not they should be de-delegated.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Maintained primary, secondary, special, nursery and PRU heads (as applicable) to agree the de-delegations as set out in Table 7.

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Background

- 3.1 The Schools' Forum in October 2017 and Dec 2017 agreed for the following services to be centrally provided to primary and secondary maintained schools in the 2018/19 financial year through the pooling of funding:

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support
- Trade Union Representation
- Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary only)
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
  - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools
  - Internal Audit of schools
  - Administration of pensions for school staff
  - Health and Safety (level 1 support)

- 3.2 The schools funding regulations for 2018/19 confirm that similar arrangements apply for dedelegation of the cost of these services will apply for the financial years 2018/19 and 2019/20. Funding arrangements are expected to change in 2020/21, but details of the changes have not yet been announced.

- 3.3 Representatives of Primary and Secondary schools are required to make a recommendation to Schools Forum whether or not funds should be de-delegated in the financial year 2019/20 for:
- Behaviour Support Services
  - Ethnic Minority Support
  - Trade Union Representation
  - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary only)
  - CLEAPSS
- Funds cannot be de-delegated from Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs for these services, but those schools will have the option to buy back these services at a cost based on the same amount per pupil as for primary and secondary schools.
- 3.4 In the case of the services which make up Statutory and Regulatory Duties, representatives of all maintained schools (including Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs) are required to recommend to Schools Forum whether or not funds should be de-delegated.
- 3.5 For 2018/19 Schools were offered the option to pool funds for the provision of level 2 Health and Safety support, as part of the Statutory and Regulatory Duties block (option 1).
- 3.6 The Schools' Forum also agreed for 2018/19 to pool funds for the provision of the statutory element of the School Improvement Service, which was previously funded from the Education Services Grant. However a new School Improvement Grant has now been made available to the Local Authority to provide this service, so it is no longer necessary to propose the pooling of schools' funds for School Improvement.
- 3.7 Academies and other non maintained schools also may be able to choose to buy into any of the above services subject to service provider agreement.
- 3.8 Appendix A sets out the total cost of each service and an initial estimate of the amount to be de-delegated from each school. This estimate is based on the October 2017 census. However the final amounts will be based on the October 2018 census when that data becomes available.

#### **4. Behaviour Intervention Service**

- 4.1 The Behaviour Intervention Service proposal for 2019/20 is set out in Appendix B.
- 4.2 Table 1 shows the budget and unit charge for 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. The total cost will be divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2018 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2017 census this is estimated to be £14.22 per pupil but the final rate will be determined according to the October 2018 census.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	2018/19		2019/20	
	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£14.05	£174,897	£14.22	£180,808
Maintained Secondary Schools	£14.05	£42,733	£14.22	£54,482
<b>Total</b>		<b>£217,630</b>		<b>£235,290</b>

## 5. Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service

- 5.1 The detail of the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) is set out in Appendix C.
- 5.2 Table 2 shows the budget and the estimated unit charge for the service for 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. The total cost in respect of Primary and Secondary schools will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (EAL) in the October 2017 census to determine a unit charge per EAL pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. The estimated unit charge of £187.34 per pupil is lower than the rate for 2018/19 because of the increase in the number of EAL pupils.. The estimated unit charge is based on the October 2017 census, but the final rate will be determined according to the number of EAL pupils in the October 2018 census.

<b>TABLE 2</b>	2018/19		2019/20	
	Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£274.17	£169,085	£187.34	£206,079
Maintained Secondary Schools	£274.17	£4,392	£187.34	£38,968
		<b>£173,477</b>		<b>£245,047</b>

## 6. Trade Union Representation

- 6.1 The detail of the service provided by Trade Union representatives to schools is set out in Appendix D.

Table 3 shows the budget and unit charge for the service for 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. The proposal for 2019/20 has increased from 2018/19 with the cost based on 1FTE supply teacher on UPS3. It is assumed there will also be some buy in from academy schools. The total net cost in respect of Primary and Secondary schools will be divided by the total number of pupils in the October 2017 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based on. As all schools have access to all representatives (regardless of which school they are based in), the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2017 census this currently estimated to be £3.28 per pupil but the final rate will be determined according to the October 2018 census.

<b>TABLE 3</b>	2018/19		2019/20	
	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£3.13	£38,930	£3.28	£41,753
Maintained Secondary Schools	£3.13	£9,512	£3.28	£12,581
		<b>£48,442</b>		<b>£54,334</b>

## 7. Schools in Financial Difficulty

- 7.1 If schools decide to de-delegate funding to provide a fund for schools in financial difficulty, the amount to be pooled can be for any amount. Currently only primary schools de-delegate.
- 7.2 The proposal shown in Table 4 assumes continuing with an annual fund of £120,000, which would equate to £9.44 per pupil based on the October 2017 census but the final rate will be determined according to the October 2018 census.

<b>TABLE 4</b>	2018/19		2019/20	
	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£9.64	£120,000	£9.44	£120,000
Maintained Secondary Schools				
		<b>£120,000</b>		<b>£120,000</b>

- 7.3 More schools are now applying for funding, and it is largely used for one off exceptional costs such as those in relation to staffing restructures. If it is agreed to continue pooling, Schools' Forum will also be required to agree the criteria for primary schools to access this fund.

## 8. Consortium of Local Education Authorities for the Provision of Science Services (CLEAPSS)

- 8.1 The detail of the service provided by this subscription is set out in Appendix E.
- 8.2 As the actual pricing from CLEAPSS will not be available until after the schools budget has been set, an assumption has been made on the 2019/20 fee. Any over or under spend will be recovered the following year, as in all de-delegated services. Table 5 shows the budget and unit charge for the service for 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. The unit charge includes the administration fee. Note that secondary schools will need to pay the fee relating to sixth form pupils separately as de-delegation is based on pre 16 pupils only.

<b>TABLE 5</b>	2018/19			2019/20		
	Unit Charge per pupil	Charge per school	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Charge per school	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£0.16		£1,991	£0.16		£2,034
Maintained Secondary Schools	£0.16	£225	£1,162	£0.16	£225	£1,288
		<b>£2,990</b>				<b>£3,322</b>

## 9. Statutory and Regulatory Duties

- 9.1 The statutory regulatory duties consist of the statutory functions in respect of schools of Accountancy, Internal Audit, Pension scheme administration and Health and Safety. The Accountancy, audit and pension administration services are described in appendix F.
- 9.2 In 2018/19 funds to provide level 1 Health and Safety support were de-delegated but individual schools were given the choice whether or not to buy back level 2 support. The Health and Safety service is proposing two alternative options for de-delegation, as set out in appendix G. Option 1 is to de-delegate funds to provide level 1 and 2 support for all maintained primary and secondary schools. Option 2 is the same arrangement as for 2018/19.
- 9.3 Table 6 shows the budget and estimated unit charges for these services in 2019/20 compared to 2018/19. The total cost will be divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2018 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. The same unit charges will apply to both primary and secondary schools. The estimated unit charges shown are based on the October 2017 census but the final rates will be determined according to the October 2018 census.

<b>TABLE 6</b>	2018/19		2019/20				
	Charge per Pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Total Budget	Estimated Primary Budget	Estimated Secondary Budget	Estimated budget for Nursery, Special Schools and PRUs
Accountancy	£2.09	£33,793	£2.29	£39,466	£29,103	£8,769	£1,593
Audit	£2.79	£45,173	£2.68	£46,154	£34,035	£10,256	£1,863
Pension Scheme Administration	£2.09	£33,759	£2.09	£35,948	£26,509	£7,988	£1,451
Health and Safety Option 1	£3.52	£56,962	£8.19	£141,200	£104,125	£31,375	£5,700
Health and Safety Option 2			£10.70	£184,397	£135,980	£40,974	£7,444
Total Option 1	<b>£10.49</b>	<b>£169,687</b>	<b>£15.24</b>	<b>£262,768</b>	<b>£193,772</b>	<b>£58,388</b>	<b>£10,607</b>
Total Option 2			<b>£17.75</b>	<b>£305,965</b>	<b>£225,627</b>	<b>£67,987</b>	<b>£12,351</b>

## 10. Summary of Proposals

10.1 Table 7 summarises the services and budgets which are proposed to be de-delegated in 2019/20:

<b>TABLE 7</b>	<b>2019/20 Primary Budget £</b>	<b>Agreed by HFG</b>	<b>2019/20 Secondary Budget £</b>	<b>Agreed by HFG</b>	<b>2019/20 Early Years &amp; High Needs Budgets £</b>	<b>Agreed by HFG</b>
Behaviour Integration	180,808		54,481		n/a	n/a
Ethnic Minority Support	206,079		38,968		n/a	n/a
Trade Union Representation	41,753		12,581		n/a	n/a
Schools in Financial Difficulty	120,000		n/a		n/a	n/a
CLEAPSS	2,034		1,288		n/a	n/a
Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 1	193,773		58,388		10,608	
Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 2	225,627		67,986		12,351	

## 11. Consultation and Engagement

11.1 The proposals set out in this report will be included in the consultation with all schools on the proposed school funding arrangements for 2019/20.

## 12. Appendices

Appendix A – Indicative De-delegations per school for 2019/20

Appendix B – Behaviour Intervention Service

Appendix C – Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service

Appendix D – Trade Union Representation Service

Appendix E – CLEAPSS Service

Appendix F – Accountancy, Audit and Pension Administration

Appendix G- Health and Safety

# West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

## Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### Indicative De-delegations per school for 2019/20

Indicative De-Delegations for 2019/20 - Based on October 2017 Census Data															Appendix A	
				Behaviour Intervention	Ethnic Minority Support	Trade Union Representation	Schools in Financial Difficulty	CLEAPSS	Statutory Accounting Functions	Internal Audit of Schools	Pension Scheme Administration	Health and Safety Support Option 1	Health and Safety Support Option 2	Total Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 1	Total Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 2	
	Proposed Primary Delegation			£180,808	£206,079	£41,753	£120,000	£2,034	£29,103	£34,035	£26,509	£104,125	£135,980	£193,773	£225,627	
	Proposed Secondary Delegation			£54,481	£38,968	£12,581	£0	£1,288	£8,769	£10,256	£7,988	£31,375	£40,974	£58,388	£67,986	
	Total Proposed Delegation			£235,290	£245,047	£54,334	£120,000	£3,322	£37,873	£44,291	£34,497	£135,500	£176,953	£252,160	£293,614	
	Estimated income from other maintained schools			£0	£187	£2,286	£0	£76	£1,593	£1,863	£1,451	£5,700	£7,444	£10,608	£12,351	
	Total Cost of Service			£235,290	£245,234	£56,620	£120,000	£3,399	£39,466	£46,154	£35,948	£141,200	£184,397	£262,768	£305,965	
	Indicative cost per primary pupil			£14.22	£187.34	£3.28	£9.44	£0.16	£2.29	£2.68	£2.09	£8.19	£10.70	£15.24	£17.75	
	Indicative cost per secondary pupil			£14.22	£187.34	£3.28	n/a	£0.16	£2.29	£2.68	£2.09	£8.19	£10.70	£15.24	£17.75	
	Indicative cost per other maintained school pupil			n/a	£187.34	£3.28	n/a	£0.16	£2.29	£2.68	£2.09	£8.19	£10.70	£15.24	£17.75	
	Fixed cost per secondary school			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	£225.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Cost Centre	School	Pupil No's	EAL No's	Indicative Delegation for each Service by School												
91000	Adlestrop Church of England Primary School	158	8.0	2,247	1,499	519	1,491	25	362	423	329	1,294	1,690	2,408	2,804	
91100	Basildon Church of England Primary School	142	0.0	2,019	0	466	1,340	23	325	380	296	1,163	1,519	2,164	2,520	
91300	Beedon Church of England Controlled Primary School	49	5.0	697	937	161	462	8	112	131	102	401	524	747	870	
91400	Beenhaim Primary School	73	3.0	1,038	562	240	689	12	167	195	152	598	781	1,113	1,295	
91200	Birch Copse Primary School	422	14.0	6,001	2,623	1,386	3,983	68	966	1,130	880	3,456	4,513	6,432	7,489	
91500	Bradfield Church of England Primary School	145	1.0	2,062	187	476	1,369	23	332	388	302	1,188	1,551	2,210	2,573	
91600	Brightwalton Church of England Aided Primary School	94	3.0	1,337	562	309	887	15	215	252	196	770	1,005	1,433	1,668	
91700	Brimpton Church of England Primary School	56	0.0	796	0	184	529	9	128	150	117	459	599	853	994	
91800	Buckbury Church of England Primary School	120	0.0	1,707	0	394	1,133	19	275	321	250	983	1,283	1,829	2,130	
91900	Burghfield St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	211	5.0	3,001	937	693	1,992	34	483	565	440	1,728	2,257	3,216	3,725	
92000	Calcot Infant School & Nursery	255	33.0	3,626	6,182	837	2,407	41	584	683	532	2,088	2,727	3,886	4,444	
92100	Calcot Junior School	288	33.0	4,096	6,182	946	2,718	46	659	771	600	2,359	3,080	4,389	5,111	
95600	Chaddeworth St. Andrew's Church of England Primary School	25	0.0	356	0	82	236	4	57	67	52	205	267	381	444	
92400	Cheveley Primary School	206	6.0	2,930	1,124	677	1,944	33	472	551	430	1,687	2,203	3,140	3,656	
95900	Cold Ash St. Mark's Church of England Primary School	190	4.0	2,702	749	624	1,793	30	435	509	396	1,556	2,032	2,896	3,372	
92200	Compton Church of England Primary School	185	3.0	2,631	562	608	1,746	30	423	495	386	1,515	1,979	2,820	3,283	
92300	Curridge Primary School	101	4.0	1,436	749	332	953	16	231	270	211	827	1,080	1,539	1,792	
92500	Downsray Primary School	215	12.0	3,058	2,248	706	2,029	34	492	576	448	1,761	2,299	3,277	3,815	
92800	Enborne Church of England Primary School	61	0.0	867	0	200	576	10	140	163	127	500	652	930	1,083	
92900	Englefield Church of England Primary School	102	2.0	1,451	375	335	963	16	233	273	213	835	1,091	1,555	1,810	
93000	Falkland Primary School	453	19.0	6,442	3,560	1,488	4,276	72	1,037	1,213	945	3,710	4,845	6,904	8,039	
93200	Francis Baily Primary School	550	31.0	7,822	5,808	1,806	5,191	88	1,259	1,472	1,147	4,504	5,882	8,382	9,760	
93400	Garland Junior School	216	3.0	3,072	562	709	2,039	35	494	578	450	1,769	2,310	3,292	3,833	
93500	Hampstead Norreys Church of England Primary School	85	0.0	1,209	0	279	802	14	195	228	177	696	909	1,295	1,508	
93600	Hermage Primary School	195	8.0	2,773	1,499	640	1,840	31	446	522	407	1,597	2,086	2,972	3,461	
93700	Hungerford Primary School	384	21.0	5,461	3,934	1,261	3,624	61	879	1,028	801	3,145	4,107	5,852	6,815	
92700	The Isleys' Primary School	69	0.0	981	0	227	651	11	158	185	144	565	738	1,052	1,224	
93800	Inken Primary School	79	1.0	1,123	187	259	746	13	181	211	165	647	845	1,204	1,402	
93900	John Rankin Infant & Nursery School	310	46.0	4,409	8,618	1,018	2,926	50	710	830	646	2,539	3,316	4,725	5,501	
94000	John Rankin Junior School	313	31.0	4,451	5,808	1,028	2,954	50	716	838	653	2,563	3,348	4,770	5,555	
94100	Kennet Valley Primary School	202	32.0	2,873	5,995	663	1,907	32	462	541	421	1,654	2,160	3,079	3,585	
94200	Kirbury St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	162	2.0	2,394	375	532	1,529	26	371	434	338	1,327	1,733	2,469	2,875	
94400	Long Lane Primary School	209	11.0	2,972	2,061	686	1,973	33	478	559	436	1,712	2,236	3,185	3,709	
95800	Mortimer St. John's Church of England Infant School	174	4.0	2,474	749	571	1,642	28	398	466	363	1,425	1,861	2,652	3,088	
97500	Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England Junior School	216	2.0	3,072	375	709	2,039	35	494	578	450	1,769	2,310	3,292	3,833	
94500	Mrs. Bland's Infant & Nursery School	209	23.0	2,972	4,309	696	1,973	33	478	559	436	1,712	2,236	3,185	3,709	
94600	Pangbourne Primary School	218	21.0	3,100	3,934	716	2,058	35	499	584	455	1,785	2,332	3,323	3,969	
94700	Parsons Down Infant School	198	13.0	2,816	2,435	650	1,869	32	453	530	413	1,622	2,118	3,018	3,514	
94800	Parsons Down Junior School	293	12.0	4,167	2,248	962	2,765	47	671	784	611	2,400	3,134	4,466	5,200	
94900	Purley Church of England Infants School	118	16.0	1,678	2,998	388	1,114	19	270	316	246	966	1,262	1,798	2,094	
95000	Robert Sandilands Primary School & Nursery	265	40.0	3,769	7,494	870	2,501	42	607	709	553	2,170	2,834	4,039	4,703	
95100	Shaw-cum-Donnington Church of England Primary School	91	6.0	1,294	1,124	299	859	15	208	244	190	745	973	1,387	1,615	
95200	Shefford Church of England Primary School	39	2.0	555	375	128	368	6	89	104	81	319	417	594	692	
95400	Springfield Primary School	326	33.0	4,636	6,182	1,071	3,077	52	746	873	680	2,670	3,487	4,969	5,785	
95500	Spurcroft Primary School	481	40.0	6,840	7,494	1,580	4,540	77	1,101	1,288	1,003	3,939	5,144	7,331	8,536	
95700	St. Finian's Catholic Primary School	187	22.0	2,659	4,122	614	1,765	30	428	501	390	1,531	2,000	2,850	3,319	
97700	St. John the Evangelist Infant & Nursery School	197	31.0	2,802	5,808	647	1,859	32	451	527	411	1,613	2,107	3,002	3,496	
97800	St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	202	92.0	2,873	17,236	663	1,907	32	462	541	421	1,654	2,160	3,079	3,585	
96200	St. Nicolas Church of England Junior School	258	30.0	3,669	5,620	847	2,435	41	591	691	538	2,113	2,759	3,932	4,579	
96100	St. Pauls Catholic Primary School	326	99.0	4,636	18,547	1,071	3,077	52	746	873	680	2,670	3,487	4,969	5,785	
96300	Stockcross Church of England Primary School	101	1.0	1,436	187	332	953	16	231	270	211	827	1,080	1,539	1,792	
96400	Streatley Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	102	3.0	1,451	562	335	963	16	233	273	213	835	1,091	1,555	1,810	
96500	Summerville and Upton Nervet Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	107	2.0	1,522	375	351	1,010	17	245	286	223	876	1,144	1,631	1,899	
96700	Thatcham Park Church of England Primary School	409	3.0	5,816	562	1,343	3,860	65	936	1,095	853	3,350	4,374	6,234	7,258	
96900	Thasle Church of England Primary School	323	27.0	4,593	5,058	1,061	3,049	52	739	865	673	2,645	3,455	4,923	5,732	
96700	Welford and Wickham Church of England Primary School	95	0.0	1,351	0	312	897	15	217	254	198	778	1,016	1,448	1,688	
96800	Westwood Farm Infant School	191	16.0	2,716	2,998	627	1,803	31	437	511	398	1,564	2,043	2,911	3,390	
96900	Westwood Farm Junior School	230	24.0	3,271	4,496	755	2,171	37	526	616	480	1,884	2,480	3,505	4,082	
96700	The Willow's Primary School	409	74.0	5,816	13,863	1,343	3,860	65	936	1,095	853	3,350	4,374	6,234	7,258	
99400	The Winchcombe School	458	122.0	6,513	22,856	1,504	4,323	73	1,048	1,226	955	3,751	4,898	6,980	8,128	
97300	Woolhampton Church of England Primary School	92	0.0	1,308	0	302	868	15	211	246	192	753	984	1,402	1,633	
97400	Yattendon Church of England Primary School	74	1.0	1,052	187	243	698	12	16							



## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### Behaviour Intervention Service

#### Outline of Proposed Service 2019/20

The Behaviour Intervention Team (BIT) offers evidence-based advice and support to schools. The type of involvement includes whole school support, staff training, staff support, class or year group support as well as individual support. This tiered service represents an enhanced offer from previous years.

#### Key Features

These themes stem from the behaviour review:

1. Quick and flexible response to challenging cases in schools.
2. Different levels of response within the team (whole school, group, individual).
3. Training available in a range of areas.
4. Advice and support using newly developed SEMH Range Guidance and Behaviour Action Guidance.

#### Team Members

1. The Team –  
 Beth Cartwright (BIT Manager & Senior EP)  
 Kate Pike (BIT EP)  
 Gerry Heaton (Primary BIT Advisor)  
 Sue Keepax (Secondary BIT Advisor)  
 Alison Crawford (BIT Worker)  
 Rachel Wallace (BIT Worker)  
 Kayleigh Chocian (BIT Worker)  
 Roslyn Arthur (Exclusions Officer)  
 Piyush Bharania (Admin Assistant)

In addition to the above, schools have access to a team of educational psychologists and graphic facilitators who run circle of adult meetings to support schools with pupils at risk of exclusion. A Circle of Adults meeting is led by 2 trained workers and involves key staff and professionals from the school. It lasts 90 minutes and provides a structured approach to problem-solving and identifying agreed strategies.

This represents an increased offer from previous years with a range of professionals and expertise in the team. This will be delivered without a significant increase in the cost of the service. This is due to a team restructure and a more efficient deployment of resources.



2. Rapid Response: capacity to respond rapidly to school concerns. This could relate to children but also whole school situations that arise. Behaviour would be main focus but wouldn't exclude other complex situations.
3. For those needing some quick advice, signposting, or consultation with a BIT Educational Psychologist, Kate or Beth will be available for a telephone consultation on Wednesday afternoons from 1230 - 1630.
4. BIT referrals will be triaged weekly and the most appropriate level of support offered within 5 days.
5. The team will be informed by evidence based practice which will result in clear suggestions of what needs to happen to move the situation forward.
6. Partners and working relationships: In partnership with other agencies Beth will continue to develop a clear referral pathway for social emotional and mental health issues. This will include consideration of EHA, iCollege, EPS, EWS, and ASD support teachers.
7. All of the above sits neatly with Local Authority social and emotional mental Health and well-being agenda and restorative themes.
8. Research indicates that a number of children and young people presenting with challenging behaviour have unidentified mental health problems. Revised request for involvement forms have been created along with screening tools to identify any mental health problems. This will enable these needs to be addressed by BIT team members or for referrals to be made to appropriate services.

### **What would schools get?**

1. Screening and signposting for identified mental health difficulties.
2. Immediate write up and actions as well as agreed review of cases where appropriate.
3. Links with other support services and help in securing necessary actions
4. More direct support with very complex cases involving a wide range of services.
5. Access to support for challenging whole school situations through advisors with senior level management experience and experienced educational psychologists.
6. Direct links into PPP (Pupil Placement Panel & Fair Access process), VCF (Vulnerable Children's Fund) and other relevant systems/services
7. Support from workers where appropriate to help implement/model strategies in school.
8. Clear information of key personnel and agencies within West Berkshire –regularly updated.

9. Suggestions and links regarding potential training needs

10. Access to circle of adults meetings facilitated by an educational psychologist and a BIT worker for pupils at risk of permanent exclusion.

### Feedback from 2017/18 delivery

#### Comments from Primary Schools:

*'I have worked with BIT on a particularly challenging case - they have been professional, very helpful and above all are providing an invaluable service.'*

*'We seem to have made some very good progress, thanks to your efforts. In addition to the work you have done with groups I feel different about where we are as a school. Plenty to do but a clearer direction. I am sure the next few weeks will be busy and positive.'*

*'A big thank you to all who have been involved at X School – finally we have a team that follow up requests promptly, listen to the individual needs of our children and mainly just support staff in a useful way i.e: followed up!! – Your support has been very much appreciated by not just me but other staff in the school too.'*

#### Comments from Secondary Schools:

*'Thank you for your help and advice on motivating our year 10 pupils. The focusing on the positives whilst rigorously following up on the negatives seems to have had a positive impact. We have not got them 100% where we want them but we are much closer than we were!'*

*'The staff benefited from sharing their concerns with a trusted colleague; the insights gained into Y10 issues have helped inform our planning and training for 1819; progress has been less marked with the student being supported but the quality of the support he received has been very good.'*

*'We have really benefited from the flexibility of the support on offer.'*

### Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2019/20

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2019/20. It is based on employing the team members outlined above.

	2017/18 £	2018/19 £	2019/20 Proposed £	% increase
Staffing Costs	198,460	203,230	207,750	
Other Costs	6,150	6,150	6,150	
Support Service Recharges	19,400	20,940	21,390	
Total Cost	224,010	230,320	235,290	2.11%
Less Surplus Brought Forward	-10,640	-12,690		
<b>Amount to be De-Delegated</b>	<b>213,370</b>	<b>217,630</b>	<b>235,290</b>	<b>7.51%</b>

The overall cost of delivering the service has increased by 2.11% which takes into account the expected April 2019 pay award and salary increments. As the underspend in 2017/18

has been requested to be added to 2018/19 budgets there is no carry forward from previous years. Therefore the amount proposed to be de-delegated in 2019/20 is 7.51% higher than in 2018/19.

This does not take into account income which will be earned from any Academies which choose to buy back this service. Any additional income received from this source will reduce the net cost and the charge to maintained schools.

### Method of charging in 2019/20

The total net cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2018 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2017 census data to provide an indicative amount, this would equate to £14.22 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the indicative total amount per school.

Other Options which *may* be considered

1. The local authority offer a fully traded service (likely to increase the cost to individual schools).
2. Schools “pay as you go” either by employing/using own staff when needed or purchasing support from external providers (may include the local authority if still able to offer this service).
3. Local authority to consider an alternative (cheaper) service to offer.

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS)

#### Context

EMTAS has been funded through a de-delegation process as agreed with the Heads Funding Group. Historically the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service was provided to West Berkshire Schools through a consortium arrangement hosted through Reading Borough Council and the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) Service was through a consortium hosted through Wokingham District Council. The EMA service was brought in house several years ago and the GRT service became a West Berkshire Service in 2009. All of the support for Black Minority Ethnic, English as an additional language (EAL) pupils and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) pupils is provided by the EMTAS Service.

#### Current Structure

The current service is led by a Team Manager (0.8FTE), supported by a Learning Support Adviser (a qualified teacher) for 0.6 FTE. There are 5 part time Pupil Support Officers (Teaching Assistant level posts) who are employed for a total of 3.0 FTE. The service has administrative support for 1 day per week.

The Team Manager is responsible for the day to day management of the service.

- Organisation of English language assessments of new arrivals and advanced bilingual speakers;
- Arranging advice and support for individual pupils, including those with EAL and SEND, EHC planning.
- Arranging support for first language GCSE/AS/A2 papers; SATs maths translation.
- Arranging in- house school INSET focusing on EAL teaching and learning.
- LA wide INSET around issues such as the Equality Act 2010 and bespoke support for individual schools where necessary
- Leading training for teachers and teaching assistants on EAL/BME issues.
- Organisation of tailored packages of support to schools meet the needs of ethnic minority pupils and those from Gypsy, Roma, Traveller families.
- Joint working with other agencies to support schools with ethnic minority pupils.
- Provision of language assessments and support of unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) in schools.
- Advice and guidance documents and resources to schools.

The Learning Support Adviser is responsible for providing support to schools. This includes:

- Carrying out the English language assessments for new arrivals. Providing assessment reports with recommendations and guidance for classroom teachers.
- Tracking the attainment of GRT pupils termly.
- Support and guidance to schools with GRT pupils and managing the Great 121 project which trains teaching assistants to work on short term intensive programmes of learning to enable GRT pupils to narrow the gap in attainment with their peers.

The Pupil Support Officers (PSO) all work in schools supporting individual and small groups of pupils.

- Bilingual support is provided for Polish, German, Portuguese and Romanian.
- Support is focused on helping pupils to access the curriculum and English acquisition which can include pre-teaching of concepts; support for written work; translations; support for external examinations.
- Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking children and young people receive weekly support in class from EMTAS
- PSOs support schools with parent meetings/ FSM letters/interpreting for parents at SEND reviews/EHC planning/CP and CIN cases.
- The Pupil Support Officer for GRT pupils has a wider brief involving intensive liaison between families and staff as well as supporting pupils in schools. GRT families are supported with attendance, admissions, transition, access to extra-curricular activities and engagement with learning.

## Benefits of Service

### Number of EAL assessments completed in the last three years

Referrals from schools for EAL assessments dipped slightly from 111 to 101 in the academic year 2017/18.

In 2017/18 English assessments were carried out in 31 primary schools and 5 secondary schools. The autumn term has continued to have the highest number of referrals than in other terms.

EAL assessments, including guidance and reports, have been completed in the following schools in 2017/18

Birch Copse	John Rankin Infants
Calcot Infant	St.Finian's
Compton	Pangbourne
Calcot Junior	Spurcroft
Francis Baily	Hungerford
Long Lane	Kenet Valley
Mortimer St. John's Infant	Lambourn
Parsons Down Infant	Mortimer St. Mary's Junior
St. Finians	Mrs Bland's Infant
St. John the Evangelist Infant	Purley
St. Joseph's	Robert Sandilands
Shaw cum Donnington	Speenhamland (Academy)
Westwood Farm Infant School	St. Nicolas
Westwood Farm Junior School	The Willows
St. Bartholomew's (Academy)	Yattendon
The Downs	Little Heath
Kenet (Academy)	The Castle
Park House (Academy)	Garland

### Pupil Support Officer (Romanian)

Bilingual support has been provided in the following schools this year:

St. Joseph's	Kenet Valley
Hungerford Primary	Shaw cum Donnington
The Castle	Speenhamland (Academy)

Schools have also received assistance with Romanian first language assessments, CP cases, Early Years, Speech and Language, SEND issues, EHC planning and parental liaison.

### **Pupil Support Officer (Polish)**

Theale Green (Academy)	Francis Baily
Thatcham Park	Compton
Little Heath	Robert Sandilands
Parsons Down Infants	Thatcham Park
St John the Evangelist	The Willows
St. Joseph's	Park House
Birch Copse	Brookfields
The Downs	Theale Green (Academy)
Denefield (Academy)	Yattendon
Park House (Academy)	

The Polish PSO has carried out the oral component of GCSE Polish and relevant tuition and offers 'A' level Polish. 100% pass rate at A\* and A in 2017 and 2018.

Schools have also received assistance with Polish first language assessments and EHC planning meetings, translating documents and enabling the parents and children to have their opinions heard.

### **Pupil Support Officer (Portuguese)**

Portuguese and Brazilian pupils in the following schools have received Portuguese PSO support in this academic year.

Little Heath	Pangbourne
Francis Baily	Park House (Academy)
St. Joseph's	St. Bartholomew's (Academy)

Schools have also received assistance with Portuguese first language assessments and EHC planning meetings, enabling the parents and children to have their opinions heard. GCSE Portuguese is offered to schools.

### **Pupil Support Officer (UASC)**

Eight secondary aged unaccompanied asylum seeking children from Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Afghanistan have been supported this year in three different secondary schools. EMTAS has continued to support pupils arriving as part of the Syrian Resettlement programme. EMTAS provides one to one academic, exam and pastoral support in lessons and in tutor time. This PSO also attends Personal Education Planning meetings, liaising with SENCOs, Social Workers, Heads of Year and the Virtual School. Support has been provided at the following schools this year:

Park House (Academy)	Kennet School (Academy)
St. Bartholomew's (Academy)	

**Number of TA funded hours given to schools**

2017/18
1050 hours (EAL)
105 hours (GRT)
Total £9251.55

**Schools in receipt of GReaT 1 to 1 project funding during 2017/18** to provide targeted intervention for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. (hours included in the figures above):

Mrs Bland's	Thatcham Park
Garland Junior	Basildon
Hungerford	Hampstead Norreys

**Number of training sessions (both general and school specific)**

2017/18
'New Arrivals with EAL' to teachers
'EAL' and 'Equalities' to SCITT trainees
EAL Co-ordinator's Network meeting
'Every Child a Talker' to Early Years Practitioners
'Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Culture' to CAAS team
EAL training for Teaching Assistants: Long Lane School Compton School
EAL Training for new SENDCo at Thatcham Park School
GRT training for one to one support: Basildon School Hungerford Primary

**Number of families supported by Pupil Support Officer (GRT)**

West Berkshire has 94 children who are ascribed as Gypsy, Roma or Traveller.  
33 West Berkshire schools have Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils on roll.

Approximately 35 GRT children and families have been supported by the PSO GRT and work continues with new families being ascribed to GRT status. Transition support has been provided between schools and also when pupils have been transferring from out of West Berkshire into our schools. This work involves 'in year' changes as well as end of Key Stage transitions.

### Number of schools supported with GRT pupils

The following schools have received support from EMTAS for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. EMTAS Pupil Support Officer for GRT pupils has made 192 visits to schools in 2017/18.

Aldermaston	Sulhamstead and Ufton Nerve
Basildon	Theale Green (Academy)
Garland Junior	Thatcham Park
Hermitage	Alternative Provision
Fir Tree (Academy)	Mrs Bland's Infants
Kennet Valley	The Willink
Hampstead Norreys	Hungerford Primary
Beenham	Lambourn
Kennet (Academy)	Trinity (Academy)
The Castle	Park House (Academy)

Schools have been supported with engagement with their GRT families, issues around behaviour, avoiding exclusion, intervention for gaps in learning, transport, admissions and attendance.

### Number of pupils attending the Autumn 2017 Michaelmas Fair 'School'

EMTAS run a 'school' for the children travelling with the Michaelmas Fair. 23 pupils attended over the three days ranging in age from 4 to 13 years. They took part in lessons which focused on the core curriculum areas of literacy and numeracy. Feedback from parents and Northcroft Leisure Centre staff was 100% positive.

### Number of sessions run by the Learning Bus

8 sessions have been delivered from September 2017 to July 2018 on the 'Bus of Hope'. These have taken place monthly at Paices Hill Traveller site and have provided Parent and Toddler activities for families. These sessions have enabled Family Hubs staff, the Fire and Rescue Service, EWOs, Health Visitors, schools and other agencies to make contact with 'hard to reach' families through working alongside EMTAS.

### Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2019/20

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2019/20 in comparison with 2018/19 and 2017/18.

	2017/18 £	2018/19 £	2019/20 £	% increase
Staffing Costs	182,010	185,480	196,920	
Other Costs	31,530	31,720	26,020	
Support Service Recharges	21,000	21,720	22,294	
Total Cost	234,540	238,920	245,234	2.6%
Less Surplus Brought Forward	-3,150	-38,300	-35,170	
	231,390	200,620	210,064	4.7%
Less income from Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs		-27,143		
<b>Amount to be De-Delegated</b>	<b>231,390</b>	<b>173,477</b>	<b>210,064</b>	<b>21.1%</b>



NOTE: Carry forward amount from 2017-18 has yet to be confirmed by Schools Forum

The overall cost of delivering the service has increased by 2.6% which is in line with the estimated increase in staffing costs due to the expected April 2019 pay award and increments expected to be paid to existing staff. The service received income in 18/19 which reduced the amount to be de-delegated. The amount proposed to be de-delegated in 2019/20 is therefore higher than in 2018/19.

### Method of charging in 2019/20

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (for up to 3 years after they enter the statutory school system) in the October 2018 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2017 census data to provide an indicative amount, this would equate to £3187.34 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the indicative total amount per school.

### Other Options which *may* be considered

Schools receive a high quality level of support in West Berkshire which has been highly valued by those that have used the service. The centrally funded service has allowed all schools to receive the level of support that they need which has not been directly linked to the number of pupils in schools.

If schools did not support a centrally delivered service to meet the needs of English as an additional language learners/Black Minority Ethnic pupils and those from the Gypsy Roma Traveller community they could expect to have to purchase support at the following rates:

An EAL assessment and report	£500-£600
Support for individual pupils by a Pupil Support Officer	£200 a day
Training on Equality and Diversity including Equality Act requirements; EAL bilingualism, meeting the needs of GRT pupils tailored to schools	
Requirements	£600-£800 a day
Tailored support provided by staff with relevant expertise	£400-£500 a day

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### Trade Union Representation Service

#### Outline of Proposed Service 2019/20

West Berkshire Council has a school trade union facilities agreement which includes provision for compensating individual schools for release time for teacher trade union representatives they employ. Compensation is paid from the dedicated schools grant (DSG).

Union representatives attend joint consultation meetings with the authority and meetings with head teachers and HR on a variety of employee relations matters. The latter includes TUPE consultation meetings where schools converted to academy status; consultation on reorganisations of teaching and support to staff (note: NASUWT and ATL also represent non teaching staff; NUT only represents teachers); disciplinary issues; grievances; ill health cases; capability cases; and settlement agreements.

#### **What union officers do**

Union officers use 'facilities time' to work with members experiencing professional difficulties (casework) and to support groups of members either in individual schools or through negotiation and consultation with the local authority acting on behalf of its schools (collective work). The casework dealt with by union officers falls into two broad categories: individual issues and collective issues.

#### Individual casework issues

The union officers spend most of the facilities time dealing with members. Union members in West Berkshire schools are able to contact their union representative directly by email or telephone. Issues raised by members in this way are known as casework. Casework can be divided into capability; disciplinary; grievance; and contracts, pay and conditions

Advice is often given on how the teacher can seek to resolve the matter for themselves. However, there are a number of cases where the union officer has to make contact with school management, human resources providers or an LA officer directly. Employees are entitled to be accompanied by a union officer at formal meetings under school HR procedures.

Contracts, Pay and Conditions issues such as pay determination appeals and questions of what teachers can be directed to do are becoming increasingly common.

#### **Collective Issues**

These include consultation on changes to working conditions such as pay policies, sickness absence policies, codes of conduct restructuring and redundancy.

This school year has seen an increase in the number of school restructurings accompanied by the risk of redundancy, as school budgets come under increasing pressure. The redundancy procedure is complex and often involves multiple meetings. The threat of redundancy can quickly undermine morale in a school and often the role of union

officers is to reassure and support employees as well as ensuring that correct procedures are followed.

## Benefits of Service

The following data gives information on the level and types of support provided in 2015/16:

### Number of contacts made to/by union officers in 2015/16

Casework	Email	Phone	In person	Meeting
Capability Issues <sup>1</sup>	26	12	11	6
Pay & Conditions	19	7	4	3
Contracts	4	3	0	1
Disciplinary Issues	5	5	3	2
Grievance	4	6	1	1
Redundancy**				20
Restructuring**				8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>41</b>

Collective	In Person
LA Meetings <sup>2</sup>	27**
Del Train	9
Personal	
Receive Train	14
Research	Not recorded
Union Briefing	15

<sup>1</sup> Includes formal support through appraisal

<sup>2</sup> Such as Joint Consultative Panel and Education Liaison meetings.

\*\* Number of attendances. Officers of several unions are normally present at each meeting

### Notes

This is hierarchical, i.e. an email that leads to a meeting is not recorded.

**Email:** number of members supported by an exchange of emails

**Phone:** number of members supported through at least one phone call.

**In person:** number of members with whom a officer has met at least once

**Meeting:** number of members supported at a meeting with management.

**Hearing:** number of members supported at a hearing

Officers also spend time on internal union organisation such as attending, committee and general meetings. These activities are not undertaken in 'facilities time' Each union has a support infrastructure for its officers that includes reference resources as well as briefings and training courses included above.

## Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2019/20

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2019/20, compared to 2018/19. It is based on engaging a representative from each of the unions:

Union	2018/19	Proposed 2019/20
NASUWT	£14,745	£15,950
NUT	£14,698	£15,900
ATL	£12,634	£13,665
NAHT	£3,264	£3,530
ASCL	£2,244	£2,425
Support Service Recharges	£4,760	£5,150
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£52,340</b>	<b>£56,620</b>
Income from Academies	£1,696	£1,730
<b>Cost to Maintained Schools</b>	<b>£50,644</b>	<b>£54,890</b>
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	£2,202	£2,286
<b>Cost to Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>£48,442</b>	<b>£52,604</b>

The proposed budget for 2019/20 is based on:

- Reimbursement to schools providing release time for teacher trade union activities is dependent on agreement by Schools Forum in respect of maintained primary and secondary schools and from other schools which elect to buy in the facilities time - approximately equivalent to 1fte supply teacher across all unions, paid on UPS 3;
- Each trade union to have five days for activities including attendance at local authority consultative meetings;
- Balance of budget available is divided proportionately by the number of current members in each union as at 1<sup>st</sup> June (the budget will be adjusted depending on the actual level of buy back from other schools).

Note that representatives work across all sectors, and it is irrelevant what type of school they are employed by. Therefore the total net cost is divided between all schools de-delegating rather than taking each sector separately.

## Method of charging in 2019/20

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2017 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2017 census data to provide an indicative amount, this would equate to £3.11 per primary and secondary pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the indicative total amount per school. Academies and other schools may choose to buy into the service at the same per pupil rate (this would provide funding for additional hours).

## Other Options which *may* be considered

It should be noted that once a decision has been made to discontinue pooling arrangements, it would be almost impossible to reverse that decision at a later date. Therefore the HFG and SF need to be aware that a decision to cease pooling arrangements for this budget would be permanent.

Currently some academies are using their allocation for trade union facilities time to set up school based consultative arrangements, rather than 'buying in' to local authority arrangements. This might be the preferred model for all secondary schools in the future

with de-delegation and funding of release time for representatives to undertake union duties in another WBC school to be confined to the Primary sector.

There may also be the option to consider a reduced service at a lower cost to schools.

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### CLEAPSS Service

#### Outline of Proposed Service 2019/20

West Berkshire Council has an agreement with CLEAPSS (Consortium of Local Education Authorities for the Provision of Science Services) which includes the provision of support and advice to teachers, technicians, head teachers and governors/trustees on how best to use high quality practical work to support pupils learning in science, design & technology and, most recently, art & design.

All but two of the 182 authorities, with the duty to provide education, in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and the various islands, are members of CLEAPSS.

The Local Authority can offer schools and academies the opportunity to purchase an annual CLEAPSS subscription at a heavily discounted price from that which schools would pay independent of West Berkshire Council.

The CLEAPSS subscription includes Radiation Protection Officer (RPO) (including site visit/assessment) and the Radiation Protection Adviser Service (RPA) for secondary schools and academies.

#### Benefits of Service

CLEAPSS covers:

- Health & safety including model risk assessments
- Chemicals, living organisms, equipment
- Sources of resources
- Laboratory design, facilities and fittings
- Technicians and their jobs
- D&T facilities and fittings

CLEAPSS provides:

- Termly newsletters for primary and secondary schools
- A wide range of free publications
- Model risk assessments
- Special risk assessments
- Low-cost training courses for technicians, teachers and local authority officers
- A telephone helpline
- A monitoring service, e.g. for mercury spills
- Evaluations of equipment
- Advice on repairs
- A H&S / Review of service publishers, exam boards and other organizations producing teaching resources

The local authority will have met the conditions of membership if all community schools subscribe.

## Costs and Method of charging for 2019/20

CLEAPSS set the pricing each year in January/February for the financial year April to March ahead. In 2018/19 the charge to schools was 15 pence per pupil including administration costs plus £225 per secondary school for the RPA and RPO services.

The proposal for 2019/20 is to set a rate per pupil of 16 pence per pupil which we hope will cover any increase in the CLEAPSS fee and the cost of administration. As the de-delegation covers pre-16 pupils only, maintained secondary schools will need to pay the 6<sup>th</sup> form element of the fee as a separate sum. Any shortfall or surplus will be carried forward to the following year.

## Other Options which *may* be considered

Independent, Academies, Foundation and VA schools may purchase the CLEAPSS subscription directly through CLEAPSS at an increased price.

The proposed cost per pupil/school is shown in the table below in comparison with the cost of buying this service directly from CLEAPSS.

School	Cost through local authority per pupil	Cost directly per pupil (min 200 pupils/ 350 secondary)	Radiation Protection Advisor	Radiation Protection Officer
Nursery	16p	21.2p	N/A	N/A
Primary	16p	21.2p	N/A	N/A
Secondary	16p	27.5p	£50	£185
Special	16p	21.5p	N/A	N/A
PRU	16p	21.5p	N/A	N/A
Primary Academy	16p	21.5p	N/A	N/A
Secondary Academy	16p	27.2p	£50	£185

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

#### Statutory and Regulatory Duties - Accountancy, Audit and Pension Scheme Administration

##### Accountancy (Statutory Functions)

**Description of Duties:**

Consolidation of school accounts into Council's year end statement of accounts.

Overview of school budget submissions & budget monitoring reports.

Monitoring of schools in deficit.

Monitoring adherence to Scheme for Financing Schools.

Returns to Central Government – CFR, CFO grants return.

Administration of grants & other funding to maintained schools eg. PPG, budget allocations & adjustments.

Cost: £39,466

0.35 FTE Accountant  
0.10 FTE Senior Accountant  
0.27 FTE Finance Manager

##### Pension Scheme Administration

**Description of Duties:**

Administration of Teachers and Local Government pension schemes in relation to staff working in maintained schools:

Amending and updating employee records in relation to pensions

Responding to queries from employees in relation to pensions

Completion of statutory monthly returns to Teachers Pensions and Local Government pension scheme, including service and pay calculations.

Cost: £35,948

1.0 FTE Pensions Assistant



Internal Audit of Schools – Statutory Requirements
<p><b>Description of Duties:</b></p> <p>Annual internal audit of maintained schools according to level of risk - circa 10 schools are audited per year. Each audit takes on average 7 days. The audit covers Governance; financial planning and management; financial policy, processes and records; benchmarking and value for money; school fund, SFVS.</p> <p>We also carry out Follow-up reviews for those schools that have a weak or very weak audit report opinion.</p> <p>There is provision for adhoc advice to schools/issuing the Anti Fraud Advisory Bulletins and the investigation of any financial irregularities. We also monitor compliance with submitting the SFVS returns.</p> <p>We have also included an element of time for the planning and monitoring of the school visit programme, and liaising with Accountancy /governor support etc on queries when they arise.</p> <p>Cost: £46,154</p> <p>0.3FTE Senior Auditor 0.5 FTE Auditor 0.07 FTE Audit Manager</p>

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2019-20

### Statutory and Regulatory Duties – Health and Safety

#### 1. Summary of Options

##### Option 1

- 1.1 To delete one (currently vacant) of the three posts currently supporting schools to reduce costs but to maintain a viable service including the provision of training etc.
- 1.2 The two posts will provide a complete health and safety support service broadly equivalent to the current Level Two service to all maintained schools. Some site visits and needs assessments would need to be more evenly distributed to accommodate the extra schools and spread the workload over a longer period with 2.2 FTE posts. For example we could move all schools health and safety needs assessments to either results/risk based approach similar to Ofsted inspections. See Appendix A for further details of the service levels provision.
- 1.3 A buy-back option would be offered to non-maintained schools where the Council is not the employer and therefore is not the main duty holder in relation to health and safety. Any income generated from the buy-back service would be offset to reduce costs for the Council maintained schools.

##### Option 2

- 1.4 Maintain the current split in the service levels and funding, with a Level 1 service funded through the DSG with those schools equally and equitably sharing the costs of the provision of the Level 1 service.
- 1.5 Those schools that decide to purchase the Level Two schools health and safety service will then be provided the Level 2 health and safety service.

#### 2. Legislative Context

- 2.1 The principal legislation in the United Kingdom for health and safety is the Health and Safety at Work Etc Act 1974. There is also a considerable amount of health and safety legislation under the Health and Safety at Work Etc Act 1974 including the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations.
- 2.2 The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations set out that every employer shall appoint one or more competent persons to assist him in undertaking the measures he needs to take to comply with the requirements and prohibitions imposed upon him by or under the relevant statutory provisions and by Part II of the Fire Precautions (Workplace) Regulations 1997.
- 2.3 The regulations state that the employer shall ensure that the number of competent persons appointed, the time available for them to fulfil their functions and the means

at their disposal are adequate having regard to the size of his undertaking, the risks to which the employers employees are exposed and the distribution of those risks throughout the undertaking. It should be noted that the regulations do not suggest any limit or scope to the competent advice or how it should be delivered practically.

- 2.4 The regulations also state that where there is a competent person in the employer's employment, that person shall be appointed in preference to a competent person not in his employment.
- 2.5 The duties imposed by the health and safety at work Act 1974 and associated regulations apply to the Council as the employer in the majority of the Council's schools.
- 2.6 In the case of Foundation and Voluntary Aided schools the Governors are the employer. In independent schools and Academies the Governors or the Academy Trust are the employers.
- 2.7 The Council also has the general "duty to educate", even where the Governors or an Academy Trust are the employer, there could be some limited involvement for the Council if a serious incident were to occur. See Appendix B for further information on the legal duty holders.
- 2.8 In order to meet the requirements of the employer under the Health and Safety at Work Etc. Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations and other related health and safety legislation the Council considers that the schools health and safety service should be provided to all Council maintained schools, thus removing the differing levels of service. See Appendix C for a list of schools detailed who the employer is and therefore who should hold the primary legal duties.
- 2.9 A buy-back option would be offered to non-maintained schools where the Council is not the employer and therefore is not the main duty holder in relation to health and safety. Any income generated from the buy-back service would be offset to reduce costs for the Council maintained schools.

### **3. Health & Safety Support Service**

- 3.1 The Council has an established, professional and well regarded Health and Safety Team that already supports West Berkshire schools, currently through two service options, Level One and Level Two.
- 3.2 The Level One service suggests compliance with the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations in terms of access to competent advice for health and safety. The Level One service includes for a health and safety needs assessment of schools on a three year basis but all other services are remote and delivered by email and/or telephone contact. All other services set out in Level Two are not included or would require payment.
- 3.3 Schools health and safety needs assessments are completed less frequently for Level One schools and there is no additional support to improve on the areas identified in the needs assessment report. The schools are expected to make the improvements themselves without further access to competent advice and support. The issues discussed at 3.2 and 3.3 are not necessarily compatible with 2.3 above.

- 3.4 The Level Two service is a comprehensive health and safety support service and covers all aspects of health and safety management and support including necessary health and safety training.
- 3.5 Two members of the health and safety team provide the Level Two service to the schools that opt to take the service. It could also be argued that there is a potential conflict in performing a compliance / enforcement role with their customers and there is often a need to provide services to the those schools buying the service, sometimes at the expense of those schools that do not.
- 3.6 For example, we have had to prioritise work with those schools buying the service over completing needs assessments for those schools that do not due to resource constraints but this could arguably increase risk and is not necessarily fair as the schools who do not buy the service are still paying a small contribution to cover the level service.
- 3.7 The Health and Safety Team provide a compliance, advice and training role for schools. However, the work of the team relies on the buy-back which thus far has been reasonably stable but only just covers the costs of the posts.
- 3.8 This brings with it difficulty in future planning and the risk that if there was even a relatively small drop off in buy-back that one of the posts would be vulnerable. This in turn would make the service unviable as it would not be possible to maintain the Level Two service with one post/person.
- 3.9 As the Council is the employer and therefore the principal legal duty holder (notwithstanding any delegated responsibilities to a schools and its Head Teachers and Governors) in relation to health and safety, it makes sense to ensure an adequate, effective and efficient health and safety service is provided to all Council maintained schools and then a buy-back option offered to non-maintained schools where the Council is not the employer and therefore is not the main duty holder in relation to health and safety.
- 3.10 Any additional income from the buy-back service would serve to reduce the costs for all maintained schools but any new business needs to be balanced with providing a high quality service to West Berkshire schools within the available resources.
- 3.11 Other options that could be considered would be to try to staff the team to match income levels e.g. reduce hours for remaining posts, look at alternative contracts such as term time only etc. These are not likely to be practical and may lead to the loss of quality staff that historically has been hard to attract to West Berkshire. It is somewhat ironic that having been able to build and develop a professional and well regarded Health and Safety Team that we now find that external factors pose a threat to its viability.

#### **4. Update on position since last year**

- 4.1 An options paper setting out a number of alternative ways that the schools health and safety service could be funded into the future was taken to the Schools Funding Forum in January 2018.
- 4.2 There were options to move to a uniform service level delivered to all schools and funded by all schools paying an equal share based on pupil numbers and one option to remain with the part funded and part buy-back service as we are. Head

Teachers voted to remain as we are with a Level 1 core service (funded by all schools) and the Level 2 buy-back support service.

- 4.3 Head Teachers accepted that if the Level 2 buy-back drops off then this would jeopardise the future provision of the service and requested that a further report be brought for their consideration if that was to happen.
- 4.4 As was somewhat expected at this time last year the overall buy-back of the service by schools did reduce slightly with around five schools dropping out due to budget constraints.
- 4.5 Buy back for the year 2018/19 is around £86,000 with staffing costs around £120,000 including overheads, leaving a shortfall of around £34,000.
- 4.6 Funding for the Level 1 post (Approx £37k), which was held vacant, offset this in the short term but we need to establish the structure and funding for the Schools H&S Team going forward as the current system is unlikely to be viable in the longer term.
- 4.7 We were successful in a tender process for health and safety support service to the Excalibur Academies Trust for approximately £13,000 per annum. If the Excalibur Academies Trust renew the contract then this would reduce the overall shortfall to around £20,000.
- 4.8 We have also been successful in gaining work and income from Park House Academy and St Gabriel's independent school.

## 5. Proposals

### Option 1

- 5.1 In order to meet the requirements of the employer under the Health and Safety at Work Etc. Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations and other related health and safety legislation the Council considers that the schools health and safety service should be provided to all Council maintained schools, thus removing the differing levels of service.
- 5.2 To delete one (currently vacant) of the three posts currently supporting schools to reduce costs but to maintain a viable service including the provision of training etc.
- 5.3 The two posts will provide a health and safety service to all maintained schools. Some site visits and needs assessments would need to be more evenly distributed to accommodate the extra schools and spread the workload over a longer period with 2.2 FTE posts.
- 5.4 We could, for example move schools health and safety needs assessments to a results and risk based approach similar to Ofsted inspections. See Appendix A for further details of the service level provision.
- 5.5 A buy-back option would be offered to non-maintained schools where the Council is not the employer and therefore is not the main duty holder in relation to health and safety. Any income generated from the buy-back service would be offset to reduce costs for the Council maintained schools.

**Table 1**

<b>Staffing Structure Required to deliver Option 1:</b> 0.2 FTE Health & Safety Manager 2.0 FTE Senior Health & Safety Officers CREST IT System	
<b>Total Cost of Service to Maintained Schools</b>	<b>£141k</b>
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special, and PRU schools	-£6k
<b>Total Cost of Service Proposed to be met by Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>£135k</b>
Estimated Rate per Pupil	£8.19

**Option 2**

- 5.6 Maintain the current split in the service levels and funding, with a Level 1 service funded through the DSG with those schools equally and equitably sharing the costs of the provision of the Level 1 service.
- 5.7 Those schools that decide to purchase the Level Two schools health and safety service will then be provided the Level 2 health and safety service.
- 5.8 It is likely that we would need to change the service offer in the near future as the service is already operating at a deficit of around £20,000 that is only being offset by not appointing to the vacant post but this has a knock on effect on staff and service delivery and arguably risk. See Appendix A for further details of the service levels provision.

**Table 2**

<b>Staffing Structure Required to deliver Option 2:</b> 0.2 FTE Health & Safety Manager 1.0 FTE Health & Safety Officer 2.0 FTE Senior Health & Safety Officers CREST IT System	
<b>Total Cost of Service to Maintained Schools</b>	<b>£184k</b>
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special, and PRU schools	-£7k
<b>Total Cost of Service Proposed to be met by Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>£177k</b>
Estimated Rate per Pupil	£10.70

## 6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The Council recognises that safety is important but needs to be approached creatively and should not be seen as simply another legal burden or bureaucratic chore. A planned approach to managing risk should be seen as an enabler, not just to prevent accidents and work related health problems to both staff and pupils but to build a culture of sensible risk management, linked to a curriculum where teaching young people can develop their capability to assess and manage risk.
- 6.2 Risk is part of life but accidents do not need to be, so while schools need to make sure staff, pupils and visitors are safe, they also need to make sure that pupils are helped to become risk aware without becoming unnecessarily risk averse.
- 6.3 The Council will continue to support sensible and pro-active health and safety management in schools by providing a supportive infrastructure and service to schools.

## 7. Appendices

### 7.1 Appendix 7.1



Health and Safety  
Service V9 (Sept18).c

### 7.2 Appendix 7.2

England and Wales	
School type	Employer
Community schools	The local authority
Community special schools	
Voluntary controlled schools	
Maintained nursery schools	
Pupil referral units	
Foundation schools	The governing body
Foundation special schools	

Voluntary aided schools	
Independent schools	The governing body or proprietor
England	
Academies and free schools	The Academy Trust

### 7.3 Appendix 7.3



Schools Employer  
Sept 2018 V1.xlsx



## Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2019/20 - Overview

Report being considered by: Schools Forum

On: 15/10/2018

Report Author: Wendy Howells

Item for: Discussion By: All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the changes to the calculation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2019/20, and the implications of these changes on the Schools Budget.

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To note the changes, the timetable, and decisions that will be required in the setting of the 2019/20 Schools Budget.

Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 The Government has now announced the funding arrangements for 2019/20.
- 3.2 2019/20 is the second year of the new National Funding Formula which is a new formula used to calculate the funding allocation for the Schools Block, Central School Services Block, and High Needs Block. The new formula for calculating the Early Years was introduced from April 2017.
- 3.3 This report summarises how each block will be calculated in 2019/20, and the likely impact of the estimated funding allocations on the 2019/20 budget. Actual Primary and Secondary units of Funding (PUF and SUF) have been published, which will be used to calculate the actual Schools Block allocations in December 2018. Provisional allocations have been announced for the High Needs and Central Services Block and the actual allocations for 2019/20 will be announced in mid December.

### 4. Schools Block

- 4.1 The Government has announced that the National Funding Formula (NFF) will be operated as a “soft” formula for an additional year ie 2020/21. This means that the local authority will still receive Schools Block DSG and will determine locally how this is then allocated to schools.
- 4.2 The schools block funding for 2019/20 is calculated as follows:

- The national funding formula at the national rates is run for each school. This is based on the latest available pupil characteristics data.
- An area cost adjustment (ACA) is added to the total sum for each school.
- The gains cap will increase to 6.09% against the baselines (the baseline is the 2017/18 formula allocation plus formula funding for the pupil numbers in resource units added back in). Note that this is a compounded figure.
- The funding floor will increase to ensure that all schools will attract at least a 1% gain per pupil against the 2017/18 baselines. This is not a guarantee per year.
- The minimum funding guarantee (MFG) will continue and Local Authorities have the flexibility to set a local MFG of between minus 1.5% and plus 0.5% per pupil.
- For primary schools, the minimum per pupil funding level in 2019/20 is set at £3,500, and for secondary £4,800.
- The allocations for every school in the local authority are added up and divided by the October 2017 pupil numbers. This produces a Primary Unit of Funding (PUF) and a Secondary Unit of Funding (SUF).
- In December 2018, the PUF and SUF will be multiplied by the October 2018 primary and secondary pupil numbers to produce the schools block DSG allocation.
- A sum for growth funding will be calculated based on pupil data from the October 2018 census. This is a new approach and the amount allocated per LA will not be published until December.

4.3 The total allocation excluding the growth fund is then distributed to schools through the formula, by setting the formula funding rates and a minimum funding guarantee and funding cap on gains. The method of distributing the funding will need to go out to consultation with all schools and be agreed by Schools' Forum in December, before being approved by the Council's Executive in January.

4.4 With the agreement of Schools' Forum, and subject to consulting with all schools, up to 0.5% of the total schools block funding can be transferred to the high needs budget or other funding blocks. Secretary of State approval is required for transfers above this limit or where the Schools' Forum has opposed the transfer.

4.5 Overall, the West Berkshire increase in cash terms from the 2017 baseline is 1.8% per pupil or £1.7m (based on the same pupil numbers as the 2017 baseline), but the final allocation will be determined by the October 2018 census.

4.6 It will be impossible for the local authority to replicate exactly the national funding formula rates to schools for the following reasons:

- The minimum funding guarantee in the school formula can be set between 0% and -1.5%.

- The funding rates (PUF and SUF) have been determined using October 2017 census data, whereas actual allocations to schools use October 2018 census data. This will create a surplus or shortfall to be adjusted for.
- The amount of funding being received for the business rates element of the formula is based on historical amounts, whereas the funding allocated to schools will need to be the actual 2019/20 amounts – this is likely to be significantly more and will be reflected in the Authority Proforma Tool to be submitted to ESFA.
- The amount of funding to be received for growth is based on 2018 pupil data and will not be known until December 2018. If the estimated requirement for 2019/20 is greater, this will need to be funded.
- If there is a significant shortfall in high needs funding, up to 0.5% could be transferred from the schools block allocation.

4.7 Another report on this agenda gives further details of the proposals for the school formula.

## **5. Central Schools Services Block**

5.1 The Central Schools Services Block consists of the centrally retained services that were previously funded from the Schools Block, i.e. admissions, licences, servicing of Schools' Forum, Education Welfare, asset management, and statutory & regulatory duties.

5.2 A new formula is in place to determine funding allocations to local authorities, and the details were set out in previous reports. As the funding being received does not cover the ongoing costs in this block (a shortfall of £335k), proposals to balance this block were brought to the January 2018 meeting of the Schools' Forum.

5.3 The proposals agreed were as follows:

- (1) Transfer of funding from the early years block and high needs block towards paying for the central services that are carried out on behalf of settings in these blocks (£60k).
- (2) Staff savings in the Education Welfare Service (£30k).
- (3) Asset management to be funded from the Council's capital programme (£54k).
- (4) Some statutory & regulatory duties (for strategic planning of the education service and finance support for education services) to be met from the Council's revenue budget (£191k).

5.4 Although the Council's Executive has agreed to meet the statutory and regulatory duties costs in 2018/19, this is a one year only decision and there will be a requirement to find significant savings in this block next year. In addition, the funding for this block will reduce by about £25k in 2019/20.

- 5.5 In setting the budget for this block it has been assumed there will be no carry forward from 2018/19. There may be a small under spend, and if so this will improve the position.
- 5.6 The funding yet to be confirmed for CSSB is £992,560. This assumes no transfers in from other Blocks.

## 6. Early Years Block

- 6.1 The new Early Years formula was introduced in 2017/18 with new funding rates to local authorities, and a revised simplified formula for allocating funding to providers was also brought in. All providers have to be on the same base rate by 2019/20.
- 6.2 The funding will, as always, be based on two consecutive years of January census data, and be finalised three months after the close of the financial year to which it relates. The requirement to manage shortfalls or surpluses on an annual basis due to the mismatch between funding received based on the January census, and allocations to providers based on actual provision of nursery hours during the year, continues to be a challenge.
- 6.3 The provisional DSG allocation 2018/19 is based on the January 2018 census and allows for the estimated full year effect of the introduction of 30 hours provision for three and four year old children of working parents. In order to set the budget for 2019/20, the January 2018 census data is being used, and in calculating the funding the assumption is being made that there will be no change to this data in January 2019.
- 6.4 The 2017/18 budget was set with a deficit to be repaid over three years (i.e. by 2019/20). The current year position it is estimated that a small deficit will be carried forward to 2019/20.
- 6.5 Therefore it is has been agreed that the funding rates for 2018/19 to providers is to be increased slightly and when all providers are on the same base rate in 2019/20 the budget will be balanced.
- 6.6 In 2019/20, 5% of funding can be set aside for centrally retained services, which can include services to support early year's children with high needs, and transfers to other funding blocks.

2019/20 estimated DSG	£9,609,428
Less deficit carried forward	-£37,000
Less expenditure based on 2018/19	-£9,656,614
Planned Deficit	£84,186

This assumes there are no transfers of funding to the Central Schools Block.

## 7. High Needs Block

- 7.1 The basic structure of the High Needs formula is not changing in 2019/20. The formula uses a number of proxy factors (population, deprivation, low prior attainment, disability living allowance and children in bad health), but with 50% allocated on the basis of historical spend, and a basic entitlement for the number of places in special schools. Under this formula West Berkshire receive less than the current High Needs Block allocation. However in 2019/20 the funding floor will increase so that all Local Authorities will attract at least a 1% gain per head of population against their 2017 – 2018 baselines.
- 7.2 Place numbers at special schools, and import/export adjustments will be excluded from the baseline, and will be an additional allocation, so that any year on year changes can be taken into account in the annual allocation.
- 7.3 The baseline for this block has been determined as follows:
- Total high needs block allocation in 2017/18
  - Less the first £4,000 of resource unit place funding transferred to the Schools Block.
- 7.4 As West Berkshire is on the baseline, funding is calculated as follows:
- Baseline + 1%
  - Add pupil numbers (429 pupils x £4,209)
  - Add import/export adjustment (128 x £6,000)
- This adjustment is to reflect that the DSG funding is based on resident population rather than where pupils go to school/college. If a local authority is receiving more pupils from other local authority areas than are being sent to other local authority areas, (and vice versa) a funding adjustment is made.
- 7.5 The pupil number element will be based on the October 2018 census, whereas the import/export adjustment will use the January 2019 census and February 2019 ILR data – the final allocation being provided *after* the budget for 2019/20 is required to be set. An estimate will therefore need to be made.
- 7.6 The High Needs Block was in deficit at the end of 2016/17. When the budget was set in 2017/18 budget it was agreed to repay the deficit over a three year period ie by the end of 2019/20. Assuming there are no changes to the cost base, the impact of the new funding will be as follows:

	<b>2019/20 budget estimate</b>
2019/20 estimated DSG	£19,676,682
Less revised budgeted overspend in 2018/19	-£546,895
Less 2018/19 budget	-£19,776,040
- Over spend / surplus	-£646,253

This assumes there are no transfers of funding to the Central Schools Block and no transfers from the Schools Block. The National Funding Formula does, however allow for 0.5% of their Schools Block funding to be transferred into another Block with Schools Forum approval. A 0.5% funding transfer would be approx. £485k (without taking rates funding into account). This would go a long way to addressing the deficit position for 2019/20 but does not address the underlying problem of funding within the High Needs Block.

- 7.7 Additional savings will therefore be required to balance the budget.
- 7.8 As in previous years, a place funding review needs to take place, with a deadline of 17<sup>th</sup> November for submitting changes to ESFA .

## **8. Timetable for Setting the Budget**

- 8.1 The timetable for setting all the elements of the DSG budget is set out below:

September to October 2018	Modelling of new primary & secondary school formula (once received national formula rates from ESFA)
2 October 2018 (reports due 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2018)	Heads Funding Group review school formula options and make recommendation to Schools' Forum.
18 October 2018	School Admin (finance staff) briefing
15 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (reports due 9 <sup>th</sup> October 2018)	Schools' Forum to agree on formula to go out to consultation with schools.
17 <sup>th</sup> October – 13 November 2018 (14 working days)	Consultation with Schools
November	High needs initial budget proposals worked on by officers Early years initial budget proposals worked on by officers.
28 November 2018 (reports due 21 November 2018)	Heads Funding Group review consultation responses and make a recommendation. Review high needs budget proposals.
18 December 2018 (reports due 4 December 2018)	Corporate Board – draft formula proposal. (Ahead of Schools' Forum and final funding

	allocation)
10 December 2018 (reports due 4 December 2018)	Schools Forum consulted on school formula final proposals in principle (as prior to final funding). To agree de-delegations and funding/criteria for additional funds. Need to consult and agree to any funding block transfers. Review central schools, high needs, and early years budget proposals
Mid December 2018	DSG funding allocations and APT containing census data for final formula due from DfE
Mid December 2018	Finalisation by officers of formula and the funding rates in light of actual DSG funding
20 December 2018 (reports due 13 December 2018)	Operations Board – Final formula proposal based on final funding allocation
17 January 2019 (reports due 10 January 2018)	Executive – Approval of School Formula
21 January 2019	Deadline for submission of final School Formula APT to ESFA
8 January 2019 (reports due 2 January 2019)	Heads Funding Group review budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years in light of funding announcement.
21 January 2019 (reports due 15 January 2019)	Schools' Forum review funding calculation and budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years. Agree budget strategy and determine any further work.
22 January to 20 February	Finalisation by officers of central schools, high needs, and early year's budget proposals.
27 February 2019 (reports due 20 February 2019)	Heads Funding Group review final proposals and make recommendation to Schools' Forum.
28 February 2019	Statutory deadline for providing primary and secondary maintained schools with their funding allocation (in practice this is late January).
11 March 2019 (reports due 5 March 2019)	Schools' Forum to agree final budgets.

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Schools: deficit recovery

---

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 15 October 2018  
**Report Author:** Wendy Howells  
**Item for:** Information      **By:** All Maintained Schools Representatives

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the work being carried out with the schools that have set a deficit budget in 2018/19.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the report be noted.

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Introduction and Summary

- 3.1 Schools' Forum received the "School Budgets 2018/19 and Schools in Financial Difficulty" report on 16 July 2018 on school budgets, which included listing the nine schools that had set a deficit budget in 2018/19.
- 3.2 The report in July also set out West Berkshire's strategy for supporting the growing number of schools setting a deficit, and schools at risk of going into deficit. The work undertaken to date is summarised in Table 1 below and detailed in Appendix A. Appendix B summarises the schools' plans for reducing their deficits. This was previously presented to the Schools Forum on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

<b>TABLE 1 - Deficit Schools Monitoring Progress Summary</b>		
<b>As at 04.10.18</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
2018/19 Budget submitted by agreed date	9	0
2018/19 submitted budget sense and arithmetically checked by Schools Accountancy	9	0
Licensed deficit papers completed in full	7	2
Licensed agreement letters from Heads of Education and Finance sent	9	0
Submission of P3 Budget Monitoring reports to Schools Accountancy for review by 14.07.18	2	7
Feedback given P3 Budget Monitoring Reports submitted	5	4
Submission of P4 Budget Monitoring reports to Schools Accountancy for review*	2	7
Feedback given P4 Budget Monitoring Reports submitted	2	0
Submission of P5 Budget Monitoring reports to Schools Accountancy for review by 14.09.18	7	2
Feedback given P5 Budget Monitoring Reports submitted as at 28.09.18	8	#
Governor Minutes received ( <i>reminder sent to deficit schools 18.09.18</i> )	4	5
1st Task Force Meeting arranged	4	5
Request for support received and booked	3	6
* no date given as submission not required as schools closed for summer holidays		
# agreed that 9th school did not have to submit a P5		

- 3.3 The final number of schools that submitted a Period 3 Budget Monitoring Report was 9 out of 9. As the vast majority of schools are closed in August there is no requirement to submit a report for Period 4 but 2 of the 9 chose to submit. Timing of Period 3 and Period 4 is such that meaningful budget monitoring and forecasting in schools is difficult. The accountants have checked where submissions allowed and fed back on anything of concern.
- 3.4 All schools except one have now submitted their Period 5 reports, Schools Accountancy have completed their review of these submissions and sent the schools feedback. (See Appendix A)
- 3.5 This year each school is being asked to arrange the attendance of the Clerk to the Governors to minute the Task Force meetings as previously minute taking had been insufficient. At the time of writing one of the four schools contacted to arrange a meeting has questioned the fact they are being asked to incur unplanned expenditure. The Schools Forum has previously agreed that schools in deficit using the Finance service to work with them on their deficit recovery have this cost refunded from the Schools In Financial Difficulty fund direct rather than schools needing to submit individual bids to the Schools Forum to reimburse this cost.
- 3.6 In recent years the annual financial benchmarking data has been released increasingly late. To try and assist our schools the Senior Accountant is trying to produce local benchmarking data based on the 2017/18 submission.
- 3.7 All schools will receive an email in late October / early November recommending that they carry out a self-check (Appendix B) of their financial position for next year (if not already done so) and offering a support meeting (aimed at those currently not in deficit).
- 3.8 A one year fixed term 0.8FTE term time only Senior Accountant post has been created in the Schools Finance team. For the period 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2019 the post holder will assist with the work to be undertaken with the schools that have set a deficit budget in 2018/19.

## 4. Supporting Information

### 4.1 Progress to date

#### **The Willows Primary School**

It has been agreed that the school will not submit the Period 5 Budget Monitoring Report as a large amount of work is being undertaken by the new Headteacher and her team to correct historic errors and identify necessary spend that was not included in the original budget. The first review meeting will take place on 18th October.

#### **Beenham Primary School**

Feedback on the Period 5 submission has been emailed to both the Headteacher and Finance Officer, changes to the budget have been suggested and actioned to reflect the significant changes in staffing that have occurred. These are included in the Period 6 Finance Report sent to school on 1<sup>st</sup> October. At the suggestion of the Senior Accountant an appointment has been made to work with the Head Teacher and Finance Officer on the preparation of the Period 6 Budget Monitoring and Forecast Report on 8<sup>th</sup> October (this will be funded by the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund).

#### **St John the Evangelist Infant School**

Written feedback on the Period 5 submission has been sent to both the Headteacher and School Business Manager, including suggested budget changes to assist with future monitoring and forecasting.

#### **John Rankin Schools Federation**

This is one of the two schools that made a Period 4 submission. Detailed feedback was sent to the Executive Headteacher and Finance Manager, including requests that savings be identified to cover overspends already incurred. Budget changes have been actioned reflecting the identified savings which will assist the federation with future monitoring and forecasting. These changes are included in the Period 6 Finance Report sent to the school on 1<sup>st</sup> October. The first review meeting will take place on 12<sup>th</sup> October.

#### **Parsons Down Schools Federation**

This is the second of the two schools that submitted a Period 4 report. Detailed feedback was sent to the Executive Headteacher and School Business Manager, including requests that savings be identified to cover overspends. Budget changes have been actioned reflecting the identified savings which will assist with future monitoring and forecasting. These changes are included in the Period 6 Finance Report sent to school on 1<sup>st</sup> October.

#### **St Finians Catholic Primary School**

The first review meeting will take place on 6<sup>th</sup> November. The school has requested a half day support visit from the Senior Accountant to assist with the start of the 19/20 budget build, this has been booked on 3rd December, and will be funded by the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund.

#### **Kintbury**

The first review meeting will take place on 13<sup>th</sup> November.

**The Willink School**

A support visit was made by the Senior Accountant on 04.10.18 to provide guidance to the new Finance Manager on budget monitoring and forecasting.

**5. Appendices**

- 5.1 Appendix A: Programme of Works and Progress table
- 5.2 Appendix B: Draft contents for Schools Financial Position for 2019/20 email

APPENDIX A				Submission of monthly Budget Monitoring and Forecasting (from P6) BMF								14/15		15/16		16/17		17/18		18/19				Schools In Financial Difficulty Fund Payments															
	5 Year Planner Submitted fully completed by 1st May	Schools Accountancy sense check and review completed	Letter From Ho/E* and Ho/F* authorising terms of licensed deficit	P3 BMF due 14.07.18 Received	P3 Reviewed and Feedback Emailed	P4 BMF due 14.07.18 Received	P4 Reviewed and Feedback Emailed	P5 BMF due 14.09.18 Received	P5 Reviewed and Feedback Emailed	Submission of Minutes and Agendas	1st Task Force meeting arranged	Support requested and booked to be paid from SIFP	Licensed Deficit	Unlicensed Deficit	Licensed Deficit	Unlicensed Deficit	Licensed Deficit	Unlicensed Deficit	Licensed Deficit	Unlicensed Deficit	Licensed Deficit	Unlicensed Deficit	No of yrs prior to 18/19 in deficit	No of yrs expects to be in deficit incl 18/19	Total no of years in deficit	Proposed year of recovery	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Phase	Ofsted Rating	Last Ofsted Report	Head teacher	SBM/FM/FO
PRIMARY SCHOOLS																																							
Beenham Primary School	01.05.18	Yes	Yes	18.07.18				14.09.18	18.09.18			08.10.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11k	N/A	-64,783	N/A	-36,153	N/A	2	2	4	20/21							25,430		P	Good	19.10.17	Sue Butcher	Bev Sharp (FO)
John Rankin Schools Federation	01.05.18	Yes	Yes	17.07.18		13.08.18	23.08.18	14.09.18	02.10.18			12.10.18	N/A	-21,154	N/A	-169,724	182k	N/A	-189,992	N/A	131,033	N/A	4	2	6	20/21						60,330		I	Good	6	Felix Rayner	Aileen Rae (FM)	
Kintbury St Mary's Church of England Primary School	01.05.18	Yes	Yes	12.07.18	16.07.18			14.09.18	28.09.18	Draft F&R Minutes 24.04.18		13.11.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-12,317	N/A	-15,576	N/A	1	1	2	19/20					18,677			P	Good	21.03.18	Ronnie Green	Philippa Bell (SBM)	
Parsons Down Schools Federation	22.05.18	Yes	Yes	20.07.18		20.08.18	23.08.18	MSB - 14.09.18 Rest - 17.09.18	01.10.18				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-22,432	N/A	-92,212	N/A	1	4	5	22/23							32,106		I	RI	04.05.18	Donna Fox	Clair Lloyd Butler (SBM)
St Finian's Catholic Primary School	24.04.18	Yes	Yes	17.07.18	18.07.18			14.09.18	27.09.18	18.04.18 EGM Budget 10.05.18 GB 10.05.18 GB Part 2 17.07.18 GB		06.11.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-7,714	N/A	-31,909	-61,542	N/A	1	2	3	20/21									P	Good	15.12.16	Liz Housden	Michelle Harrison (SBM)
St John the Evangelist Cof E Infant and Nursery School	01.05.18	Yes	Yes	13.07.18	16.07.18			14.09.18	18.09.18	16.03.18 Final Fin 20.04.18 Dr Fin 27.04.18 Final FGB 18.05.18 Final Fin 18.05.15 Final Fin P2			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-22,725	-37,759	N/A	-46,010	N/A	3	2	5	20/21						6,000			P	Good	09.03.16	Gaynor Zimmerman	Jasmin Scarr (SBM)
Westwood Farm Schools Federation	30.04.18	Completion of 2 tabs of Budget Planner outstanding	Yes	31.07.18				20.09.18	01.10.18				N/A	N/A	N/A	-40,270	-67,108	N/A	-82,753	N/A	-45,260	N/A	2	2	4	20/21						76,000			I	OS	01.07.11	Barabra Hunter	Sharon Goddard (SBM)
The Willows Primary School	11.06.18	Yes	Yes	18.07.18	24.07.18							18.10.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-17,826	N/A	-212,694	-130,797	N/A	1	2	3	20/21	115,453	174,453						36,118	P	RI	16.04.18	Jo MacArthur	Paula Jones (SBM)
SECONDARY SCHOOLS																																							
The Willink School	30.04.18	Yes	Yes	17.07.18	18.07.18			14.09.18	27.09.18	FGB 17.09.18 Draft FGB 09.07.18 Final RC 18.06.18 Final		04.10.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2,630	-98,684		-311,588		1	3	4	21/22									S	Good	20.07.18	Peter Fry	Lisa Adye (FM)
	Agreed late submission	School have indicated these will be completed for the 1st support meeting (email SG to SLR 20.09.18)	Ho/E* = Head of Education Ho/F* = Head of Finance	Most schools are closed for summer so P4 is not chased					No minutes received to date-reminders being sent with P5 feedback		Exceeded licence						Exceeds max no of yrs allowed to recover deficit						Exceeds max no of yrs allowed to recover deficit				Historically RI judgements have resulted in overspending								New to role - less than one years experience				
											Exceeds max no of yrs allowed to recover deficit						Equals max no of yrs allowed to recover deficit				Experienced but new to school																		

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix B**

### **Draft Contents for Self-Check of Schools Financial Position for 2019/20 to be emailed to schools late October/early November 2018**

- a. In your current year budget, is your expenditure greater than your income (i.e. you are using carry forward reserves to balance your budget)?
- b. When you set your three year budget last April, did this show you going into deficit next year?
- c. Have your staffing costs since setting the budget increased? e.g. as a result of new appointments or this could include the impact of the 2% pay award or PRP.
- d. Are your October 2018 pupil numbers lower than the numbers used in the 2019/20 forecast set last April?
- e. Have you had any unexpected significant expenditure in the current year not in your budget which cannot be offset by savings elsewhere in the budget?

This page is intentionally left blank



## DSG Outturn 2017/18 and Carry Forward to 2018/19

Report being considered by: Schools Forum  
 On: 15th October 2018  
 Report Author: Wendy Howells  
 Item for: Decision By: All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the actual deployment of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2017/18, with the main variances and to propose the amounts to be carried forward to 2018/19

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 To approve the overall carry forward, and the utilisation of the unspent DSG funds being carried forward from 2017/18 to 2018/19 as set out in section 6 of the report.

Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?

Yes: ☐

No: ☒

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 This report has already been considered by Heads Funding Group and Schools Forum and Schools Forum has already agreed the carry forward recommendations but due to a technicality the recommendations were not voted on and so this report summarises the position for voting purposes.

### 4. Year End Position – Summary

- 4.1 Table 1 shows the year end position against the final budget including variances.

TABLE 1	Final Budgeted Over Spend 17/18 £	Actual Over Spend at 31/3/2018 £	Variance to Budget £
Early Years	283,670	117,950	-165,720
High Needs	490,210	308,635	-181,575
Schools Block general		79,695	79,695
Schools Block De-Delegations	26,740	-466,181	-492,921
Central Schools Services Block		-26,550	-26,550
	800,620	13,549	-787,071

## 5. Schools Block

5.1 A breakdown of the variances in the schools block is shown in Table 2:

<b>TABLE 2</b>	<b>Final Budget £</b>	<b>Actual Spend £</b>	<b>Actual Variance £</b>
<b>Primary schools in financial difficulty</b>	314,650	55,551	-259,099
<b>Other de-delegated services</b>	660,440	575,743	-84,697
<b>Growth fund/falling rolls fund</b>	202,000	126,287	-75,713
<b>Maintained primary &amp; Secondary school delegations</b>	61,837,750	61,917,436	79,686
<b>School improvement</b>	223,240	149,830	-73,410
<b>Other centrally retained services</b>	1,048,410	1,021,865	-26,545
<b>Support Service Recharges</b>	333,800	333,800	0
<b>Expenditure Variance to Budget</b>	<b>64,620,290</b>	<b>64,180,512</b>	<b>-439,778</b>
Total Grant Received		-64,593,550	<b>-413,038</b>
<b>Difference</b>			<b>26,740</b>

Brought forward under spends from 2016/17 are included in the total actual variance. It has already been agreed by Schools Forum to utilise £38k and £13k of the 2016/17 brought forward variance in Ethnic and Minority Bilingual Learners and Behaviour Support respectively to reduce the cost to schools for these services in 2018/19. This reduces the overall amount of under spend available.

Note that the under spent variances against the budget are greater than the total variance against the grant received. This is due to the allocation of the under spends from last year creating a carry forward over spend of £27k. The actual under spend of £413k against the grant will be the allocation for the recommendations otherwise the same problem will occur for 2019/20.

5.2 The following are the recommendations for utilising the unspent budgets

- For the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty it is recommended that the unspent budget of £259,099 be added to the funding available in 2018/19 to help meet restructuring costs for schools in deficit – this would provide a total budget of £379,120.
- Support to Ethnic and Minority and Bilingual Learners - £35,170 – it is proposed to use this money to offset the cost to schools for this service in 2019/20 (this will be an approximate reduction of £50 per pupil)

- Behaviour Support - £4,500 – it is proposed to add this to the current year budget and utilise this in 2018/19.
- Growth Fund - £75,710 – it is proposed to roll this money into the budget already set for 2018/19 thereby increasing the budget to £277,710.
- School improvement - £73,410 – it is proposed to utilise £5,960 to offset the over spend in the Statutory and Regulatory Duties budget and to correct the £27k over allocation of the under spends from last year. School improvement is funded via a new school improvement grant and therefore the remainder of the under spend could be used to either fund additional school improvement services or increase the budget of any other de-delegated service or be carried forward to the next funding period to reduce the cost of de-delegations in 2019/20. No further proposal was made in relation to the remaining under spend.
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties – (£5,960) is proposed to be covered by the school improvement under spend above.

## 6. Summary of the Carry Forward Proposals

- 6.1 Table 3 details the 2018/19 proposed budget changes to reflect the net reduction in DSG resources carried forward to 2018/19 as proposed in the detail of each block in the preceding paragraphs.

TABLE 3	Use of funds 2018/19	Use of funds 2019/20
Primary schools in financial difficulty	259,100	
Support to Ethnic Minority and Bilingual Learners	38,300	35,170
Behaviour Support Services	17,190	
Growth Fund	75,710	
School Improvement		40,710
	390,300	75,880

- 6.2 Table 4 shows the movement in the over spend calculation and the use of funds:

TABLE 4	Final Budgeted Over / - Under Spend 18/19					
	Original Budgeted Over Spend	Change due to 17/18 Outturn	Net Difference	Use of funds 2018/19	Under Spend 18/19	Use of funds 2019/20
	18/19	£	£	£	£	£
Early Years	-47,860	84,934	37,074		37,074	
High Needs	702,900	-256,005	446,895	100,000	546,895	
Schools Block general		-17,905	-17,905		-17,905	
Schools Block De-Delegations		-466,181	-466,181	390,300	-75,881	75,881
Central Schools Services Block		-26,550	-26,550		-26,550	
	655,040	-681,707	-26,667	490,300	463,633	75,881

## 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 Following the vote the proposals above will increase the various budgets by £390k (including increases already agreed) as detailed above. The invest to save sum of £100k from the High Needs budget this will be held in a separate fund in order to monitor specific spend; if not spent this will reduce the amount of the High Needs over spend forecast for 2018/19.

## Schools Funding Formula 2019/20

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum

**On:** 15 October 2018

**Report Author:** Wendy Howells

**Item for:** Decision **By:** All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the changes and requirements for setting the primary and secondary school funding formula for 2019/20 and to set out the funding proposal to go out to consultation with all schools .

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Approve the following proposal for setting the school funding formula for 2019/20:
- Use the National Funding Formula rates for every formula factor as per the 2018/19 budget setting.
  - Apply a funding cap on gains of 2% and a minimum funding guarantee of 0%. Two models are presented to the Forum but this model ensures that no schools lose any funding.
  - Scale every funding factor upwards or downwards in order to match the final allocation available for distribution to schools.
  - Apply a top slice after the formula allocation rather than through the factors to the High Needs Block. An allocation through the factors means that schools that are protected under the minimum per pupil funding will still be protected and will therefore not be contributing towards this allocation.
- 2.2 To note the timetable for consulting with schools.

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 The Government announced in 2018/19 an additional £1.3billion to go towards education funding over the two years from 2018/19. Additional funding has been put into the National Funding Formula meaning that no school should lose on a per pupil basis. For West Berkshire schools this was a significant improvement.
- 3.2 The 2019/20 National Funding Formula will operate as a “soft” system – this means that the local authority will receive a total allocation and then allocate this out to schools according to a local formula, which is determined after consulting with all schools and the Schools’ Forum. In the summer the Government announced that this “soft” formula has now been extended to 2020/21.

- 3.3 The Government has produced a number of policy and operational documents relating to the funding. These documents can be found on this webpage:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/school-and-college-funding>

#### 4. National Funding Formula

- 4.1 The National Formula assigns funding rates to each of the formula factors. For some Local Authorities these will be uplifted by an area cost adjustment – for West Berkshire this is 1.0341.
- 4.2 Table 1 sets out the national rates which are also the West Berkshire rates with the Area Cost Adjustment. The only factor that has changed is the Primary Prior Attainment which has been reduced to £1,022 nationally.

**Table 1: National Funding Formula Rates**

Factor	National Rate	WBC National Rate (with ACA)
<b>1.Basic Entitlement:</b>		
Primary	£2,747	£2,841
Secondary KS3	£3,863	£3,995
Secondary KS4	£4,386	£4,536
<b>2.Deprivation:</b>		
Primary current FSM	£440	£455
Primary FSM Ever 6	£540	£558
Primary IDACI Band F (0.2 – 0.25)	£200	£207
Primary IDACI Band E (0.25 – 0.3)	£240	£248
Primary IDACI Band D (0.3 – 0.4)	£360	£372
Primary IDACI Band C (0.4 – 0.5)	£390	£403
Primary IDACI Band B (0.5 – 0.6)	£420	£434
Primary IDACI Band A (over 0.6)	£575	£595
Secondary current FSM	£440	£455
Secondary FSM Ever 6	£785	£812
Secondary IDACI Band F	£290	£300
Secondary IDACI Band E	£390	£403
Secondary IDACI Band D	£515	£533
Secondary IDACI Band C	£560	£579
Secondary IDACI Band B	£600	£620
Secondary IDACI Band A	£810	£838
<b>3.Prior Attainment:</b>		
Primary	£1,022	£1,057
Secondary	£1,550	£1,603
<b>4.English as an Additional Language:</b>		
Primary EAL 3	£515	£532
Secondary EAL 3	£1,385	£1,432
<b>5.Sparsity</b>		
Primary	£25,000	£25,852
Secondary	£65,000	£67,216
<b>6.Lump Sum:</b>		
Primary	£110,000	£113,751
Secondary	£110,000	£113,751
<b>7.Rates:</b>		
Primary	18/19 estimate	

Secondary	18/19 estimate	
-----------	----------------	--

4.3 The schools that gain funding under the NFF will be those with the following characteristics:

- High number of pupils from deprived backgrounds (free school meals or IDACI).
- High number of pupils with low prior attainment.
- Small rural school meeting the sparsity criteria – pupils live more than two miles from their next nearest school.

4.4 There will be a minimum per pupil funding level of £3,500 for primary and £4,800 for secondary.

4.5 The funding floor has increased so that all schools will attract at least a 1% gain per pupil against their 2017/18 baselines. For schools that gain, a funding cap of 3% (cumulative) 6.09% per pupil is set for 2019/20.

## 5. Funding

5.1 Based on the October 2017 census data the funding to allocate is £98.4m excluding the growth fund which is now allocated separately. This will change with the October 2018 census numbers. An increase to business rates will reduce the amount to be allocated.

5.2 Note that the funding received will not change as a result of pupil characteristics.

## 6. Proposals

6.1 Although it will be impossible to replicate the national funding formula as shown in the DfE's tables for each school, it is proposed that in principle the aim will be replicate the national rates as was the case for 2018/19. There is no advantage in doing anything different, as the minimum funding guarantee will protect schools that lose. Two models showing the formula as currently (notionally) allocated and showing a top slice to the High Needs Block are included in the Appendices.

6.2 Annex A of Appendix A shows the funding factors and allocations per school prior to the MFG, funding floor and cap on gains per school.

6.3 The minimum funding guarantee will be set according to the guidance at between minus 1.5% and plus 0.5% per pupil depending on affordability, and the cap on gains will be set up to 3%.

The two proposed formula allocations shown in Annex C and D of Appendix A have the following impact:

	Option 1 MFG -0.5% Cap 3%	Option 1 MFG - 0% Cap 2%
Number of schools losing	16	2
Number of schools gaining nil	0	16
Gains of £1k - £5k	27	27
Gains of £5k - £15k	12	14
Gains of £15k - £30k	9	8
Gains of over £30k	10	9
Highest Gain	£90,840	£90,840
Average Gain	£13,340	£10,087

- 6.4 It is proposed that any transfer to the High Needs Block be funded through a top slice after the formula allocation since an allocation through the factors means that some schools that are protected through the minimum per pupil funding will still be protected and will not be contributing to this allocation. The top slice per school is pro rata to the school's funding and the total funding.

## 7. Next Steps

- 7.1 A consultation document will go out to schools containing the above proposals. The document is set out in Appendix A for approval.
- 7.2 The consultation will last for 3 weeks and the results will be brought back to the next Heads Funding Group to review before determining a final proposal to take to the December Schools' Forum meeting for approval. The Council's Executive will make a final decision in January.
- 7.3 The consultation will also ask schools their views on the criteria currently used for additional funds, and on de-delegations. Final proposals on these will also come back to Schools' Forum for final decision in December.

## 8. Conclusion

- 8.1 Since the NFF rates have remained largely the same in 2019/20 as in 2018/19 (only Primary low prior attainment has changed) then it is logical to follow the same methodology as last year in the formula setting.
- 8.2 When the actual allocation is received in December the formula will be allocated according to the principles above and the Council's Executive will make the final decision in January 2019.

## 9. Appendices

Appendix A – Primary and Secondary Schools Funding – proposed arrangements for 2018/19: Briefing and Consultation document for schools.



## Criteria and Budgets for Additional Funds 2019/20

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 15 October 2018  
**Report Author:** Wendy Howells, Ian Pearson  
**Item for:** Decision **By:** All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the current criteria and budgets for additional funds, for review by members of the Heads Funding Group to ensure they are still relevant and meet their purpose.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Agree any changes to the proposals (in order go out to consultation with schools).

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	------------------------------

### 3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1 Under the current school funding regulations, no in-year adjustments to funding allocations are permitted and all funding to schools has to be allocated through the approved formula. There are, however, four circumstances where the local authority can provide additional funding:

- 1) A growth fund for the purpose of supporting growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need; to support additional classes needed to meet infant class size regulation; and to meet the costs of new schools.
- 2) A falling rolls fund where a population bulge is expected in the future but where a good and necessary school or academy currently has surplus places and faces an unmanageable funding shortfall in the short term.

For each of these funds local authorities are required to produce criteria on which any growth funding or falling rolls fund is to be allocated. These should provide a transparent and consistent basis (with differences permitted between phases) for the allocation of the funding. The criteria should both set out the circumstances in which a payment could be made and provide a basis for calculating the sum to be paid.

Funding for both these funds is from the Schools' Block DSG, and any increase to the previous year's budget is deducted from the funding that is to be allocated out to primary and secondary schools through the funding formula.

- 3) Funding for schools in financial difficulty where a school phase has agreed to de-delegate this funding (primary phase only in West Berkshire). There needs to be agreed criteria on how this funding is to be determined and allocated to schools.
- 4) Funding can be used from the high needs block to allocate additional funding to schools which have a disproportionate number of high needs pupils. This has to be determined by a formulaic method.

- 3.2 In 2018/19 the Schools Forum agreed to cease the Falling Rolls fund because only one school in four years had qualified for a payment. Funds are held for each of the other three circumstances. These now need to be reviewed and amended where appropriate. The forthcoming school funding consultation will also invite views from schools.
- 3.3 Schools' Forum will be required to agree the criteria and be consulted on the total sum to be top sliced from the DSG at the DECEMBER meeting. The Schools Forum will receive regular updates on the use of the funding.

#### 4. Proposals

- 4.1 No changes are proposed for the Growth Fund, Financial Difficulty Fund and Additional High Needs Fund.
- 4.2 The criteria for each fund are included in the appendices for members of the group to review and to propose any amendments.
- 4.3 The budget for each fund also needs to be agreed. Previous year's budgets and actual are shown in Table 1.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>Growth Fund</b>	<b>Falling Rolls Fund</b>	<b>Primary Schools in Financial difficulty</b>	<b>Additional High Needs Funding</b>
Budget Set 2014/15	250,000	120,000	115,470	48,000
<i>Actual Spend 2014/15</i>	<i>148,341</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>112,297</i>	<i>38,576</i>
Budget Set 2015/16	250,000	40,000	115,110	50,000
<i>Actual Spend 2015/16</i>	<i>158,563</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>18,677</i>	<i>87,966</i>
Budget Set 2016/17	250,000	40,000	117,320	127,690
<i>Actual Spend 2016/17</i>	<i>100,922</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>137,930</i>	<i>114,033</i>
<b>Budget Set 2017/18</b>	<b>162,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>119,980</b>	<b>100,000</b>
<i>Actual Spend 2017/18</i>	<i>126,287</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>55,551</i>	<i>100,972</i>
<b>Budget Set 2018/19</b>	<b>205,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>120,020</b>	<b>100,000</b>

- 4.4 The Schools Block allocation for 2018/19 includes £205k for the growth fund. It has been agreed that the budget for the growth fund is to be increased by £76k from the unspent allocation from 2017/18. This is being mindful that in September 2019 a new primary school is due to open, and the additional funding for this will need to be met from the Schools Block DSG. The allocation from the DfE for the Growth Fund is £202k rather than £205k and the additional £3k is not needed due to the increase

in budget from the carry forward amount. It was therefore agreed at Heads Funding Group to remove the £3k which would have added to any deficit carry forward. The funding for 2019/20 will be allocated to local authorities using a new formulaic method based on lagged growth data. Details of the actual formula have not yet been released.

- 4.5 The primary schools in financial difficulty fund has a budget of £120k and it has been agreed that a further £259k be added from the unspent allocation from 2017/18, as it is likely more schools will struggle to balance their budgets and will undergo staffing restructures which will qualify for funding.
- 4.6 The budget for disproportionate number of high needs pupils is currently showing an under spend but this is based on the autumn term number of children which then forms the basis of the spring term estimate. It is recommended that this budget is reviewed later on in the year to accurately estimate the budget required for next year. However funding still needs to be set aside from the High Needs Block in order to fund those schools qualifying.

## 5. Appendices

Appendix A – Current Growth Fund Criteria 2018/19

Appendix B – Current Funding for Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Criteria 2018/19

Appendix C – Current Additional High Needs Funding Criteria 2018/19

# Appendix A

## Growth Fund Criteria 2018/19

### 1. Background

- 1.1 Under the current School Funding Regulations, local authorities can set up a growth fund from the DSG in advance of allocating school budget shares. The purpose of the growth fund is to support maintained schools and Academies which are required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority and to meet the cost of new and reorganised schools including pre-opening and diseconomy costs. It can also include funding schools where very limited pupil number growth requires an additional class as required by infant class size regulations. It cannot be used for general growth in pupil numbers at a school due to a school's popularity.
- 1.2 The growth fund is ring-fenced so that it can only be used for the purpose of supporting growth in pre 16 pupil numbers to meet basic need. Any funds remaining at the end of the financial year must be added to the following year's DSG and reallocated to maintained schools and Academies through the local formula.
- 1.3 Local authorities are required to provide on a transparent and consistent basis the criteria on which any growth funding is to be allocated. The criteria should both set out the circumstances and have clear objective trigger points for a school to qualify for payment and provide a clear formula for calculating the sum to be paid.
- 1.4 The Schools' Forum is required to agree the criteria and the total sum to be top sliced from each phase, and will receive reports on the use of the funding.
- 1.5 The criteria and funding for 2018/19 as agreed by the Schools' Forum at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017 is set out below.

### 2. Growth Fund Criteria

#### 2.1 New School

**Pre opening costs** payable to a new school such as for the Headteacher and other staffing and recruitment costs prior to opening and initial equipping allowance *where the school is opening in response to basic need in the area*.

Funding will be actual cost of staff appointed and in post prior to the opening of the new school up to a maximum of £75,000, plus a fixed one-off lump sum of £25,000 for all other purchases necessary before the school opens.

**Diseconomies of scale**. The total pupil numbers required by the new school to ensure viability will be agreed in advance with the school on an annual basis whilst the school is growing to full capacity and funding paid via the school formula will be based on this number. This will meet any diseconomies of scale and the school will not require additional funding from the growth fund.

#### 2.2 Extending Age Range (including new schools)

This is payable to a school which has extended its age range and set up a new class in agreement with the authority *in response to basic need in the area*. Funding is payable from the growth fund where the new pupil numbers have not been added

to the school formula funding in agreement with the DfE (i.e. the deadline for such agreement was missed) or the new pupil numbers are greater than the number agreed with the DfE.

Funding will be total AWPU per additional pupil in the new class (pro rata for the remainder of the financial year).

### **2.3 Provision of an Extra Class**

This is payable where a school has *agreed with the authority to provide an extra class in order to meet basic need in the area* (either as a bulge class or as an ongoing commitment).

Funding will be total AWPU per additional pupil in the new class up to a maximum of £50,000 per class (approx. 17 pupils in primary, 11 pupils in secondary) pro rata for the remainder of the financial year. £50,000 will pay for a full time teacher at mid scale, a term time only Teaching Assistant, and approximately £9,000 for other costs.

### **2.4 Increase in Pupil Admission Number (PAN)**

This is payable where a school has increased its admission number by 5 or more pupils *in agreement with the authority*, but this has not necessitated an additional class, though is in response to basic need in the area.

Funding will be 50% of the AWPU per additional pupil up to a maximum of £25,000 (approx. 17 pupils in primary, 11 pupils in secondary) pro rata for the remainder of the financial year.

### **2.5 KS1 Classes (infant class size)**

This is payable to a school with infant classes which is required to set up an additional class in the Autumn term as required by infant class size regulations, and the school cannot accommodate all its additional reception and Key Stage 1 pupils in classes of 30 or less i.e. the total number of pupils in the 3 year groups exceeds a multiple of 30. (see Appendix A for examples).

In order to qualify for the additional funding, the school must have set up an additional class and employed an additional teacher, and must not have exceeded its admission number unless requested to by the LA.

Funding will be a fixed sum of £40,000 for each new class (to pay for a mid scale teacher plus a teaching assistant), pro rata for the remainder of the financial year.

Before setting up an additional class and employing an additional teacher, schools should be aware that this additional in-year payment is temporary one-off funding for the remainder of the financial year in order to meet the pupil's basic need until full per pupil funding is received the following April. Schools will be required to meet the costs of the additional class from their formula pupil funding and lump sum from the following financial year. Schools accessing the infant class size funding where pupil numbers are just 2 or 3 above the limit, should carefully consider the longer term financial implications of employing an additional teacher (approximately 11 additional pupils are needed to pay for a midscale teacher, or 9 additional pupils for a newly qualified teacher).

### 3. Funding

3.1 The sum to be set aside in 2018/19 is as follows:

Estimated Requirement	Calculation	Total
New School (pre-opening costs for new primary opening in September 2019)	£100,000 x 3/8 Assumes set up costs commence January 2019	£30,000
Extending Age Range (none expected)		£0
Additional Classes x 6	£50,000 x 6 x 7/12	£175,000
Increase in PAN (none expected)		£0
Infant classes (covered above)		£0
Contingency		£0
<b>TOTAL DSG REQUIREMENT</b>		<b>£205,000</b>

3.2 Funding requests from schools are to be submitted to Schools' Finance who will make payment following approval by the Head of Education if he is satisfied that the criteria are met. All approvals will be reported to Schools' Forum.

3.3 Any overspends in year will be met from a top slice of the following years DSG allocation. Any underspends will be carried forward and reallocated to all schools through the following years funding formula.

## Appendix B

### Funding for Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Criteria 2018/19

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Under School funding reform, from April 2013 local authorities have been required to delegate to all schools the contingency previously held for schools in financial difficulty. Each phase in the maintained sector has the option of de-delegating this funding to continue to have this funding centrally retained.
- 1.2 At the Schools' Forum meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017, the primary school members of the Forum opted to continue to de-delegate £120,000 in 2018/19, which equates to at a rate of £9.59 per pupil.
- 1.3 The Schools' Forum is required to set clear criteria for the allocation of this funding. The criteria for 2018/19 was reviewed and agreed by the Schools' Forum at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and is set out below.

#### 2. Contingency for Schools' In Financial Difficulty Criteria (Maintained Primary Schools Only)

If a school has a deficit budget or is at risk of deficit it may be allocated additional support funding. If a school can meet the following criteria, a bid for additional funding can be made by the school to be considered by the Schools' Forum:

1. The school has sought and followed the advice of the Schools' Accountancy Service **prior** to going into deficit
2. The school has (up to) a five year robust deficit recovery plan in place which has been discussed with and verified by the Schools' Accountancy Service.
3. Additional funding may be payable for one of the following exceptional unforeseen circumstances which has taken the school into deficit:
  - Short term downturn in pupil numbers - to maintain current staffing structure where evidence can be provided that the numbers are likely to recover within a 2 - 3 year period and where downsizing of staff and resultant redundancy costs in order to balance the budget on a short term basis would not be an efficient use of resources.
  - Sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers in a school causing concern (i.e. Ofsted category of notice to improve or worse) - to maintain current staffing levels on a temporary basis where to reduce the staffing levels immediately in order to balance the budget would be detrimental to the recovery of standards in the short term.
  - Unforeseen sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers - to cover staffing costs during a short term interim period whilst restructuring takes place and in order where possible to avoid redundancies (such as through natural wastage).

- Redundancy payments, where the staffing reductions are required in order to balance the budget, but these costs will put the school further into a deficit position and taking the school longer to recover the deficit.
- Any other one off costs incurred on recovery of the deficit, such as specialist consultancy advice/support. (it was agreed by Schools' Forum on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 that where West Berkshire's Accountancy Service are engaged for such support, the cost can be charged direct to this fund without making a separate bid).

Additional Circumstance (from April 2018):

Schools not currently in deficit but required to restructure to avoid going into deficit, may also make a bid for reimbursement towards their one-off redundancy costs.

In order to access this funding, a school will need to complete and submit an application to the WBC Schools' Finance Manager who will arrange a panel (usually the next Heads Funding Group) to assess the application. The school will be invited to present their case in person to the panel and answer questions. The panel will also be provided with benchmarking information produced by Schools' Accountancy (which will be shared with the school prior to the meeting). The panel will recommend the amount and duration of the financial support to Schools' Forum for approval or not.



## Appendix C

### Additional High Needs Funding Criteria 2018/19

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Local authorities can provide additional targeted support to individual schools from its high needs block where it would be unreasonable to expect the first £6,000 of support for that schools high needs pupils to be met by them from its (pre 16) formula funding due to an exceptional number of such pupils on its roll.
- 1.2 The guidance from the DfE has stated that the additional funding paid to schools should be formulaic based on the number of high needs pupils in each school. It cannot take into account lower level needs of pupils. The formula or criteria should be as clear and simple as possible, and should be devised so that additional funds are targeted only to a minority of schools which have particular difficulties because of their **disproportionate number** of high needs pupils or their characteristics.
- 1.3 The Schools' Forum agreed the methodology at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017, and this is set out below.

#### 2. Methodology and Process

- 2.1 There will be an additional payment to schools where the actual number of pre 16 high needs pupils (i.e. pupils in mainstream receiving top ups) is significantly (1%) above the average of all schools in West Berkshire.
- 2.2 Where the actual number of pre 16 high needs pupils per school is 1% above the West Berkshire average (the average is calculated using the number of high needs pupils in January 2018 and shown in the pink column on the attachment), each additional high needs pupil will attract £6,000 in addition to the top up. The number of additional pupils will be calculated on a proportionate basis rather than rounding up or down to whole pupil numbers to avoid a funding cliff-edge.
- 2.3 The funding will be paid pro rata each term based on the actual number of pre 16 pupils receiving top ups at that time for the number of days in that term i.e. calculated and paid in April, October and January.
- 2.4 The attached table shows for each school how many high needs pupils equals the average + 1% (the pink column) before qualifying for additional funding in 2018/19. Schools will receive £6,000 per 1.0 high needs pupils they have on roll *above this average number*. Note that funding may be a proportion of £6,000 if the calculation is less than 1.0.
- 2.5 The amount of funding to be set aside for this purpose in the high needs budget will be £100,000 with current indicative funding requirement of £88,600k.

#### Annex A

#### Provisional 2018/19 Additional SEN Funding for Schools with Disproportionate large numbers of High Needs Pupils

# Criteria and Budgets for Additional Funds 2019/20

Cost Centre	SCHOOL	Relevant Data			Indicative Funding		
		Total Pre 16 Pupil No.s (Oct 2017 Census) less RU Pupils	Mainstream Pre 16 Pupil No.s Receiving Top Ups January 2018	Notional SEN Budget 2018/19	Average No. of Pupils Formula Funded	High Needs Pupils Above Average (unrounded)	Indicative Add'l Funding £6,000
	Primary				2.06%	1% above LA avg	
	Secondary				2.45%	1% above LA avg	
91000	Aldermaston Church of England Primary School	158	4	39,219	3.26	0.74	4,452
91100	Basildon Church of England Primary School	142	3	48,956	2.93	0.07	431
91300	Beedon Church of England Controlled Primary School	49	2	16,401	1.01	0.99	5,938
91400	Beenham Primary School	73	0	18,581	1.51	0.00	0
91200	Birch Copse Primary School	422	3	92,843	8.70	0.00	0
91500	Bradfield Church of England Primary School	145	1	42,041	2.99	0.00	0
91600	Brightwalton Church of England Aided Primary School	94	1	24,293	1.94	0.00	0
91700	Brimpton Church of England Primary School	56	1	16,471	1.15	0.00	0
91800	Bucklebury Church of England Primary School	120	1	37,313	2.47	0.00	0
91900	Burghfield St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	211	3	43,648	4.35	0.00	0
92000	Calcot Infant School & Nursery	219	0	41,225	4.52	0.00	0
92100	Calcot Junior School	288	1	130,059	5.94	0.00	0
95222	Chaddleworth St. Andrew's C of E Primary School	25	0	14,118	0.52	0.00	0
92400	Chieveley Primary School	206	3	40,402	4.25	0.00	0
95900	Cold Ash St. Mark's Church of England Primary School	190	1	34,467	3.92	0.00	0
92200	Compton Church of England Primary School	185	1	51,348	3.81	0.00	0
92300	Cumridge Primary School	101	1	16,453	2.08	0.00	0
92500	Downsway Primary School	215	5	66,694	4.43	0.57	3,399
92800	Enborne Church of England Primary School	61	0	26,834	1.26	0.00	0
92900	Englefield Church of England Primary School	102	3	19,763	2.10	0.90	5,380
93000	Falkland Primary School	453	4	115,647	9.34	0.00	0
93100	Fir Tree Primary School & Nursery	195	2	59,547	4.02	0.00	0
93200	Francis Bailly Primary School	550	7	156,846	11.34	0.00	0
93400	Garland Junior School	216	2	64,163	4.45	0.00	0
93500	Hampstead Norreys Church of England Primary School	85	0	22,811	1.75	0.00	0
93600	Hermitage Primary School	195	4	59,639	4.02	0.00	0
93700	Hungerford Primary School	384	4	112,651	7.92	0.00	0
92700	The Ilsleys' Primary School	69	0	13,905	1.42	0.00	0
93800	Inkpen Primary School	79	2	23,424	1.63	0.37	2,226
93900	John Rankin Infant & Nursery School	258	4	65,927	5.32	0.00	0
93922	John Rankin Junior School	313	6	108,545	6.45	0.00	0
94100	Kenet Valley Primary School	202	3	84,600	4.17	0.00	0
94200	Kintbury St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	162	2	42,179	3.34	0.00	0
94300	Lambourn Church of England Primary School	184	1	78,486	3.79	0.00	0
94400	Long Lane Primary School	209	3	56,181	4.31	0.00	0
95800	Mortimer St. John's Church of England Infant School	174	3	55,115	3.59	0.00	0
97500	Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England Junior School	216	3	61,206	4.45	0.00	0
94500	Mrs. Bland's Infant & Nursery School	171	0	45,612	3.53	0.00	0
94600	Pangbourne Primary School	198	4	53,033	4.08	0.00	0
94700	Parsons Down Infant School	198	1	54,474	4.08	0.00	0
94800	Parsons Down Junior School	293	2	98,966	6.04	0.00	0
94900	Purley Church of England Infants School	113	3	37,179	2.33	0.67	4,019
95000	Robert Sandilands Primary School & Nursery	240	3	84,431	4.95	0.00	0
95100	Shaw-cum-Donnington Church of England Primary School	90	2	29,151	1.86	0.14	865
95200	Shefford Church of England Primary School	39	0	18,444	0.80	0.00	0
95300	Speenhamland Primary School	279	2	103,871	5.75	0.00	0
95400	Springfield Primary School	303	4	77,718	6.25	0.00	0
95500	Spurcroft Primary School	463	2	140,196	9.55	0.00	0
95700	St. Finian's Catholic Primary School	187	1	63,328	3.86	0.00	0
97700	St. John the Evangelist Infant & Nursery School	179	0	37,890	3.69	0.00	0
97800	St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	202	4	78,854	4.17	0.00	0
96200	St. Nicolas Church of England Junior School	258	1	65,591	5.32	0.00	0
96100	St. Pauls Catholic Primary School	326	0	115,739	6.72	0.00	0
96300	Stockcross Church of England Primary School	101	1	17,805	2.08	0.00	0
96400	Streathley Church of England VC Primary School	102	0	22,635	2.10	0.00	0
96500	Sulhamstead and Upton Noret C of E VA Primary School	107	2	28,360	2.21	0.00	0
99700	Thatcham Park Church of England Primary School	377	1	119,130	7.77	0.00	0
96600	Theale Church of England Primary School	291	4	51,731	6.00	0.00	0
96700	Welford and Wickham Church of England Primary School	95	1	25,217	1.96	0.00	0
96800	Westwood Farm Infant School	175	2	46,851	3.61	0.00	0
96900	Westwood Farm Junior School	227	3	59,935	4.68	0.00	0
97000	Whitelands Park Primary School	314	4	100,343	6.47	0.00	0
98700	The Willows Primary School	358	5	148,302	7.38	0.00	0
99400	The Wincombe School	418	5	133,379	8.62	0.00	0
97300	Woolhampton Church of England Primary School	92	0	22,111	1.90	0.00	0
97400	Yattendon Church of England Primary School	74	0	24,321	1.53	0.00	0
98900	Denefield School	951	6	292,781	23.25	0.00	0
98800	The Downs School	901	12	212,489	22.03	0.00	0
99000	John O'Gaunt Community Technology College	355	19	194,834	8.68	10.32	61,916
99100	Kenet School	1,398	14	487,793	34.18	0.00	0
99200	Little Heath School	1,289	17	323,479	31.52	0.00	0
99300	Park House School	800	10	284,919	19.56	0.00	0
99800	St. Bartholomew's School	1,274	12	306,819	31.15	0.00	0
99500	Theale Green Community School	447	2	154,667	10.93	0.00	0
99900	Trinity School & Performing Arts College	777	19	362,328	19.00	0.00	1
99600	The Willink School	872	20	187,708	21.32	0.00	0
	PRIMARY TOTAL	13,276	141		274	4	26,710
	SECONDARY TOTAL	9,064	131		222	10	61,917
	TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS	22,340	272		495	15	88,626

## Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty – Bid for Funding 2018/19

<b>Report being considered by:</b>	Schools forum 15.10.18		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Wendy Howells, Ian Pearson		
<b>Item for:</b>	Decision	<b>By:</b>	All Primary Maintained Schools Representatives

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To summarise a bid that has been received from a school in deficit to access funding from the 'primary schools in financial difficulty' de-delegated fund.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 To recommend to Schools' Forum approval of the bid, with payment being the full amount sought of £18,833.

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 Since April 2013, local authorities have been required to delegate to all schools the contingency previously held for schools in financial difficulty. Each phase in the maintained sector then has the option to de-delegate and pool this funding, with allocations made to schools that need it. This decision is made on an annual basis.
- 3.2 Primary schools have opted to continue to de-delegate this funding in 2018/19.
- 3.3 The budget for 2018/19 has been set with an initial budget of £120,020, which with Schools Forum agreement will increase to £379,120. Two bids have been received and approved to date totalling £68,219.
- 3.4 The criteria agreed by the Schools' Forum for allocating this funding to schools is as follows:

*If a school has a deficit budget it may be allocated additional support funding. If a school can meet the following criteria, a bid for additional funding can be made by the school to be considered by the Schools' Forum:*

- 1. The school has sought and followed the advice of the Schools' Accountancy Service **prior** to going into deficit*
- 2. The school has (up to) a five year robust deficit recovery plan in place which has been discussed with and verified by the Schools' Accountancy Service.*
- 3. Additional funding may be payable for one of the following exceptional unforeseen circumstances which has taken the school into deficit:*

- a) *Short term downturn in pupil numbers - to maintain current staffing structure where evidence can be provided that the numbers are likely to recover within a 2 - 3 year period and where downsizing of staff and resultant redundancy costs in order to balance the budget on a short term basis would not be an efficient use of resources.*
- b) *Sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers in a school causing concern (i.e. Ofsted category of notice to improve or worse – to maintain current staffing levels on a temporary basis where to reduce the staffing levels immediately in order to balance the budget would be detrimental to the recovery of standards in the short term.*
- c) *Unforeseen sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers –to cover staffing costs during a short term interim period whilst restructuring takes place and in order where possible to avoid redundancies (such as through natural wastage).*
- d) *Redundancy payments, where the staffing reductions are required in order to balance the budget, but these costs will put the school further into a deficit position and taking the school longer to recover the deficit.*
- e) *Any other one off costs incurred on recovery of the deficit, such as specialist consultancy advice/support (it was agreed by Schools' Forum on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 that where West Berkshire's Accountancy Service are engaged for such support, the cost can be charged direct to this fund without making a separate bid).*
- f) *Additional Circumstance (from April 2018): Schools not currently in deficit but required to restructure to avoid going into deficit, may also make a bid for reimbursement towards their one-off redundancy costs.*

*In order to access this funding, a school will need to complete and submit an application to the WBC Schools' Finance Manager who will arrange a panel (usually the next Heads Funding Group) to assess the application. The school will be invited to present their case in person to the panel and answer questions. The panel will also be provided with benchmarking information produced by Schools' Accountancy (which will be shared with the school prior to the meeting). The panel will recommend the amount and duration of the financial support to Schools' Forum for approval or not.*

- 3.5 Note that the decision to be taken by Schools' Forum is by Primary maintained school representatives only.

#### **4. Bid from Lambourn CofE Primary School**

- 4.1 An application has been received from Lambourn CofE Primary School. It is for £18,833. This amount is to cover the cost of staff restructuring and a retirement ill health payment.
- 4.2 The school had an unplanned deficit of £38,743 at the end of 2016/17 and finished 2017/18 with an unplanned deficit of £30,171k.
- 4.3 The new substantive Head was appointed in January 2017 and had inherited this position. A new School Business Manager was also appointed at the same time. The school has been undertaking a substantial amount of work to recover their position including restructuring (which has incurred the redundancy and ill health retirement cost), and ensuring all contracts have been reviewed for best value. The school did not set a deficit budget for 2018/19 in the anticipation that the reduction in costs plus a bid to the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund due would allow them

to come out of the deficit by the end of the financial year. However, since they received the Inadequate Ofsted rating work has been underway to transfer the school to academy status, which happened on the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018. As a result of this mid year transfer and the additional work this involved for the school it was not possible to submit the bid earlier. The bid meets the criterion (3d, e and f) set by the Schools' Forum.

- 4.4 The Head attended the Heads Funding Group meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018 and gave an explanation for the reasons the school went into deficit which included the redundancy/retirement costs and having to pay a teacher for longer than anticipated following a redundancy. The school had anticipated coming out of deficit in 2017/18 but due to these factors was unable to and had plans in place to reduce their deficit this year. Due to the additional costs and the timing of the school becoming an academy the deficit has not been cleared.

## **5. Recommendation and Conclusion**

- 5.1 It is recommended that the bid be approved in full since the costs have been incurred as a result of restructuring to recover an unplanned deficit and avoid further going into deficit. Further, the costs have been incurred when the school was a maintained school and has contributed to the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2018/19 – Month 6

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 15 October 2018  
**Report Author:** Ian Pearson  
**Item for:** Information **By:** All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out the current financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), highlighting any under or over spends.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the report be noted.

<b>Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

### 3. Background

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring fenced specific grant which can only be spent on school/pupil activity as set out in The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018.
- 3.2 The main change to the DSG for 2018 is that there are now four funding blocks: Schools Block, High Needs Block, Early Years Block and a new Central Schools Services Block. Each of the four service blocks has been determined by a separate national funding formula.
- 3.3 The schools block is ring fenced in 2018-19 but the Local Authority can transfer up to 0.5% of the funding out of the schools block with Schools Forum agreement. The other blocks are not subject to this limitation on transfers.
- 3.4 Table 1 shows the original DSG budget as set. The total budget was set with a planned over spend of £655k. This will be subject to change following the Schools Forum vote on utilisation of actual over/under spends from 2017-18.
- 3.5 The actual in year grant allocation is £129m.

Table 1 summaries the budget position:



<b>Table 1</b>	<b>Schools Block</b>	<b>Central Schools Services Block</b>	<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>High Needs Block</b>	<b>DSG Total</b>
Original Grant Allocation	98,011	992	10,357	19,665	129,025
Original Planned Budget carry forwards	-98	0	-795	138	-1,410
Revised Budget carry forwards	386	27	-118	-309	-14
Funding before any Block Transfers	98,299	1,019	9,444	19,494	127,601
Transfers in / -out	0	60	-33	-27	0
Funding after Transfers	98,299	1,079	9,411	19,467	127,601
	0	0	0	0	0
Planned Over/-under spend	-94	-27	37	547	463
<b>Final Budget</b>	<b>98,205</b>	<b>1,052</b>	<b>9,448</b>	<b>20,014</b>	<b>128,064</b>

- 3.6 The figures include funding to Academies and post 16 high needs place funding which form part of our allocation but not our budget as they are paid direct by the EFA – this totals £35.5m.
- 3.7 Over spends, unless funded from outside the DSG, can be carried forward and top sliced from the following year's DSG allocation. Under spends must be carried forward to support the schools' budget in future years.
- 3.8 The Authority and Schools' Forum are responsible for ensuring that the DSG is deployed correctly according to the Regulations, and monitoring of spend against the grant needs to take place regularly to enable decision making on over spends/under spends and to inform future year budget requirements.

#### 4. Monitoring Position as at Month 6 (30 September 2018)

- 4.1 The forecast under or over spend position at the end of August is shown in Table 2 below. A more detailed position per cost centre is shown in Appendix A.

Table 2 - DSG Block Net Budgets	Total Net Budget £'000	Proposed Budget Changes £'000	Revised Budget Overspend £'000	Forecast (under) / over spend against budget					Change from last report
				Month Three	Month Six	Month Seven	Month Nine	Month Ten	Report
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Schools Block (inc ISB)	64,490	339	64,829	0	0				0
Central Schools Services Block	847		847	0	0				0
Early Years Block	9,479		9,479	0	0				0
High Needs Block	17,569	100	17,669	0	247				247
<b>Total Net Expenditure</b>	<b>92,385</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>92,824</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>247</b>
Support Service Recharges	444		444	0	0				0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>92,829</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>93,268</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>247</b>
DSG Grant	92,805		92,804		-87				-87
<b>Net Position Over / -Under spend</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>334</b>

- 4.2 The budgeted over spend on DSG is as per the decision made by the Schools' Forum in July with the revised position which will be voted on at this meeting.



- 4.3 The total over spend position against expenditure budgets is £247k with a further £87k under achievement on the High Needs funding due to a reduction in the import/export adjustment.
- 4.4 Explanations for variances per funding block are summarised in the following paragraphs.

## 5. Schools Block

- 5.1 Table 3 sets out the current position of the Schools Block. The budget position has changed as a result of the amount carried forward from 2017/18 and when the additional de-delegated budget transfers are voted on this will change further as per the revised budget position shown. At this stage in the year, no variance is forecast. The main risk of over spend in this block is in relation to business rates (as schools are funded according to their actual rates bill). Note that the de-delegated budgets within the Schools Block will be forecast as on line during the year because any over or under spending can only be used within these budgets and cannot be allocated generally across the DSG.

<b>Table 3 - Schools Block</b>	<b>Current Budget £000</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Changes</b>	<b>Final Revised Budget</b>	<b>Current Forecast £000</b>	<b>Variance £000</b>
Expenditure	64,490	339	64,829	64,829	0
Support services	62		62	62	0
Schools Block DSG	64,985		64,985	64,985	0
<b>Net Position</b>	<b>-433</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>-94</b>	<b>-94</b>	<b>0</b>

## 6. Early Years Block

- 6.1 Table 4 sets out the current position of the Early Years Block. The Early Years Block is difficult to predict due to the volatile nature of both the funding (the final grant allocation will be determined by the January 2019 census), and payments to providers (payments are made according to actual number of hours of provision each term). The budgeted over spend is due to the change in the carried forward amount from 2017/18.

<b>Table 4 - Early Years Block</b>	<b>Current Budget £000</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Changes</b>	<b>Final Revised Budget</b>	<b>Current Forecast £000</b>	<b>Variance £000</b>
Expenditure	9,479	0	9,479	9,479	0
Support services	50		50	50	0
EY Block DSG	9,492		9,492	9,492	0
<b>Net Position</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>

- 6.2 The final grant for 2017/18 has been notified, and a claw back of £355k has been taken against a provision of £360k.

## 7. Central Schools Services Block

7.1 Table 5 shows the position for the Central Schools Services Block.

<b>Table 5 - Central Schools Services Block</b>	<b>Current Budget £000</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Changes</b>	<b>Final Revised Budget</b>	<b>Current Forecast £000</b>	<b>Variance £000</b>
Expenditure	847		847	847	0
Support services	205		205	205	0
CSSB Block DSG	1,079		1,079	1,079	0
<b>Net Position</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>0</b>

7.2 The budget for this new Block had been set with an on line budget position following transfers of funding from the Early Years Block and the High Needs Block towards paying for the central services that are carried out on behalf of settings within these blocks. There was a £27k brought forward under spend from 2017-18 which has been adjusted within this budget and will improve the year end projected year end position.

7.3 At this point there is no other variance to budget projected.

## 8. High Needs Block

8.1 Table 6 sets out the current position of the High Needs Block, which was set at an initial £703k over spend position. Following the change to the amount brought forward from 2017/18 the budget position has been revised to an over spend of £447k. When the budget movements are voted on the final revised position will be a £547k over spend.

8.2 Schools Forum agreed to proposals to utilise £100k of the 2017/18 improved position for invest to save proposals, if this sum is not utilised this will improve the budget position.

<b>Table 6 - High Needs Block</b>	<b>Current Budget £000</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Changes</b>	<b>Final Revised Budget</b>	<b>Current Forecast £000</b>	<b>Variance £000</b>
Expenditure	17,569	100	17,669	17,916	247
Support services	127		127	127	0
HN Block DSG	17,249		17,249	17,162	-87
<b>Net Position</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>881</b>	<b>334</b>

8.3 There is currently a variance predicted of £247k against expenditure and an £87k under achievement on the grant allocation which is due to the lower than predicted amount of the import export adjustment.

8.4 The main variances against expenditure are as follows:

- £74k - over spend in Sensory Impairment due to increased costs within the Joint Arrangement with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and an income target of £27k which has been set but is not expected to be achieved.

- £21k - over spend in Therapy Services which is due to a saving in the contract cost which was expected to be 10% of the cost but was in fact only £10k.
- £70k - over spend in SEN Commissioned Provision largely as a result of a forecast under achievement in income of £64k due to places being filled by WBC pupils. Savings will be realised elsewhere as a result of placing these pupils in our own provision. There is also a forecast over spend on the repairs an maintenance budget.
- £121k – under spend in Further Education College Top Ups – as a result of building the budget on the same basis as last year which was found to be incorrect and did have a large under spend at the end of 2017/18.
- £215k – over spend in the PRU top up budgets – this is as a result of far more than expected pupils receiving funding as permanently excluded pupils than budgeted.
- £125k – over spend in the new SEMH budget – this is new funding for pupils sent to the PRU where they are on a single roll and the request is agreed by the SEN assessment team. Savings may be identified elsewhere as a result of using this provision.
- Other over and under spends within the Top Up funding areas are demand led and can be as a result of pupil movement from one setting to another.

## 9. Conclusion

- 9.1 Over spending in the High Needs Block are significant and the total over spend forecast against this Block is £881k (including the budgeted over spend) and consideration needs to be given to where spending can be scaled back and savings identified in order to contain the over spend to the initial budget' or alternatively transferring an amount from the Schools Block to support the High Needs Block. This will, however be a one year only transfer and will not address the structural deficit problem.
- 9.2 It is not usually until later when changes to other high risk budgets such as early years payments become apparent.

## 10. Appendices

Appendix A – DSG 2018-19 Budget Monitoring Report Month 6



Appendix A - Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2018-2019 Budget Monitoring Month 6							
Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2018-19	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2018-19	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90020	Primary Schools (excluding nursery funding)	48,786,120		48,786,120	48,786,120	0	
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Primary	0		0	0	0	
90025	Secondary Schools (excluding 6th form funding)	14,784,820		14,784,820	14,784,820	0	
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Secondary	0		0	0	0	
90230	DD - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools)	120,020		120,020	120,020	0	
90113	DD - Trade Union Costs	43,680		43,680	43,680	0	
90255	DD - Support to Ethnic minority & bilingual Learners	151,750	38,300	190,050	190,050	0	
90349	DD - Behaviour Support Services	196,830	12,690	209,520	209,520	0	
90424	DD - CLEAPSS	3,170		3,170	3,170	0	
90470	DD - School Improvement	0		0	0	0	
90423	DD - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	147,590		147,590	147,590	0	
90235	School Contingency - Growth Fund/Falling Rolls Fund	205,000		205,000	205,000	0	
	Schools Block Total	64,438,980	50,990	64,489,970	64,489,970	0	
90583	National Copyright Licences	159,610		159,610	159,610	0	
90019	Servicing of Schools Forum	43,580		43,580	43,580	0	
90743	School Admissions	244,860		244,860	244,860	0	
90354	ESG - Education Welfare	201,900		201,900	201,900	0	
90460	ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	197,540		197,540	197,540	0	
	Central School Services Block DSG	847,490	0	847,490	847,490	0	
90010	Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	876,070		876,070	876,070	0	
90037	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	1,269,090		1,269,090	1,269,090	0	
90036	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	6,199,460		6,199,460	6,199,460	0	
90052	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	48,280		48,280	48,280	0	
90053	Disability Access Fund	23,370		23,370	23,370	0	
90018	2 year old funding	719,480		719,480	719,480	0	
90017	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	223,300		223,300	223,300	0	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	45,000		45,000	45,000	0	
90238	Early Years Inclusion Fund	75,000		75,000	75,000	0	
	Early Years Block Total	9,479,050	0	9,479,050	9,479,050	0	
90026	Academy Schools RU Top Ups	854,270		854,270	825,410	-28,860	
90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	3,300,420		3,300,420	3,344,950	44,530	Additional Place and Top Up funding in relation to increased numbers of pupils.
90548	Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	1,098,070		1,098,070	897,500	-200,570	Known movements to other settings including one placement costing in excess of £100k
90575	Non LEA Special School (OofA)	840,100		840,100	810,860	-29,240	Various movements of placements.
90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	2,436,400		2,436,400	2,410,180	-26,220	
90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,396,140		1,396,140	1,275,330	-120,810	Costs factored into the budget no longer require payment including several changes to pupil placements.
90617	Resourced Units Top Up Funding Maintained	293,020		293,020	243,680	-49,340	
90618	Non WBC Resourced Units - Top Up Funding	107,000		107,000	147,260	40,260	Known costs for placements agreed to date
90621	Mainstream - Top Up Funding maintained	541,560		541,560	598,830	57,270	
90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Acadamies	185,170		185,170	238,500	53,330	
90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	75,000		75,000	87,510	12,510	Known costs for placements agreed to date
90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	542,950		542,950	757,700	214,750	Summer Term Actuals and Estimate for Autumn & Spring Terms
90627	Disproportionate No: of HN Pupils NEW	100,000		100,000	73,470	-26,530	Includes Spring 2019 Estimate
90628	SEMH			0	125,000	125,000	Based on number of pupils currently attending Alternative Provision
	High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total	11,770,100	0	11,770,100	11,836,180	66,080	
90320	Pupil Referral Units	660,000		660,000	660,000	0	
90540	Special Schools	2,860,000		2,860,000	2,860,000	0	
90584	Resourced Units - Place Funding (70)	242,000		242,000	242,000	0	
	High Needs Block: Place Funding Total	3,762,000	0	3,762,000	3,762,000	0	
90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	75,000		75,000	93,510	18,510	Based on current demand
90280	Spec! Needs Spprt Team	319,170		319,170	319,170	0	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	40,000		40,000	40,000	0	
90288	Elective Home Education Monitoring	27,990		27,990	27,990	0	
90290	Sensory Impairment	172,750		172,750	246,330	73,580	Increase in JA costs and the number of additional visits needed . Assumes NO recharges will apply this FY.
90295	Therapy Services	240,760		240,760	261,470	20,710	Savings in contract costs lower than anticipated
90315	Home Tuition	245,000		245,000	245,000	0	
90555	LAL Funding	82,400		82,400	93,400	11,000	Fewer than expected places requested therefore recharges lower.
90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	0		0	8,910	8,910	2017/18 C/F budget yet to be agreed.
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	456,000		456,000	525,580	69,580	Income target not achievable, places now filled by WB pupils so factored into underspends elsewhere. Some extra repairs and maintenance to building
90582	PRU Outreach	61,200		61,200	61,200	0	
90585	HN Outreach Special Schools	50,000		50,000	50,000	0	
90610	Hospital Tuition	45,000		45,000	24,000	-21,000	Known demand for funding to date.
90830	ASD Teachers	141,550		141,550	141,550	0	
90961	Vulnerable Children	50,000		50,000	50,000	0	
90581	Dingleys Promise	30,000		30,000	30,000	0	
	High Needs Block: Non Top Up or Place Funding	2,036,820	0	2,036,820	2,218,110	181,290	
	High Needs Block Total	17,568,920	0	17,568,920	17,816,290	247,370	
	Total Expenditure across funding bocks	92,334,440	50,990	92,385,430	92,632,800	247,370	
	SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES	444,000		444,000	444,000	0	
	TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE	92,778,440	50,990	92,829,430	93,076,800	247,370	
90030	DSG Grant Account	-92,778,440	-50,990	-92,829,430	-93,076,800	-247,370	
	NET DSG EXPENDITURE	0	0	0	0	0	

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 14

## Schools Forum Work Programme 2018/19

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 2	Apprenticeship Funding	21/11/18	28/11/18			Discussion	Tracy Sheriff
	Draft DSG Funding & Budget 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Wendy Howells
	Final School Funding Formula Proposal 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Decision	Wendy Howells
	Final Additional Funding Criteria 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Decision	Wendy Howells
	Final De-delegations 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Draft Central Schools Block Budget	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	Draft High Needs Budget 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	High Needs Places and Arrangements 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	High Needs Block - Resourced Units	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Draft Early Years Budget 2019/20	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Avril Allenby
	Schools Funding Benchmarking Information	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Information	Wendy Howells
	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 7 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Information	Ian Pearson
Term 3	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 7 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	21/11/18	28/11/18	04/12/18	10/12/18	Discussion	Wendy Howells
	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Discussion	Wendy Howells
	Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Decision	Wendy Howells
	Central Schools Block Budget Proposals 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Decision	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Decision	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	Early Years Block Budget Proposals 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Decision	Avril Allenby
	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2018/19	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Information	Wendy Howells
	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 9 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Information	Ian Pearson
Term 4	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 9 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Discussion	Wendy Howells
	Work Programme 2019/20	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Decision	Jessica Bailiss
	Final DSG Budget 2019/20 - Overview	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Decision	Wendy Howells
	Final Central Schools Block Budget 2019/20	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Decision	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	Final High Needs Block Budget 2019/20	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Decision	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	Final Early Years Block Budget 2019/20	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Decision	Avril Allenby
	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 10 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Information	Ian Pearson
	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 10 Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	20/02/19	27/02/19	05/03/19	11/03/19	Discussion	Wendy Howells

This page is intentionally left blank