

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum

Monday 10th December 2018 at 5.00pm
Shaw House Church Road Newbury
RG14 2DR

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday 4th December 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

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at www.westberks.gov.uk



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 10 December 2018 *(continued)*

Forum Members: Reverend Mark Bennet, Ben Broyd, Anthony Chadley, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Lynne Doherty, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Angela Hay, Alan Henderson, Jon Hewitt, Lucy Hillyard, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, 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	Apologies	
2	Minutes of previous meeting dated 15th October 2018	1 - 10
3	Actions arising from previous meetings	11 - 12
4	Declarations of Interest	
5	Membership	

Items for Decision

6	Final Additional Funding Criteria 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)	13 - 22
7	Final School Funding Formula Proposal 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)	23 - 60
8	Final De-delegations 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)	61 - 92
9	High Needs Block - Resourced Units (Jane Seymour)	93 - 94
10	Funding children with EHCPs who attend PRUs (Jane Seymour)	95 - 122

Items for Discussion

11	High Needs Places and Arrangements 2019/20 (Jane Seymour)	123 - 126
12	Draft DSG Funding & Budget 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)	127 - 132



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 10 December 2018 *(continued)*

13	Draft High Needs Budget 2019/20 (Jane Seymour)	133 - 146
14	SEN Benchmarking (Jane Seymour)	147 - 154
15	Schools: deficit recovery (Amin Hussain)	155 - 160

Items for Information

16	DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 7 (Ian Pearson)	161 - 166
17	Forward Plan	167 - 168
18	Any Other Business	
19	Date of the next meeting <i>Monday 21st of January 2019, 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, 15 OCTOBER 2018

Present: Jonathon Chishick, Councillor Lynne Doherty, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Reverend Mary Harwood, Angela Hay, Alan Henderson, Jon Hewitt, Lucy Hillyard, Councillor Mollie Lock, Patrick Mitchell, Chris Prosser, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Suzanne Taylor and Charlotte Wilson

Also Present: Wendy Howells (Finance Manager: Schools), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service), Annette Yellen (Accountant for Schools Funding and the DSG), Suzy Mugford (Accountant) and Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support))

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Reverend Mark Bennet, Councillor Anthony Chadley, David Ramsden and Bruce Steiner

(Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman) in the Chair)

PART I

16 Minutes of previous meeting dated 16th July 2018

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16th July 2018 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17 Actions arising from previous meetings

July18 – Ac1, unspent funding in the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund: Ian Pearson reported that this had been discussed at the Heads Funding Group on the 2 October 2018 and it had been agreed that it would be appropriate to apply a £200k cap on the fund.

Ian Pearson reported that Jane Seymour had provided a written update on the following two actions as follows:

July18 – Ac2a, High Needs Block – Invest to Save Proposals, SEN Equipment for children attending nursery schools and resourced units: It was agreed at the previous meeting of the Schools' Forum that, although mainstream schools were now expected to fund their own Special Educational Needs (SEN) equipment, £10K would be set aside for funding equipment at nurseries as they did not have delegated SEN budgets and also at resourced schools. (It would not be fair to expect schools which hosted resourced units to fund all SEN equipment as they were taking children from across the local authority area and would have disproportionate equipment costs compared to other schools). This funding was being well utilised. There was a risk that demand might exceed the £10K budget so this would need to be considered when setting the 19-20 High Needs Budget.

July18 – Ac2b, High Needs Block – Invest to Save Proposals, Setting up on line forum for SENCOs: £1,600 was set aside for this, which was the balance left from the £100K allocated for invest to save projects once the Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Training and Behaviour projects had been funded. The most logical way to set up an on line forum for Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs) would be through the

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

Council's Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Local Offer website as this was where all SEND information was held and effort was being made to encourage parents and professionals to use it more.

The software provider for the Local Offer website was a company called Open Objects. The price they had quoted was £3,900 to set up the on line forum, which exceeded the available budget of £1,600. There would be no ongoing running costs. It was suggested that the Schools' Forum might wish to defer consideration of this until the budget setting process began for the 2019-20 HNB.

July18 – Ac2c, High Needs Block – Invest to Save Proposals, Review of resourced school funding: An initial report on this would be brought to the next round of meetings in November/December 2018.

18 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

19 **Membership**

Jessica Bailiss gave the following updates regarding the Membership for the Schools' Forum:

- Mark Bennet would replace Mary Harwood from December 2018, which would leave an Academy Governor vacancy. Consultation was taking place with the relevant forum to find a new representative.
- Gary Upton had replaced Keith Watts as Trade Union Representative from October 2018.
- Jacquie Davies' Term of Office had come to an end in October 2018 and she had confirmed that she would continue for a further three years.
- Angela Hayes' Term of Office would end in December 2018. Angela had been contacted and was consulting the Primary Executive Group.
- Charlotte Wilson's Term of Office had come to an end in October 2018 and she had consulted the Secondary Heads' Forum and they had approved that she would continue to be the Academy Headteacher representative on Schools' Forum for a further term.
- There was a Primary School representative vacancy and a response was due from the Primary Executive Group, to confirm who would fill this position
- There was still a Secondary Governor representative vacancy and consultation was taking place on this.

20 **De-delegations 2019/20 (Amin Hussian)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 6), which set out the details, cost and charges to schools of the services on which maintained school representatives were required to vote whether or not they should be de-delegated. Ian Pearson added that it was a decision that needed to be taken by the Schools' Forum on an annual basis.

The report gave further detail on each service including a table showing the budget and estimated unit charge. The Heads Funding Group (HFG) had reviewed each area including what the change in cost would be for each service in 2019/20. There were some areas where further justification had been required. One particular area of interest had included Health and Safety under the Statutory and Regulatory Duties (Table 6). There had been concern raised that the cost of Option 1 had increased from £3.52 in 2018/18 to £8.19 in 2019/20. It had been agreed that the Health and Safety Manager should be invited to the next meeting of the HFG to justify the reasons for the cost increase.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

Ian Pearson reported that in previous years the Schools' Forum had acknowledged that the HFG was looking into the de-delegation proposals in great detail and would submit a recommendation to the December Schools' Forum meeting, which it could then choose to approve or not.

Keith Harvey referred to the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service and noted that there was a change in the amount per pupil with English as an Additional Language (EAL). Keith Harvey asked if this included pupils with EAL in the early stages, as some schools had children who could speak English fluently and did not require support. It was possible an increased amount was required for pupils with EAL. Ian Pearson stated that de-delegations were restricted by Education and Skills Funding Agency rules and he would need to investigate in more detail to see if there was any flexibility in relation to the point made.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report, it would return to the Schools' Forum in December 2018 for final decision.

21 **DSG Budget Overview 2019/20 (Wendy Howells)**

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 7) which set out the changes to the calculation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2019/20, and the implications of the changes on the Schools Budget. Wendy Howells reported that the report was for discussion only.

Schools Block

Wendy Howells explained that section 4.2 of the report set out how the Schools Block funding for 2019/20 was calculated. For primary schools, the minimum per pupil funding level in 2019/20 was set at £3,500, and for secondary £4,800. The allocations for every school in the local authority were added up and divided by the October 2017 pupil numbers.

The total allocation excluding the Growth Fund was distributed to schools through the formula, by setting the formula funding rates and a minimum funding guarantee and funding cap on gains. The Growth Fund was now calculated separately to the funding formula using the October 2018 Census and therefore the final amount to be received was uncertain.

The method of distributing the funding would need to go out to consultation with all schools and be agreed by the Schools' Forum in December 2018, before being approved by the Council's Executive in January 2019.

With the agreement of the Schools' Forum and subject to consulting with all schools, up to 0.5% of the total schools block funding could be transferred to the high needs budget of other funding blocks. This was something that needed to be considered on an annual basis.

Jonathon Chishick asked if there would be specific funding available for the teacher pay award. Wendy Howells confirmed that this funding was separate to that being discussed and would be based on a per pupil amount. It would be available as a separate grant from September 2018 and it was unknown if the amount available would cover the amount required by each school.

Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)

A new formula was in place to determine funding allocations for local authorities. As the funding being received did not cover the ongoing costs in the CSSB (a shortfall of £335k) proposals to balance the block had been considered by the Schools' Forum in January 2018. The funding yet to be confirmed for the CSSB was £992,560.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

Keith Harvey noted the significant shortfall and asked how this was being managed. Ian Pearson confirmed that plans to manage the shortfall would include actions that had been taken the previous year as a starting point.

Early Years Block (EYB)

The new Early Years formula was introduced in 2017/18 however the funding for the EYB would not be finalised until the result from the January 2019 census was available. There was a planned deficit of £84,186 for the EYB.

The High Needs Block (HNB)

The basic structure of the High Needs formula was not changing in 2019/20. The formula used a number of proxy factors, but with 50% allocated on the basis of historical spend, and a basic entitlement for the number of places in special schools.

Section 7.4 of the report illustrated how the funding for the HNB was calculated including import and export adjustments. In 2018/19 these had been included in the overall High Needs Funding Formula however, it was proposed for 2019/20 that import and export funding be ring-fenced. The issue was that fewer children had been imported so far in 2018 and this had placed pressure on the HNB.

Wendy Howells drew attention to the table on page 50 of the report, which confirmed that there was a planned overspend of £646,253 for 2019/20.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

22 Schools: deficit recovery (Wendy Howells)

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 8), which provided an update on the work being carried out with the schools that had set a deficit budget in 2018/19. This was something that had been requested as a standing item at each Heads Funding Group and Schools' Forum meeting.

Wendy Howells explained that the report provided an up to date position. All schools except one had now submitted their Period Five reports, however, it had been agreed that the Willows Primary School would not submit their Period Five Budget Monitoring Report due to reasons set out in the report. Wendy Howells suggested that going forward the Schools' Forum should receive exception reports only for schools in deficit.

A support meeting had already taken place with the John Rankin Schools Federation and were set to take place with each of the other schools in the near future.

Graham Spellman highlighted that the draft content for the Self-Check of schools financial position for 2019/20 was included in Appendix B.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

23 DSG Outturn 2017/18

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 9), which set out the actual deployment of the Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG) in 2017/18 and proposed the amount to be carried forward to 2018/19. Wendy Howells added that the report had come to the last meeting of the Schools' Forum however, by omission some of the recommendations within the report had not been voted on and therefore needed to return for consideration.

Wendy Howells explained that Table 1 showed the year end position for 2017/18 and that the actual over spend at year end was £13,549.

Section 5.2 set out proposals that the Schools' Forum were required to vote on. All recommendations were the same as what had been submitted to the July Schools' Forum meeting apart from the recommendation for School Improvement. It was proposed

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

that £5,960 of this budget be used to offset the overspend in the Statutory and Regulatory Duties budget and to correct the £37k over allocation of the under spends from last year.

Jonathan Chishick asked how the decision to cap the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund at £200k affected the recommendation concerning the budget under section 5.2. Ian Pearson confirmed that schools would not be asked to contribute to the fund in 2019/20 or until the fund dropped below £200k.

Keith Harvey asked if the decisions required were based on the current year's budget rather than 2019/20 and it was confirmed that this was correct. It was noted that the following items were for decision by maintained secondary and primary schools only.

- 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 – this would provide a total budget of £379,120. It was noted that this was a decision for maintained primary school representatives only.

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum agreed the recommendation.

- 2) Support to Ethnic and Minority and Bilingual Learners – it was recommended to use the amount of £35,170 to offset the cost to schools for this service in 2019/20 (this will be an approximate reduction of £50 per pupil).

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum agreed the recommendation.

- 3) Behaviour Support - It was recommended that the amount of £4,500 be added to the current year budget and utilised in 2018/19.

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum agreed the recommendation.

- 4) Growth Fund - It was recommended that this money be rolled into the budget already set for 2018/19 thereby increasing the budget to £277,710.

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum agreed the recommendation.

- 5) School improvement: £73,410 – it was recommended that £5,960 be utilised 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.

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum agreed the recommendation.

- 6) Statutory and Regulatory Duties: It was recommended that the amount of £5,960 be covered by the school improvement under spend above.

RESOLVED that: the Schools' Forum approved the recommendation.

24 Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (Wendy Howells)

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 10), which 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.

In 2018/19, as agreed by the Schools' Forum, the National Funding Formula (NFF) had been followed. In 2019/20 the NFF would operate as a 'soft' system, which meant that the Local Authority would receive a total allocation and then allocate this out to schools according to the local formula. In the summer of 2018, the Government announced that this 'soft' formula would be extended until 2020/21.

Wendy Howells reported that it was being proposed that a top slice be applied. Wendy Howells drew attention to the supplement pack which had been circulated, which contained the consultation document which would go out to all schools.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

Table 1 detailed the National Funding Formula Rates and Annex A contained the funding factors and allocations for each school before the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG), funding floor or cap on gains were applied. Two proposed formula allocations would be sent out to consultation and these could also be viewed under Annex A.

One of the proposed formula allocations would cause 16 schools to lose funding and the other (recommended) option, would cause two schools to lose funding by around £200 each.

Wendy Howells stated that the consultation document suggested that there should be an allocation of £400k from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block (HNB) and this needed to be firmed up to specifically ask schools if they agreed that a top slice should be applied.

The current funding regulations allowed for a few exceptional circumstances to be funded outside the formula and be top sliced from the DSG. For each fund the Schools' Forum would need to agree the amount set aside and establish clear criteria setting out circumstances in which a payment could be made (Agenda Item 11). The two funds falling within this remit were the Growth Fund and funding for schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils which could not be reflected adequately in the formula funding.

Keith Harvey asked what the amount of £400k for the HNB was based on. As far as he was aware, the maximum amount that could be transferred was 0.5%, which equated to around £500k. Wendy Howells stated that the amount quoted was lower because she had excluded rates however, if preferable the amount could be rounded up to £450k. Keith Harvey was of the view that the maximum amount should be applied for.

Ian Pearson summarised that there were two funding options for consideration along with whether funding should be transferred into the HNB and if so how much. If the decision was taken to transfer money into the HNB, then this would not become an annual commitment.

The Schools' Forum was required to take a view on whether to put both formula allocation options out to schools for consultation or alternatively just one. Jon Hewitt reported that special schools were heading towards a deficit and the number of children with high needs was increasing. He was therefore of the view that it would be sensible to transfer the maximum amount possible to the HNB from the Schools Block. This would help to support invest to save initiatives going forward.

Patrick Mitchell felt that it was important that schools were provided with a consultation rather than a recommendation. He also felt that supporting the HNB needed to be a priority.

The Chairman invited the Schools' Forum to vote on whether one or both funding options should be submitted for consultation with Schools and it was agreed that both options should go out to consultation.

The Chairman invited the Schools' Forum to vote on whether transferring funding into the HNB from the Schools Block should be included in the consultation with schools and it was agreed that it should be included.

Jon Hewitt stated that it was important to note that more than 0.5% could be transferred from the Schools Block to the HNB however, an application would need to be submitted to the Secretary of State for this.

Charlotte Wilson suggested that it would be useful when the information was sent out to schools to include information from other local authorities for comparison along with numbers of high need pupils. Jon Hewitt commented that benchmarking in the sector

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

was particularly difficult. Charlotte Wilson queried if there was a specific trend in West Berkshire that was causing the deficit in the HNB.

Wendy Howells added the caveat that the information was going out to consultation on the 16th October 2018.

Councillor Lynne Doherty stated that there was a South East Leaders piece of work taking place which involved South East benchmarking. A report would be made available in the near future however, it would not in time for the consultation.

Ian Pearson suggested that an email be sent out to all schools after the consultation had commenced to provide schools with some background and comparison information for the high needs area. He confirmed that he would speak to Jane Seymour regarding this. Councillor Doherty highlighted that some of the information was already contained within the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Strategy.

Ian Pearson added that there was an underlying issue in the way local authorities were funded to support children with special needs. Charlotte Wilson stated that if more money was required for pupils with high needs, then Headteachers should be provided with a reason for why this was.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Both funding options should go out to schools for consultation.
- 2) The option to transfer the maximum amount of funding from the Schools Block to the HNB should be included in the consultation with schools.
- 3) Ian Pearson would liaise with Jane Seymour regarding providing information on high needs in West Berkshire for schools. This would accompany the consultation document.

25 Additional Funding Criteria 2019/20 Wendy Howells)

Wendy Howells introduced the report (Agenda Item 11) which set out the current criteria and budgets for additional funds, for review by members of the Schools' Forum to ensure they were still relevant and fit for purpose.

Wendy Howells reported that there was very little change in the criteria and budgets for additional funds since 2017/18. She explained that in 2017/18 the decision had been taken by the Schools' Forum to remove the falling rolls fund because only one school in four years had qualified for a payment. The Growth Fund, Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund and Additional High Needs Fund had all been retained.

The value of the Growth Fund would change in the next report to the Schools' Forum in December 2018 because there had been a change in its value and how it was allocated out to schools.

The Chairman asked Members of the Schools' Forum if they were happy for the Criteria and Budgets for Additional Funds 2019/20 to go out to schools for consultation and this was agreed.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum agreed that the Criteria and Budgets for Additional Funds 2019/20 could go out to consultation.

26 Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty - Bid for Funding: Lambourn Primary School (Wendy Howells)

Ian Pearson introduced the report which summarised a bid that had been received from a school in deficit to access funding for the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty De-Delegated Fund.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

Ian Pearson reported that Headteacher of Lambourn Primary School, Rachael Duke, had presented the bid to the Heads Funding Group (HFG) at its meeting on the 2nd October 2018 and the HFG had recommended that the Schools' Forum agree the bid. The amount (£18,833) was to cover the cost of staff restructuring and a retirement ill health payment.

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

27 DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 6 (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 explained that the area that required discussion was the High Needs Block (HNB). Table 1 summarised the budget position for each of the four blocks. Table 2 showed the forecast under or overspend position at the end of August 2018. The total overspend position against expenditure was £247k with a further £87k under achievement on High Needs funding due to a reduction in the import/export adjustment. Ian Pearson confirmed that no other variances were predicted for the other three blocks.

Section eight of the report looked at the HNB in more detail. Table 6 set out the current position of the block and the final revised budget was £547k. The total over spend forecast against the block was £881k, giving a net variance of £334k. Consideration would need to be given to where spending could be scaled back and savings identified. The report identified the main variances against expenditure under section 8.4 of the report. The largest areas of variance related to the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

Keith Harvey asked if the variances were based on a six month period or a whole year and Ian Pearson confirmed that they were based on the year end position.

Jonathan Chishick asked what percentage permanent exclusions had increased by. Ian Pearson stated that figures around permanent exclusions presented a challenge. If viewing the number of exclusions for the current year they were far less than the previous year. Therefore the increase in spending did not relate to an increase in actual numbers of children being permanently excluded but was more likely related to the cost of the higher level of support they required. This required further investigation.

Regarding the PRU, the number of pupils requiring a place at the provision was lower than what had been anticipated. Because schools were now being asked to subsidise the cost of pupils attending the PRU, schools were choosing to look at alternative provision. This in turn reduced the budget for the PRU and a review needed to be undertaken into the size and staffing levels required going forward.

Angela Hayes commented that the cost expected from schools was prohibitive and was a particular pressure for primary schools and small secondary schools. Ian Pearson commented that changes to charging for PRU placements had been enforced as part of a cost cutting exercise however, this needed to be reviewed.

Patrick Mitchell felt that reversing the decision to increase the costs to schools placing pupils at the PRU would be a mistake however, the proportion of cost provided by schools needed to be revisited.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

28 Forward Plan

It was noted that a report would be brought to the next round of meetings in November and December 2018 regarding a review into School Funding Transfers for Mainstream Exclusions and Fresh Starts.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 15 OCTOBER 2018 - MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the Forward Plan.

29 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

30 Date of the next meeting

The next meeting would take place on Monday 10 December 2018, 5pm at Shaw House.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 6.15 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Actions from previous meeting

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Oct18 - Ac1	15th October 2018	Schools Funding Formula 2019/20	Ian Pearson would liaise with Jane Seymour regarding providing information on high needs in West Berkshire for schools. If possible this would accompany the consultation document.	Ian Pearson / Jane Seymour	A report on SEN Benchmarking is on the agenda for 10th December 2018.

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	Consultation with Governors is ongoing.

This page is intentionally left blank

Criteria and Budgets for Additional Funds 2019/20

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Ian Pearson

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To set out for approval the proposed criteria and budgets for additional funds for 2019/20.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 To agree the following:

- The total number of years that a new school would receive protection for its pupil numbers from the Growth Fund.
- To set a cap on the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund of £200k

2.2 Approve the budgets for these funds as follows:

- Growth Fund: as set by the DfE together with the amount in the current budget which is unspent at year end.
- Schools in Financial Difficulty: £0 per pupil, for 2019/20.
- Schools with Disproportionate Number of High Needs Pupils: £100,000.

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/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 if it chooses, 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.

- 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 West Berkshire holds funds for three of these four circumstances. The Falling Rolls Fund was removed in 2018/19. These were reviewed at the last meeting of the Schools' Forum and the school funding consultation also invited views from schools on the current criteria.

3.3 There were only six responses to the full consultation with schools, and there were either no response or no comments on the current criteria.

4. Proposals

4.1 For the Growth Fund criteria, a change to the wording in 2.1 is proposed to clarify the number of years a new school would receive protection from the fund.

4.2 No changes are proposed to the criteria for the primary schools in financial difficulty fund or schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils.

4.3 The budget for each fund also needs to be agreed. Previous year's budgets and actual are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1	Growth Fund	Falling Rolls Fund	Primary Schools in Financial difficulty	Additional High Needs Funding
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>
Budget Set 2017/18	162,000	40,000	119,980	100,000
<i>Actual Spend 2017/18</i>	<i>126,287</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>55,551</i>	<i>100,972</i>
Budget Set 2018/19	277,710	0	379,120	100,000

- 4.4 The expected funding for the growth fund for growth funding in 2019/20 is not yet known but it is proposed that any unspent funding this year be carried forward into next year to fund pre-opening costs for the new primary school opening in September 2019.
- 4.5 It is proposed that the primary schools in financial difficulty fund should be capped at £200k and that the amount that schools should contribute in 2019/20 be nil based on the fact that there is currently £379k in the fund. It is also proposed that any unspent funding be carried forward to ensure the budget is maximised from current funds.
- 4.6 It is apparent that the number of schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils is continuing to grow, and funding needs to be set aside from the high needs block at the current level of spend, in order to fund those schools qualifying.

5. Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed Growth Fund Criteria 2019/20

Appendix B – Proposed Funding for Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Criteria 2019/20

Appendix C – Proposed Additional High Needs Funding Criteria 2019/20

Growth Fund Criteria 2019/20

1. Background

- 1.1 Growth funding is within the Local Authorities' Schools Block NFF allocations. For 2019/20, growth funding will be allocated to Local Authorities using a new formulaic approach based on lagged growth data. 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 funding remaining at the end of the financial year may be carried forward to the following funding period, as with any other centrally retained budget, and the Local Authority can choose to use it specifically for growth. Any over spent growth funding will form part of the overall DSG surplus or deficit balance.
- 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 must be consulted on the total size of the growth fund 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 11th 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 be reviewed on an annual basis and the estimates adjusted to take into account the actual pupil numbers in the previous funding period. Funding protection will be paid to the school based on the difference between the agreed pupil numbers and the actual pupil numbers for **XX** full years.

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 Basic Needs Entitlement 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 Basic Needs Entitlement 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 Basic Needs Entitlement 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 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.
- 3.2 Any overspends in year will be met from a top slice of the following years DSG allocation. Any funding remaining at the end of the financial year may be carried forward to the following funding period, as with any other centrally retained budget, and the Local Authority can choose to use it specifically for growth.

Appendix B

Funding for Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Criteria 2019/20

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 11th December 2017, the primary school members of the Forum opted to continue to de-delegate this funding in 2018/19 at a rate of £9.64 per pupil. The total amount is now £379,120, which includes unspent funds from 2017/18 being carried forward.
- 1.3 The Schools' Forum is required to set clear criteria for the allocation of this funding. The current criteria is set out below.

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

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:
 - 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 11th 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 2019/20

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 11th 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 2019 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 [NOTE THIS TABLE WILL BE UPDATED for 2019/20 figures] 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.

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

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 (un rounded)	Indicative Add'l Funding
	Primary				2.06%	1% above LA avg	£6,000
	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	Beeton 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	Curridge 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 Baily 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	Kennet 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	Lambour 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	Sheffield 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. Paul's 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	Streatley Church of England VC Primary School	102	0	22,635	2.10	0.00	0
96500	Sulhamstead and Ufton Nerve 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 Winchcombe 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	Kennet 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

Schools Funding Formula 2019/20

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Amin Hussain, Ian Pearson

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

Purpose of the Report

To set out the results from the consultation with schools on the proposed primary and secondary school funding formula for 2019/20 and to make a final recommendation.

Recommendation(s)

Agree the following for setting the school funding formula for 2019/20, to go as a recommendation to the Council's Executive:

- Use the National Funding Formula rates for every formula factor, applying a funding cap on gains and minimum funding guarantee as agreed at this meeting.
- Use the minimum funding guarantee to flex any reduced or additional funding as appropriate and then scale factors according to affordability. Or scale every formula factor upwards or downwards in order to match the final funding allocation available for distribution to schools.
- Apply a top slice to the schools' funding if agreed at this meeting.

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

Introduction

The funding arrangements for 2019/20 are based on the National Funding Formula (NFF) factors and rates as they were in 2018/19.

For the next two years the NFF 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.

At the October meeting of the Schools' Forum it was agreed that we would again replicate the NFF as close as possible with the funding available. Two options were presented to schools for consultation – a minimum funding guarantee of either -0.5% and a cap on gains at 3% or a minimum funding guarantee of 0% with a cap on gains of 2%. There was also the option to support the High Needs Block with approx. £490k of funding from schools which is the maximum allowed under the regulations of 0.5%. It was on this basis that all schools were consulted.

Consultation Responses

Appendix A contains the briefing and consultation document that went out to all schools. This document also contains all the background information to the school formula and the proposed formula options.

The consultation document was emailed on the 18th October 2018 with a deadline for responses of 13th November 2018.

There were only 6 formal responses to the consultation – from Winchcombe, Kennet, Little Heath, the Downs, Deneffield and Francis Baily.

Of the responses 3 agreed with the first option for a 0% minimum funding guarantee (MFG) and a 2% cap on gains and 3 agreed with the option for a -0.5% minimum funding guarantee and a 3% cap on gains. 4 schools disagreed with supporting the High Needs Block, mainly citing lack of information around why the support is needed and what the High Needs Block was doing to make savings to contain the expenditure going forward.

The following points have also been made as part of the consultation

Rather than scale the factors in the event of more or less funding 2 schools suggested that the MFG is flexed first. This would be a sensible approach since we are then keeping to the NFF rates and using an approach after the factors are applied to reduce or increase the final allocation to schools.

Schools had initially expressed concern at the cost of Option 1 of the Health and Safety de-delegation and at the recent HFG 28.11.12 meeting further information was provided. Subsequently, HFG has agreed to the de-delegations and that there is a satisfactory explanation for the increase in the cost.

Copies of the responses are included as part of Appendix A.

Conclusion

As there were only 6 responses to the consultation it will fall to Head Funding Group to make the recommendations to Schools Forum since the responses were split and the High Needs proposal was not well received.

Once the actual funding allocation and census data are received (expected by 20th December), the formula funding to schools will therefore be determined on the principles recommended in this meeting.

The Council's Executive will make the final decision in January. The formula has to be submitted to ESFA by 19th January 2019.

There continues to be significant concern about the shortfall in funding and the ability of schools to balance their budget without having an impact on pupils.

Appendices

Appendix A – Primary and Secondary Schools Funding – Proposed Funding Arrangements for 2019/20: Briefing and Consultation Document for Schools



Primary and Secondary Schools Funding Proposed Funding Arrangements for 2019/20

Briefing & Consultation Document for Schools October 2018

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Department for Education (DfE) introduced a National Funding Formula (NFF) from 2018. The premise is that all schools will be funded on the same basis and pupils with similar characteristics and similar needs will attract similar levels of funding regardless of where they live. This means that the funding rates for each of the formula factors will be set nationally rather than by each individual Local Authority. In order to achieve this, funding would shift from higher funded local authorities to the lower funded ones.
- 1.2 The original intention was that all schools would move to the NFF “hard” formula by 2019. A “hard” formula means that schools will receive their funding allocations direct from the Government using the NFF rates. In 2018 and 2019 the formula would be a “soft” formula which means that the decision is taken locally on how best to allocate this funding to schools through the factors. This “soft” formula has now been extended to 2020.
- 1.3 Policy and operational documents relating to the 2019 schools budget, and the implementation of the NFF from April 2019. These can be accessed on this webpage:
- <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-funding-formula-for-schools-and-high-needs>
- 1.4 Additional funding has been put into the NFF including protecting schools that were due to lose, so that no school should lose funding on a per pupil basis compared to their baseline; the baseline being 2017/18
- 1.5 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.

1.6 This document provides a briefing on the proposed local arrangement for 2019/20. Schools are invited to make comments on five specific areas, as highlighted in boxes within the text. Please e-mail your response to Wendy Howells, Schools' Finance Manager wendy.howells@westberks.gov.uk by **13th November 2018**. In order for the Schools' Forum to consider a suggestion for change, it should be accompanied by clear rationale on why your proposal is a better solution and fair and equitable for all schools in West Berkshire Council (WBC), and not just for your own individual school. You should also check that it falls within the current funding regulations.

2. The National Funding Formula (NFF)

2.1 The NFF assigns funding rates to each of the current formula factors. For some local authorities these are uplifted by an area cost adjustment (ACA). For West Berkshire this is 1.0341.

2.2 In determining the pupil numbers the October census will continue to be used.

2.3 Table 1 sets out the national rates.

Table 1: National Funding Formula Rates

Factor	National Rate	WBC National Rate (with ACA)
1.Basic Entitlement:		
Primary	£2,747	£2,841
Secondary KS3	£3,863	£3,994
Secondary KS4	£4,386	£4,535
2.Deprivation:		
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
3.Prior Attainment:		
Primary	£1,022	£1,057
Secondary	£1,550	£1,603
4.English as an Additional Language:		
Primary EAL 3	£515	£532
Secondary EAL 3	£1,385	£1,432
5.Sparsity		
Primary	£25,000	£25,852
Secondary	£65,000	£67,216
6.Lump Sum:		
Primary	£110,000	£113,751

Annex A shows for each school a breakdown per formula factor using the NFF rates. The schools that gain funding are generally those with the following characteristics:

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

2.4 The national formula delivers a minimum per pupil funding of £3,500 per Primary pupil and £4,800 per Secondary pupil. This is taking into account all factors except business rates. All schools will be protected via a funding floor of 1% above their 2017/18 baselines – again taking into account all factors except rates. For schools that gain, a funding cap of 3% per pupil has been allowed for 2019/20 determined locally and excluding the minimum per pupil funding level guarantee.

3. Funding Available to be Allocated to Schools

3.1 Funding for schools is allocated to the Local Authority through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The grant is split into four funding blocks - Schools, Early years, High needs and new for 2018/19 Central Schools Services which is for the centrally retained services previously funded from the Schools Block (such as licences, admissions, education welfare). Thus, from 2018/19 the Schools Block is only for Primary and Secondary school formula allocations, plus growth funding for new or growing schools (as such pupils are not included in the funding allocation as they did not exist in the previous October census).

3.2 The Schools Block is ring fenced, but up to 0.5% can be transferred to other funding blocks subject to consultation with all schools and Schools' Forum agreement. Secretary of State approval is required for transfers above this limit or where the Schools' Forum has opposed the transfer

3.3 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 October 2017 census data and pupil numbers.
- An area cost adjustment (ACA) is added to the total sum for each school (1.0341 for West Berkshire).
- Each school is allocated as a minimum a 1% per pupil increase against their baseline of 2017/18 through the funding floor and a guarantee of a minimum per pupil allocation of £3,500 for Primary pupils or £4,800 for Secondary pupils (all factors excluding rates).
- 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 (£3,899 PUF) and a Secondary Unit of Funding (£4,936 SUF). These funding units are now set for 2019/20.
- 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 is added which will be calculated separately for 2019/20 to give the final DSG total.

3.4 It will be unlikely that a local authority would be able to replicate exactly the national funding formula rates to schools for the following reasons:

- The funding rates (PUF and SUF) have been determined using October 2017 census data, whereas actual allocations to schools use October 2018 census

data. If pupil characteristics (such as deprivation levels) have changed between the two census dates, 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 – which is likely to be more.
- If there is a significant shortfall in High Needs funding, up to 0.5% could be transferred from the Schools Block allocation.

3.5 Based on the October 2017 census data and pupil numbers, the schools block DSG would be £98.4m. Increases in business rates would need to be deducted, with the balance available to allocate to schools through the formula.

3.6 This figure could go up or down depending on the changes in pupil numbers in the October 2018 census.

3.7 The amount of funding required to allocate to schools using the national formula rates could also go up or down, not just in proportion to changes in pupil numbers, but if pupil characteristics used in other formula factors have significantly changed compared to October 2017 (because the funding being received does not recognise this change).

3.8 In addition to agreeing on the funding formula, a decision therefore needs to be taken on how to allocate any surplus or shortfall. The final funding will not be known until mid December and after this consultation has taken place.

4. Proposal for 2019/20 Formula and Funding Rates

4.1 **Annex B** is an extract from the Government's school revenue funding operations guide, detailing the allowable funding factors for 2019/20. The only changes in the NFF compared to 2018/19 is the low prior attainment value for Primary allocation which has dropped to £1,022 nationally.

4.2 It remains a Local Authority decision (for at least the next two years) on how the funding is allocated to schools through the formula factors. There is no requirement to stick to the NFF rates, or to use all the factors. However, it is the Government's intention that from 2021/22 all schools will be on the NFF.

4.3 Although it may not be possible to replicate exactly the national funding formula as shown in the DfE tables for each school, it is proposed that in principle the aim will be to use the national rates using all the formula factors. Using either a 0% Minimum funding Guarantee (MFG) and 2% cap on gains or a -0.5% MFG and 3% cap on gains means that the current funding allocation is affordable. The funding floor and MFG will protect schools that lose.

4.3 The models (using 0% MFG and -0.5% MFG) are shown in **Annex C and D**. Both models are affordable (but are subject to changes in business rates). The impact is as follows:

	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

4.4 The minimum funding guarantee that can be set in the school formula is between plus 0.5% and -1.5%.

4.5 As was the case last year it is proposed that the funding rates for all formula factors be scaled upwards or downwards in order to match the final funding allocation. This is because:

- It is fair and equitable for all schools – no particular type of school is advantaged or disadvantaged.
- It is logical – the area cost adjustment is applied to every formula factor, so it makes sense to add or remove funding in the same way.
- It keeps the funding for all factors in the same proportion to the national funding rates and thus in proportion to the relative needs of pupils in each school.

4.6 The models assume no change in pupil numbers, and thus illustrate the impact of the NFF based on the same details as last year. Actual individual school allocations will be dependent on the October 2018 census data. The model chosen is also available as a spreadsheet, and by entering the school cost centre in the pink box of the “school sheet” tab this will display in detail the formula allocation for the school alongside the current funding received for each factor. Schools can also enter their actual pupil numbers for October 2018 (yellow boxes) to see their likely funding for 2019/20 and beyond based on this model.

4.7 Academies should note that their minimum funding guarantee works in a different way to maintained schools and they will need to apply the funding rates set out in this proposal to their own GAG funding model.

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.

5. Additional Funding Outside the School Formula

5.1 The current funding regulations allow for a few exceptional circumstances to be funded outside the formula and be top sliced from the DSG. For each fund the Schools' Forum need to agree the amount to set aside and clear criteria setting out the circumstances in which a payment could be made and the basis for calculating the sum to be paid. The current criteria for each fund is the subject of a separate report at this meeting.

5.2 The funds are as follows:

- Growth Fund – support for schools required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority – including the cost of new schools opening.
- Schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils which cannot be reflected adequately in their formula funding. This needs to be made through a formula.

5.3 Funding for the growth fund used to be top sliced from the Schools Block DSG. From 2019/20 this is to be calculated on a formulaic basis which will be based on the October 2018 pupil census. The allocation of the Schools Block formula does not now take the Growth fund into account.

5.4 Any unspent growth funding may be carried forward to the following funding period, as with any other centrally retained budget, and Local Authorities can choose to use it specifically for growth. No changes are proposed

5.5 No changes are proposed to the criteria for the Growth Fund and for the schools with disproportionate number of high needs pupils.

5. If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.

6. De-delegations 2019/20 (maintained schools only)

6.1 From 2013/14 schools received funding for newly delegated central services. For some services (where offered by the Local Authority), maintained Primary and Secondary schools can collectively opt for the service to be de-delegated – which means that the funding is deducted from the formula allocation and continues to be centrally retained for the benefit of all maintained Primary and Secondary schools, and individual schools cannot make that choice for themselves (Academies may be given the option to buy into the service, as can Nursery schools, Special schools and PRUs). From 2017/18, statutory services previously funded by the Education Services Grant were also added, and the de-delegation for these services relate to all maintained schools. The de-delegations need to be re-determined on an annual basis.

6.2 The relevant Schools' Forum representatives for each phase will vote on whether each service is to be de-delegated or not. The services currently de-delegated are as follows:

- Behaviour Intervention Service
- Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service
- Trade Union Local Representation Service
- Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools only)
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory & Regulatory Duties (health & safety, internal audit, statutory accounting, pensions administration)

6.3 Information about these services was included in a report to the Schools' Forum on 15th October 2018, agenda item 9. The amounts to be deducted from each school for 2019/20 will be different to those shown in the report, as they will be based on the October 2018 census data.

6.4 The final decision on each de-delegation will be made by the relevant Schools' Forum Members for each phase on 10th December 2018. Schools may wish to contact their Schools' Forum representative direct to express their view, or respond as part of this consultation.

6. If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why.

7. Timetable

7.1 The timetable for determining the school formula and schools budgets for 2019/20 is as follows:

Schools' Forum to review the 2019/20 school formula arrangements and agree on a proposal.	15 th October 2018
Briefing document to schools – with opportunity given to make comments on the proposals.	18 th October 2018
Heads Funding Group to consider the responses from schools and make a recommendation to Schools' Forum.	28 th November 2018
Schools' Forum to agree on the formula and preferred funding rates to recommend to the Council. Vote taken on de-delegations and the criteria agreed for accessing the additional funds.	18 th December 2018
October census data issued by the DfE and final DSG funding allocation for schools and high needs blocks received. Final school formula rates determined according to funding available.	Mid December
Formal Political approval received.	Executive 18 th January 2019
2018/19 formula submitted to Education & Skills Funding Agency.	17 th January 2019
Schools' Forum to consider the overall DSG position and remaining budgets for all funding blocks.	21 st January 2019
Confirmation of final budget allocations to maintained primary & secondary schools	By end of January 2019
Schools' Forum to decide on the final budget for all DSG funding blocks	11 th March 2019

Annexes

Annex A – School funding Formula – changes by factor

Annex B – School funding Formula – proposals – Options 1 and 2

Annex C – Summary Consultation Responses

Annex D – Individual Consultation Responses

This page is intentionally left blank

2019/20 National Formula Funding Rates

Change by Formula Factor

Cost Centre	SCHOOL	Pupil No's (Oct 2017)	Basic Entitlement			Deprivation			Prior Attainment			English as an Additional Language			SUB TOTAL - PUPIL LED FUNDING			Lump Sum			Sparsity			Rates Funded at Cost	SUB TOTAL - CHANGE BEFORE MFG & CAP		
			2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding		2018/19 Budget	2019/20 NFF	Change In Funding
91000	Aldermaston Church of England Primary School	158	448,878	448,878	0	22,415	22,415	0	39,219	38,165	-1,054	1,788	1,788	0	512,300	511,246	-1,054	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	26,093	652,140	651,086	-1,054
91100	Basildon Church of England Primary School	142	403,422	403,422	0	8,476	8,476	0	48,956	47,640	-1,316	0	0	0	460,854	459,538	-1,316	113,747	113,747	0	1,346	2,692	1,346	14,555	590,501	590,531	30
91300	Beedon Church of England Controlled Primary School	49	139,209	139,209	0	3,179	3,179	0	16,401	15,960	-441	1,907	1,907	0	160,696	160,256	-441	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	2,656	277,099	276,658	-441
91400	Beenham Primary School	73	207,393	207,393	0	11,699	11,699	0	18,581	18,081	-499	607	607	0	238,280	237,781	-499	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	13,068	365,095	364,596	-499
91200	Birch Copse Primary School	422	1,198,902	1,243,029	44,127	24,294	24,294	0	92,843	90,348	-2,495	5,582	5,582	0	1,321,621	1,363,253	41,632	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	24,200	1,459,568	1,501,200	41,632
91500	Bradfield Church of England Primary School	145	411,945	411,945	0	17,206	17,206	0	42,041	40,911	-1,130	0	0	0	471,192	470,062	-1,130	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	2,230	587,169	586,039	-1,130
91600	Brightwalton Church of England Aided Primary School	94	267,054	267,054	0	6,492	6,492	0	24,293	23,640	-653	617	617	0	298,456	297,803	-653	113,747	113,747	0	9,630	19,260	9,630	2,063	423,895	432,872	8,977
91700	Brimpton Church of England Primary School	56	159,096	159,096	0	5,529	5,529	0	16,471	16,028	-443	0	0	0	181,096	180,653	-443	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	3,238	298,081	297,638	-443
91800	Bucklebury Church of England Primary School	120	340,920	340,920	0	3,526	3,526	0	37,313	36,310	-1,003	0	0	0	381,759	380,756	-1,003	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	12,946	508,452	507,449	-1,003
91900	Burghfield St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	211	599,451	599,451	0	12,545	12,545	0	43,648	42,475	-1,173	1,240	1,240	0	656,885	655,711	-1,173	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	15,004	785,636	784,462	-1,173
92000	Calcot Infant School & Nursery	219	622,179	622,179	0	46,805	46,805	0	41,225	40,117	-1,108	12,184	12,184	0	722,393	721,285	-1,108	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	20,328	856,468	855,360	-1,108
92100	Calcot Junior School	288	818,208	818,208	0	93,662	93,662	0	130,059	126,563	-3,496	6,384	6,384	0	1,048,313	1,044,818	-3,496	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	28,329	1,190,389	1,186,894	-3,496
95600	Chaddleworth St. Andrew's Church of England Primary School	25	71,025	71,025	0	8,210	8,210	0	14,118	13,739	-379	0	0	0	93,353	92,974	-379	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	3,001	210,101	209,722	-379
92400	Chieveley Primary School	206	585,246	585,246	0	3,440	3,440	0	40,402	39,316	-1,086	2,449	2,449	0	631,537	630,451	-1,086	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	29,075	774,359	773,273	-1,086
95900	Cold Ash St. Mark's Church of England Primary School	150	539,790	539,790	0	6,524	6,524	0	34,467	33,541	-926	1,794	1,794	0	582,576	581,649	-926	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	16,335	712,658	711,731	-926
92200	Compton Church of England Primary School	185	525,585	525,585	0	14,226	14,226	0	51,348	49,968	-1,380	623	623	0	591,781	590,401	-1,380	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	11,683	717,212	715,831	-1,380
92300	Curridge Primary School	101	286,941	286,941	0	4,936	4,936	0	16,453	16,011	-442	1,874	1,874	0	310,205	309,762	-442	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	7,246	431,197	430,755	-442
92500	Downsway Primary School	215	610,815	610,815	0	12,553	12,553	0	66,694	64,901	-1,793	3,091	3,091	0	693,153	691,361	-1,793	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	23,232	830,132	828,340	-1,793
92800	Enborne Church of England Primary School	103	173,301	173,301	0	3,439	3,439	0	26,834	26,113	-721	0	0	0	203,574	202,853	-721	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	7,651	318,086	317,365	-721
92900	Englefield Church of England Primary School	102	289,782	289,782	0	6,258	6,258	0	19,763	19,231	-531	610	610	0	316,412	315,881	-531	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	2,173	432,332	431,801	-531
93000	Falkland Primary School	453	1,286,973	1,332,163	45,190	22,146	22,146	0	115,647	112,539	-3,108	4,906	4,906	0	1,429,672	1,471,753	42,081	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	22,698	1,566,117	1,608,198	42,081
93100	Fir Tree Primary School & Nursery	197	559,677	559,677	0	67,520	67,520	0	59,547	57,946	-1,601	14,434	14,434	0	701,178	699,577	-1,601	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	3,840	818,765	817,164	-1,601
93200	Francis Baily Primary School	550	1,562,550	1,595,438	32,888	55,021	55,021	0	156,846	152,631	-4,215	8,163	8,163	0	1,782,580	1,811,253	28,673	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	38,269	1,934,596	1,963,269	28,673
93400	Garland Junior School	216	613,656	613,656	0	54,857	54,857	0	64,163	62,438	-1,725	4,256	4,256	0	736,932	735,207	-1,725	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	18,408	869,087	867,362	-1,725
93500	Hampstead Norreys Church of England Primary School	85	241,485	241,485	0	2,813	2,813	0	22,811	22,198	-613	0	0	0	267,109	266,496	-613	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	12,705	393,561	392,948	-613
93600	Hermitage Primary School	195	553,995	553,995	0	9,392	9,392	0	59,639	58,036	-1,603	3,727	3,727	0	626,753	625,150	-1,603	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	21,175	761,675	760,072	-1,603
93700	Hungerford Primary School	384	1,090,944	1,090,944	0	63,402	63,402	0	112,651	109,624	-3,027	8,072	8,072	0	1,275,070	1,272,042	-3,028	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	40,754	1,429,571	1,426,543	-3,028
92700	The Ilsleys Primary School	69	196,029	196,029	0	1,760	1,760	0	13,905	13,531	-374	0	0	0	211,694	211,320	-374	113,747	113,747	0	13,944	25,852	11,908	3,922	343,307	354,841	11,534
93800	Inkepen Primary School	79	224,439	224,439	0	3,890	3,890	0	23,424	22,795	-629	637	637	0	252,390	251,761	-629	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	3,310	369,447	368,818	-629
93900	John Rankin Infant & Nursery School	258	732,978	732,978	0	19,970	19,970	0	65,927	64,155	-1,772	17,556	17,556	0	836,430	834,658	-1,772	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	18,697	968,875	967,103	-1,772
94000	John Rankin Junior School	313	889,233	889,233	0	27,393	27,393	0	108,545	105,628	-2,917	9,102	9,102	0	1,034,273	1,031,356	-2,917	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	23,796	1,171,817	1,168,899	-2,917
94100	Kennet Valley Primary School	202	573,882	573,882	0	46,088	46,088	0	84,600	82,327	-2,273	7,454	7,454	0	712,025	709,751	-2,274	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	17,945	843,716	841,442	-2,274
94200	Kintbury St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	162	460,242	460,242	0	15,760	15,760	0	42,179	41,046	-1,134	629	629	0	518,810	517,677	-1,134	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	17,787	650,344	649,211	-1,134
94300	Lambourn Church of England Primary School	184	522,744	522,744	0	50,374	50,374	0	78,486	76,377	-2,109	8,054	8,054	0	659,658	657,549	-2,109	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	31,560	804,965	802,855	-2,109
94400	Long Lane Primary School	209	593,769	593,769	0	16,315	16,315	0	56,181	54,671	-1,510	3,089	3,089	0	669,353	667,843	-1,510	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	19,754	802,855	801,345	-1,510
95800	Mortimer St. Johns Church of England Infant School	174	494,334	494,334	0	11,971	11,971	0	55,115	53,633	-1,481	1,530	1,530	0	562,950	561,468	-1,481	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	12,676	689,372	687,891	-1,481
97500	Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England Junior School	176	613,656	613,656	0	17,054	17,054	0	61,206	59,561	-1,645	534	534	0	692,451	690,806	-1,645	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	3,734	809,931	808,286	-1,645
94500	Mrs. Bland's Infant & Nursery School	211	485,811	485,811	0	39,872	39,872	0	45,612	44,386	-1,226	7,120	7,120	0	578,415	577,189	-1,226	113,747	113,747	0	0	0	0	21,780	713,942	712,716	-1,226
94600	Pang																										

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary Consultation Responses

Annex C

Consultation Questions	Little Heath	The Downs	Denefield	Francis Baily	Kennet Academies Trust	The Winchcombe School	Agree	Not agree
1 Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.	Yes agreed	No not agreed	No not agreed	Yes agreed	No not agreed	Yes agreed	3	3
2 Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?	No not agreed	Yes agreed	Yes agreed	No not agreed	Yes agreed	No not agreed	3	3
3 Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?	Yes agreed	Yes	Yes agreed	Yes	Apply 3% gains cap first and then flex the MFG	Yes	5	1
4 Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.	Yes agreed	Yes	No, adjustment to the MFG first	Yes	Flex MFG first and then scale the factors.	Yes	4	2
5 Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.	No, not agreed. See full response	No, not agreed. See full response	at all options to reduce HM costs particularly icollege and only as a one off adjustment	No, not agreed. See full response	No not agreed, see full response	Yes agreed	2	4
6 If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.	N/A	N/A	Minimise costs first before applying the maximum	N/A	N/A	Yes		
7 If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school’s funding as a proportion to total funding or the school’s pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.	N/A	N/A	Unsure without seeing final figures	N/A	N/A	Apply in proportion to funding		
8 If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.	No comment	No comment	no response	No comment	No comment	No response		
9 If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why	No comment	Agree in principle, but contingent on getting a satisfactory agreement of H&S cost and arrangement	no response	Yes but request greater clarity on costs.	No comment	Generally yes - but H&S should be an option to buy in		

This page is intentionally left blank

Primary and Secondary Schools Funding Proposed Funding Arrangements for 2019/20

Denefield School – Response to Consultation

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.
2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?

Option 2 – this will help ensure that gains are delivered more quickly to the most underfunded schools.

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?

Agreed – see above

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

Adjustment to the MFG within the allowable range should be the main vehicle for dealing with affordability, and only then scaling the formula factors in the way you have suggested. Formula factor rates need to be as closely aligned to the NFF rates in readiness for when the NFF becomes a hard formula.

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.

Agreed – we recognise the need to support high needs students through a SB top slice for 19/20 in favour of the HNB. We understand the need to reduce the HNB deficit and that permanent exclusions put additional pressure on the HNB.

Nevertheless, WBC should not rely solely on SB funding to address the deficit, but do everything they can to make reasonable savings themselves. WBC should look at ways of reducing iCollege costs and ensure that preventative measures are in place for our most vulnerable students. It would have been helpful to have

more detail on how the £490k top-slice will be used. You are asking schools to give up a significant amount of funding without fully explaining the rationale.

For Denefield, the top-slice would mean a reduction of between £20k and £23k. This is a significant amount, but it is also just over the cost of a full time student placed for one year at iCollege and should be seen in this context.

In agreeing to the top-slice, we would not want to see it become a permanent funding reduction in future years without further consultation.

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.

Every attempt should be made to minimise the cost to schools before applying the maximum top-slice allowable.

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.

Unsure without seeing final figures.

Primary and Secondary Schools Funding Proposed Funding Arrangements for 2019/20

Briefing & Consultation Document for Schools October 2018

RESPONSE FROM FRANCIS BAILY PRIMARY SCHOOL

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.
2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?

FBPS: We believe the first option should be applied, namely MFG of 0% and gains capped at 2%. This provides the most “stability” for all schools overall.

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?

FBPS: Yes

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

FBPS: Yes

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.

FBPS: No. We believe that insufficient detail is being given to schools to make an important decision about whether to deviate from the NFF. Historically substantial sums of money have transferred from Schools Block to HNB and this has failed to address its ability to live within its means. In fact, it may well

have discouraged the HNB from making the very difficult decisions that Schools Block has had to make in order to remain financially sustainable.

Whilst it is recognised that some of the fund proposed to be transferred will be spent on “invest to save” projects, no detail has been provided to the consultation on this so a decision cannot be considered in a fully informed manner.

In addition, there are concerns around the historical variation between forecasts made for the HNB and out-turns. Even mid-year forecasts have been unreliable and there does not appear to be sufficient accountability for this degree of variation.

Before further requests are made for funding from the MSB these issues need to be addressed.

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.

FBPS: N/A – we do not agree with the proposal

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school’s funding as a proportion to total funding or the school’s pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.

FBPS: If it comes to pass that the funding is top-sliced we believe this should be done on a proportion of funding rather than on a per pupil basis.

8. If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.

FBPS: Nothing to add

9. If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why.

FBPS: Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools only) should be de-delegated at ZERO this year (as agreed at Schools Forum).

NB: As part of the consultation we believe that greater clarity should have been provided to schools as to how these de-delegation figures had been arrived at. As they are mandatory, we feel that they should meet a higher threshold of transparency as to why they are set at those levels than optional buy-backs.

Feedback provided by:

Mr Patrick Mitchell, School Business Manager
Mr Neil Pilsworth, Headteacher

Little Heath School

Little Heath Road Tilehurst Reading Berkshire RG31 5TY
Telephone 0118 942 7337
www.LittleHeath.org.uk
office@littleheath.org.uk



Headteacher
D J Ramsden, BA, NPQH

9 November 2018

Ms W Howells
Schools' Finance Manager
West Berkshire Council

Dear Wendy,

Response to Funding Consultation

Please find below our responses to the questions posed in the consultation document.

Q1) Do you agree that WBC should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2%? If not, please let us know your reasons why. **YES, AGREED**

Q2) Or do you agree that WBC should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3%? **NO, NOT AGREED**

Q3) Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability? If not please let us know the reasons why. **YES, AGREED**

Q4) Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know your reasons why. **YES, AGREED**

Q5) Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not, please let us know the reasons why. **NO, NOT AGREED**
Schools are having to make difficult decisions in order to reduce costs, and have been doing so for some time. The same level of rigour needs to apply to High Needs and possible areas of saving which have been previously identified need to be pursued and acted upon, rather than invoking a top slice



on schools. No specific justification has been provided in the consultation document as to why a top slice is essential. Proposing a top slice just because it is allowed under the 'rules' is not the same as providing a clearly thought out and justifiable rationale for doing so. The 'needs of the many' should not be further impacted by prioritising the 'needs of the few' via a top slice, without proper justification.

Q6) If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490K, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why. **N/A**

Q7) If your answer to questions 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a propotion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why. **N/A**

Additional Funding Outside the School Formula

Q1) If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details. **NO COMMENT**

Q2) If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know your reasons why. **NO COMMENT**

Yours sincerely



David Ramsden
Headteacher



Rachel Hearn-Phillips
School Business Manager

Primary and Secondary Schools Funding Proposed Funding Arrangements for 2019/20

Consultation Response – Kennet School Academies Trust

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?

KSAT supports Option 2.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728273/National_funding_formula_policy_document_-_2019_to_2020_-_BRANDED.pdf

The DfE policy document downloadable from the link above states that the DfE are updating in three key areas of the NFF in 2019-20, in line with the approach and commitments set out last year.

These three updates “will ensure that the formula continues to deliver rapid gains for the most underfunded while ensuring that all schools will have attracted some gains by 2019-20, compared to 2017-18”. The three updates are:

- **The minimum per pupil funding levels** – the minimum per pupil funding level for secondary schools will increase to £4,800 and the minimum per pupil funding level for primary schools will increase to £3,500.
- **The funding floor** – the funding floor will increase to ensure that all schools will attract at least a 1% gain per pupil against their 2017-18 baselines.
- **The gains cap** – the gains cap will increase to 6.09% per pupil against 2017-18 baselines. We have used a compounded figure so that underfunded schools can gain a further 3% on top of the 3% they gained in 2018-19.

The 2018-19 WB formula had a gains cap of 3% and a MFG of 0.1%.

The DfE policy position gives a very clear steer that the gains cap should be set at 3% again in 2019-20 ie: for previously underfunded schools to see rapid gains.

The DfE in this document are largely silent on the matter of MFG other than to note that 62 LAs have set it at 0.5% and 112 are using it but focus instead on the funding floor in terms of individual school protection.

A WB formula that sets the gains cap at 2% means that previously underfunded schools in West Berkshire absolutely cannot gain a further 3% on top of the 3% that they gained in 2018-19 and that would seem to be absolutely not in line with the DfE policy publication for NFF 2019-20.

The NFF MFG range is -1.5% to 0.5% and so support this being the variable that flexes after a 3% gains cap has been applied and to flex responsively in response to affordability.

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?

See above. MFG should flex according to affordability, the 3% gains cap having already been applied.

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

See above, MFG should flex with affordability within its NFF range.

Should affordability not be able to be dealt with by that NFF range then yes support the scaling of all factors.

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.

KSAT believe that strong rationale is required to depart from the formulae and funding blocks as defined by the NFF and that no adequate case has been presented in this consultation to enable KSAT to support this top slice.

This consultation has not provided strong rationale for the transfer, any detail or assurances on what the £490k of transferred funding is to be applied to.

Schools Block funded a significant top slice amounting to £848k from schools in 2016-17. The extracts below detail the sum and source

RESOLVED that:

- The centrally retained school budget be agreed as set out in Table 2 of this report.
- The school formula funding rates for 2016/17 be agreed as set out in options (a) and (f) in paragraph 6.5 and Appendix C of this report be agreed, as per the recommendation of the Heads Funding Group.

Extracts from Para 6.5

a) no increase to funding rates – all headroom (£607k) transferred to the high needs block.

f) reduce the lump sum by £5,000 and allocate the resultant headroom (£848k) to the high needs block.

This transfer made in 2016/17 affected 2017-18 and resulted in a permanent gain to the High Needs Block and a permanent reduction in School's Block.

Reverend Mark Bennet asked whether the transfer of funding in 2016/17 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block had led to a reduction in the per pupil funding rate received. Claire White advised that was correct, however the impact was a decrease of approximately £400k in the schools block but an increase in approximately £1m funding to the High Needs Block therefore overall West Berkshire had gained funding by this transfer.

2017-18 funding then formed the baselines for NFF when introduced in 2018-19. The High Needs Block was also subject to NFF funding protection of a minimum of +0.5% over its baseline.

Schools collectively are severely challenged and under significant funding pressures. Schools have had and continue to have to make increasingly difficult decisions. In 2016-17 the £848k which was transferred would have enabled schools to them to delay or not make at all some of those difficult decisions. Schools have since 2016/17 had to continue to deal with the impact of that transfer as well as the on-going pressure of public sector austerity.

High Needs has, both before 2016-17 and since been faced with difficult decisions and has not always made them. It has, though, taken some too and some of these decisions have invariably added further pressure on schools. The High Needs block continues to fund non-statutory services and has added new cost pressures that are non-statutory too.

The DfE publication on NFF for 2019-20, link below, has the following extract:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728273/National_funding_formula_policy_document_-_2019_to_2020_-_BRANDED.pdf

“We will continue to give local authorities some flexibility to transfer funding to other areas, particularly high needs, where there is a strong local rationale for doing so. These transfers will continue to be limited to 0.5% of local authorities' total schools block and will require the agreement of the schools forum and consultation with all local schools.”

This consultation has the following extract and it does not necessarily follow from the above DfE policy document. "If there is a significant shortfall in High Needs funding, up to 0.5% could be transferred from the Schools Block allocation."

The consultation in this question seeks agreement to a top slice to support High Needs and has not provided any let alone strong rationale given that:

1. Significant funding through a transfer from schools block has already taken place and was transferred in 2016-17.
2. Not all proposals to balance the High Needs Block since that transfer was effected have been taken to assure sustainability of the High Need Block.
3. There is no detail on what the £490k is going to be used for. It is the funding for a 1 FE primary school that schools are collectively been asked to transfer and it has not been made clear whether the monies are needed to fund statutory provision or non-statutory provision in 2019-20, or whether it will be to clear all of an accumulated deficit on the high needs block or just part of a deficit, or whether it is to fund an in year deficit.
4. High Needs sustainability has been an on-going concern of the Trust for many years. Top-slicing schools does not of itself provide the answer, particularly as only as recently as School Forum on 30 October 2017 a surplus of £131k was predicted for 2018/19 (from a predicted deficit of £76k reported in March 2017). See the table below.

7.7 The High Needs Block was in deficit at the end of 2016/17. In setting the 2017/18 budget it was agreed to repay the deficit over a three year period. Assuming there are no significant increases to the overall cost base, the impact of the new funding will be as follows:

	2018/19 budget assumed in March 2017	2018/19 budget taking into account the funding changes
2018/19 estimated DSG	£20,060,000	£19,635,300
Less expected overspend in 2017/18	-£583,980	-£486,870
Less 2018/19 budget (taking into account adjustment for resource unit budget)	-£19,551,920	-£19,017,240
Deficit/Surplus	£75,900 deficit	£131,190 surplus

However, by School Forum on 11 December 2017 High Needs had moved to become a deficit of £671k in 2018/19.

5. A top slice fills a funding gap but does not improve or grow high needs provision and limits schools' provision too.

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.

1. Additional Funding Outside the School Formula

1.1 The current funding regulations allow for a few exceptional circumstances to be funded outside the formula and be top sliced from the DSG. For each fund the Schools' Forum need to agree the amount to set aside and clear criteria setting out the circumstances in which a payment could be made and the basis for calculating the sum to be paid. The current criteria for each fund is the subject of a separate report at this meeting.

1.2 The funds are as follows:

- Growth Fund – support for schools required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority – including the cost of new schools opening.
- Schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils which cannot be reflected adequately in their formula funding. This needs to be made through a formula.

1.3 Funding for the growth fund used to be top sliced from the Schools Block DSG. From 2019/20 this is to be calculated on a formulaic basis which will be based on the October 2018 pupil census. The allocation of the Schools Block formula does not now take the Growth fund into account.

1.4 Any unspent growth funding may be carried forward to the following funding period, as with any other centrally retained budget, and Local Authorities can choose to use it specifically for growth. No changes are proposed

1.5 No changes are proposed to the criteria for the Growth Fund and for the schools with disproportionate number of high needs pupils.

5. If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.

NO COMMENTS

2. De-delegations 2019/20 (maintained schools only)

2.1 From 2013/14 schools received funding for newly delegated central services. For some services (where offered by the Local Authority), maintained Primary

and Secondary schools can collectively opt for the service to be de-delegated – which means that the funding is deducted from the formula allocation and continues to be centrally retained for the benefit of all maintained Primary and Secondary schools, and individual schools cannot make that choice for themselves (Academies may be given the option to buy into the service, as can Nursery schools, Special schools and PRUs). From 2017/18, statutory services previously funded by the Education Services Grant were also added, and the de-delegation for these services relate to all maintained schools. The de-delegations need to be re-determined on an annual basis.

2.2 The relevant Schools' Forum representatives for each phase will vote on whether each service is to be de-delegated or not. The services currently de-delegated are as follows:

- Behaviour Intervention Service
- Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service
- Trade Union Local Representation Service
- Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools only)
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory & Regulatory Duties (health & safety, internal audit, statutory accounting, pensions administration)

2.3 Information about these services was included in a report to the Schools' Forum on 15th October 2018, agenda item 9. The amounts to be deducted from each school for 2019/20 will be different to those shown in the report, as they will be based on the October 2018 census data.

2.4 The final decision on each de-delegation will be made by the relevant Schools' Forum Members for each phase on 10th December 2018. Schools may wish to contact their Schools' Forum representative direct to express their view, or respond as part of this consultation.

6. If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why.

NO COMMENTS

3. Timetable

3.1 The timetable for determining the school formula and schools budgets for 2019/20 is as follows:

Schools' Forum to review the 2019/20 school formula arrangements and agree on a proposal.	15 th October 2018
Briefing document to schools – with opportunity given to make comments on the proposals.	18 th October 2018
Heads Funding Group to consider the responses from schools and make a recommendation to Schools' Forum.	28 th November 2018

Schools' Forum to agree on the formula and preferred funding rates to recommend to the Council. Vote taken on de-delegations and the criteria agreed for accessing the additional funds.	18 th December 2018
October census data issued by the DfE and final DSG funding allocation for schools and high needs blocks received. Final school formula rates determined according to funding available.	Mid December
Formal Political approval received.	Executive 18 th January 2019
2018/19 formula submitted to Education & Skills Funding Agency.	17 th January 2019
Schools' Forum to consider the overall DSG position and remaining budgets for all funding blocks.	21 st January 2019
Confirmation of final budget allocations to maintained primary & secondary schools	By end of January 2019
Schools' Forum to decide on the final budget for all DSG funding blocks	11 th March 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation response from The Downs

Dear Wendy, thanks for the chat this morning.

Please see our responses below (myself and the head teacher)

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.
2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)?

Yes, absolutely agree that the NF rates should be applied for every factor, and we think #2 (-0.5% and +3%) because then fewer schools lose out.

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why?

Yes

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

Yes

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why.

No. Schools must be able to decide how to support their own students, so the full amount of funding that ought to be given to them must be handed over. It is then for schools to choose what support to put in place and this could mean they buy back services from High Needs, of course.

When the transition to the NFF is complete there will be no option to top-slice schools' funding in this way, so this adjustment will have to happen sooner or later.

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set i.e. £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why.

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why.

I have also had a chance this morning to meet with our chair of Finance, Craig Norford, and he is in agreement with the head and myself. I have copied Craig above.

1. If you have any comments/suggestions on this proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.

No comment

2. If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why.

In principal we agree with the de-delegation for Statutory and Regulatory Duties, but the increase in the H&S amount is very concerning. We would therefore say our agreement to continue with the de-delegations is contingent on having a satisfactory arrangement and de-delegation amount for H&S.

Many thanks,

Lisa Hill

Mrs L Hill
School Business Manager



THE DOWNS SCHOOL

The Downs School, Compton, Newbury, Berkshire. RG20 6AD
T 01635 270001 E lhill@thedownsschool.org W thedownsschool.org

Comments on School Funding Formula:

1. Do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of 0% and funding cap on gains of 2% (as shown in Annex C)? If not, please let us know with your reasons why. **Yes: Fewer schools lose; this seems to be the better option**

2. Or do you agree that West Berkshire should apply the national funding formula rates for every factor, applying a minimum funding guarantee of -0.5% and funding cap on gains of 3% (as shown in Annex D)? **No – see above**

3. Do you agree that if there is additional funding available the minimum funding guarantee should be set between 0% and 0.5% with the increase in the cap on gains at 3% according to affordability. If not please let us know the reasons why? **Yes**

4. Do you agree that any shortfall or surplus in funding is addressed by scaling all formula factors downwards or upwards? If not, please let us know with your reasons why. **Yes**

5. Do you agree that a top slice should be applied to all schools to support the High Needs Block? If not please let us know the reasons why. **Yes**

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you agree with the amount as set ie £490k, which is the maximum allowable percentage without application to the Secretary of State? Or do you think the amount should be higher or lower – please let us know your reasons why. **Yes**

7. If your answer to question 5 is yes – do you think the funding allocated per school should be in proportion to the school's funding as a proportion to total funding or the school's pupil numbers as a proportion to total pupil numbers? Please let us know the reasons why. **Funding – fairer across the board**

5. If you do not agree with any of the above services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why. **Generally agree but schools should have the option to buy- in to Health & Safety as per previous years.**

This page is intentionally left blank

De-delegation Proposals 2019/20

Report being considered by:	Schools Forum		
On:	10/12/2018		
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 That representatives of maintained primary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2019/20 financial year for:

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support
- Trade Union Representation
- Schools in Financial Difficulty
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools, Option 1 or Option 2
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff
 - Health and Safety (level 1 support)

- 2.2 That representatives of maintained secondary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2019/20 financial year for:

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support
- Trade Union Representation
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools, Option 1 or Option 2
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff
 - Health and Safety (level 1 support)

- 2.3 That representatives of maintained special, nursery and PRU heads should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2019/20 financial year for:

- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools, Option 1 or Option 2
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff

- Health and Safety (level 1 support)

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. Summary of Proposals

3.1 Table 1 summarises the services and budgets which are proposed to be de-delegated in 2019/20;

TABLE 1	2019/20 Primary Budget £	Agreed by HFG	2019/20 Secondary Budget £	Agreed by HFG	2019/20 Early Years & High Needs Budgets £	Agreed by HFG
Behaviour Integration	180,808	Yes	54,481	Yes	n/a	n/a
Ethnic Minority Support	206,079	Yes	38,968	Yes	n/a	n/a
Trade Union Representation	41,753	Yes	12,581	To be confirmed	n/a	n/a
Schools in Financial Difficulty	120,000	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CLEAPSS	2,034	Yes	1,288	Yes	n/a	n/a
Statutory and Regulatory Duties						
Statutory Accountancy Functions – Option 1	35,924	No	10,825	No	1,967	No
Statutory Accountancy Functions – Option 2	29,922	No	8,112	No	1,474	No
Internal Audit of Schools	34,035	Yes	10,256	Yes	1,863	Yes
Pension Scheme Administration	26,509	Yes	7,988	Yes	1,451	Yes
Health and Safety Option 1	102,178	No	30,788	No	5,594	No
Health and Safety Option 2	47,903	Yes	14,434	Yes	2,622	Yes

4. Background

4.1 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)

- 4.2 The schools funding regulations for 2018/19 confirm that similar arrangements apply for de-delegation 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.
- 4.3 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.
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 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).
- 4.6 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.
- 4.7 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.
- 4.8 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.

5. Behaviour Intervention Service

- 5.1 The Behaviour Intervention Service proposal for 2019/20 is set out in Appendix B.
- 5.2 Table 2 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.

TABLE 2	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
Total		£217,630		£235,290

6. Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service

- 6.1 The detail of the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) is set out in Appendix C.
- 6.2 Table 3 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.

TABLE 3	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
		£173,477		£245,047

7. Trade Union Representation

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

Table 4 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.

TABLE 4	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
		£48,442		£54,334

8. Schools in Financial Difficulty

- 8.1 It is proposed that if schools decide to de-delegate funding to provide a fund for schools in financial difficulty, the funding available will be the budget set as shown in table 5 below. Currently only primary schools de-delegate.
- 8.2 The proposal shown in Table 5 assumes continuing with an annual fund of £120,000 and no more funds will contribute to this fund in 2019/20. It will be reviewed again when setting the budget for 2020/21.

TABLE 5	2018/19		2019/20	
	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	£9.64	£120,000		£120,000
Maintained Secondary Schools				
		£120,000		£120,000

- 8.3 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, Schools' Forum will also be required to agree the criteria for primary schools to access this fund.

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

- 9.1 The detail of the service provided by this subscription is set out in Appendix E.
- 9.2 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 6 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.

TABLE 6	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
			£2,990			£3,322

10. Statutory and Regulatory Duties

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 The Accountancy function undertakes statutory duties on behalf of schools. The team has been restructured over the past few months. Option 1 is the new structure that enables each accountant to better support their schools. The charge is for the percentage of staff time spent and in total amounts to 0.91FTE. We have increased our resource in order to provide a more robust service for schools in light of changes to funding and the impact on schools budgets. There has been an increase in the number of schools in deficit and vulnerable schools at risk of deficit. There is now a dedicated resource working with schools in deficit and supporting all schools with financial concerns. Previously these schools were supported by different accountants within the team.
- 10.3 Option 2 is the same arrangement as for 2018/19.
- 10.4 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.
- 10.5 Table 7 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.

10.6

TABLE 7	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 Other*
Accountancy – Option 1			£2.83	£48,715	£35,924	£10,825	£1,967
Accountancy – Option 2	£2.09	£33,793	£2.12	£36,508	£26,922	£8,112	£1,474
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			£8.04	£138,560	£102,178	£30,788	£5,594
Health and Safety Option 2	£3.52	£56,962	£3.77	£64,959	£47,903	£14,434	£2,622

NOTE:

2018/19 Health and Safety Option 1 proposal was £10.34 per pupil to include Level 1 & 2 support

* - Estimated Other refers to Nursery, Special Schools and PRU's

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

Appendix A

Indicative De-Delegations for 2019/20 - Based on October 2017 Census Data

		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	£35,924	£34,035	£26,509	£102,178	£47,903	£198,646	£144,371		
Proposed Secondary Delegation		£54,481	£38,968	£12,581	£0	£1,288	£10,825	£10,256	£7,988	£30,788	£14,434	£59,856	£43,502		
Total Proposed Delegation		£235,290	£245,047	£54,334	£120,000	£3,322	£46,748	£44,291	£34,497	£132,966	£62,337	£258,503	£187,873		
Estimated income from other maintained schools		£0	£187	£2,286	£0	£76	£1,967	£1,863	£1,451	£5,594	£2,622	£10,874	£7,903		
Total Cost of Service		£235,290	£245,234	£56,620	£120,000	£3,399	£48,715	£46,154	£35,948	£138,560	£64,959	£269,377	£195,776		
Indicative cost per primary pupil		£14.22	£187.34	£3.28	£9.44	£0.16	£2.83	£2.68	£2.09	£8.04	£3.77	£15.62	£11.36		
Indicative cost per secondary pupil		£14.22	£187.34	£3.28	n/a	£0.16	£2.83	£2.68	£2.09	£8.04	£3.77	£15.62	£11.36		
Indicative cost per other maintained school pupil		n/a	£187.34	£3.28	n/a	£0.16	£2.83	£2.68	£2.09	£8.04	£3.77	£15.62	£11.36		
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	£AL No's	Indicative Delegation for each Service by School											
91000	Abermaston Church of England Primary School	158	8.0	2,247	1,499	519	1,491	25	446	423	329	1,270	595	2,469	1,794
91100	Basildon Church of England Primary School	142	0.0	2,019	0	466	1,340	23	401	380	286	1,141	555	2,219	1,612
91300	Beason Church of England Controlled Primary School	49	5.0	897	937	161	452	8	138	131	102	394	185	766	556
91400	Beenhelm Primary School	73	3.0	1,038	562	240	689	12	206	195	152	587	275	1,141	829
91420	Birch Copse Primary School	422	14.0	6,001	2,623	1,386	3,983	66	1,192	1,130	880	3,391	1,590	6,593	4,792
91500	Bradfield Church of England Primary School	145	1.0	2,062	187	476	1,369	23	410	388	302	1,165	546	2,286	1,647
91600	Brightwaton Church of England Aided Primary School	94	3.0	1,337	562	309	887	15	266	252	196	755	354	1,469	1,087
91700	Brimpton Church of England Primary School	56	0.0	796	0	184	529	9	158	150	117	450	211	875	636
91800	Bucklebury Church of England Primary School	120	0.0	1,707	0	394	1,133	19	339	321	250	964	452	1,875	1,363
91900	Burghfield St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	211	5.0	3,001	937	693	1,992	34	596	565	440	1,696	795	3,297	2,396
92000	Calcot Infant School & Nursery	255	33.0	3,626	6,182	837	2,407	41	721	683	532	2,049	961	3,984	2,896
92100	Calcot Junior School	288	33.0	4,096	6,182	946	2,718	46	814	771	600	2,315	1,085	4,500	3,270
92600	Chaddeshorth St. Andrew's Church of England Primary School	25	0.0	356	0	82	236	4	71	67	52	201	94	391	284
92400	Cheveley Primary School	206	6.0	2,930	1,124	677	1,944	33	582	551	430	1,656	776	3,219	2,339
92500	Cold Ash St. Mark's Church of England Primary School	190	4.0	2,702	749	624	1,793	30	537	509	396	1,527	716	2,969	2,157
92200	Compton Church of England Primary School	185	3.0	2,631	562	608	1,746	30	523	495	386	1,487	697	2,890	2,101
92300	Curridge Primary School	101	4.0	1,436	749	332	953	16	285	270	211	812	381	1,578	1,147
92500	Dawnsay Primary School	215	12.0	3,058	2,248	706	2,029	34	607	576	448	1,728	810	3,359	2,441
92800	Emborne Church of England Primary School	61	0.0	867	0	200	576	10	172	163	127	490	230	953	693
92900	Englefield Church of England Primary School	102	2.0	1,451	375	335	963	16	288	273	213	820	384	1,594	1,158
93000	Falkland Primary School	453	19.0	6,442	3,560	1,488	4,276	72	1,280	1,213	945	3,641	1,707	7,078	5,144
93200	Francis Baly Primary School	550	31.0	7,822	5,808	1,806	5,191	88	1,554	1,472	1,147	4,420	2,072	8,593	6,245
93400	Garnlad Junior School	216	3.0	3,072	562	709	2,039	31	528	578	450	1,736	814	3,375	2,453
93500	Hampstead Naresy's Church of England Primary School	85	0.0	1,209	0	279	802	14	240	228	177	683	320	1,328	965
93600	Heminge Primary School	195	8.0	2,773	1,499	640	1,840	31	551	522	407	1,587	736	3,047	2,214
93700	Hungerford Primary School	384	21.0	5,461	3,934	1,261	3,624	61	1,085	1,028	801	3,086	1,447	6,000	4,360
92700	The Isleys' Primary School	69	0.0	981	0	227	651	11	195	185	144	555	260	1,078	784
93800	Islepen Primary School	79	1.0	1,123	187	259	746	13	223	211	165	635	298	1,224	897
93900	John Rankin Infant & Nursery School	310	46.0	4,409	8,818	1,018	2,926	50	876	830	646	2,491	1,188	4,844	3,520
94000	John Rankin Junior School	313	31.0	4,451	5,808	1,028	2,954	50	884	838	653	2,515	1,179	4,890	3,554
94100	Kennet Valley Primary School	202	32.0	2,873	5,995	663	1,907	32	571	541	421	1,623	761	3,156	2,294
94200	Knitbury St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	162	2.0	2,304	375	532	1,529	26	458	434	338	1,302	610	2,531	1,840
94400	Long Lane Primary School	209	11.0	2,972	2,061	686	1,973	33	591	559	436	1,680	787	3,265	2,373
95800	Mortimer St. Johns Church of England Infant School	174	4.0	2,474	749	571	1,642	28	492	466	363	1,398	656	2,719	1,976
97500	Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England Junior School	216	2.0	3,072	375	709	2,039	35	610	578	450	1,736	814	3,375	2,453
94500	Mrs. Bland's Infant & Nursery School	209	23.0	2,972	4,309	686	1,973	33	591	559	436	1,680	787	3,265	2,373
94600	Pangbourne Primary School	218	21.0	3,100	3,934	716	2,058	35	616	584	455	1,752	821	3,406	2,475
94700	Parsons Down n Infant School	198	13.0	2,816	2,435	650	1,869	32	559	530	413	1,591	746	3,094	2,248
94800	Parsons Down n Junior School	293	12.0	4,167	2,248	962	2,765	47	828	784	611	2,355	1,104	4,578	3,327
94900	Purley Church of England Infants School	118	16.0	1,678	2,998	388	1,114	19	333	316	246	948	445	1,844	1,340
95000	Robert Sandlings Primary School & Nursery	265	40.0	3,769	7,494	870	2,501	42	749	709	553	2,130	998	4,140	3,009
95100	Shaw-cum-Donnington Church of England Primary School	91	6.0	1,294	1,124	299	859	15	244	190	731	343	1,422	1,033	743
95200	Shefford Church of England Primary School	39	2.0	555	375	128	368	6	110	104	81	313	147	609	443
95400	Springfield Primary School	326	33.0	4,636	6,182	1,071	3,077	52	921	873	680	2,620	1,228	5,093	3,702
95500	Spurcott Primary School	481	40.0	6,840	7,494	1,580	4,540	77	1,359	1,288	1,003	3,966	1,812	7,515	5,462
95700	St. Finian's Catholic Primary School	187	22.0	2,659	4,122	614	1,765	30	528	501	390	1,503	705	2,922	2,123
97700	St. John the Evangelist Infant & Nursery School	197	31.0	2,802	5,808	647	1,859	32	577	527	411	1,583	742	3,078	2,237
97800	St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	202	92.0	2,873	17,236	663	1,907	32	571	541	421	1,623	784	3,156	2,294
96200	St. Nicolas Church of England Junior School	258	30.0	3,689	5,620	847	2,435	41	729	691	538	2,073	972	4,071	2,930
96100	St. Pauls Catholic Primary School	328	99.0	4,636	18,547	1,071	3,077	52	921	873	680	2,620	1,228	5,093	3,702
96300	Stockcross Church of England Primary School	101	1.0	1,436	187	332	953	16	285	270	211	812	381	1,578	1,147
96400	Streatham Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	102	3.0	1,451	562	335	963	16	288	273	213	820	394	1,594	1,158
96500	Sulhamstead and Ulton Noret Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	107	2.0	1,522	375	351	1,010	17	302	286	223	860	403	1,672	1,215
97000	Thatcham Park Church of England Primary School	409	3.0	5,816	562	1,343	3,860	65	1,156	1,095	853	3,287	1,541	6,390	4,644
96600	Theale Church of England Primary School	323	27.0	4,593	5,058	1,061	3,049	52	913	865	673	2,596	1,217	5,047	3,688
96700	Wellford and Wickham Church of England Primary School	95	0.0	1,351	0	312	897	15	268	254	198	763	358	1,484	1,079
96800	Westwood Farm Infant School	191	16.0	2,716	2,998	627	1,803	31	540	511	398	1,535	720	2,984	2,169
96900	Westwood Farm Junior School	230	24.0	3,271	4,496	755	2,171	37	650	616	480	1,848	867	3,594	2,612
98700	The Willow's Primary School	409	74.0	5,816	13,863	1,343	3,860	65	1,156	1,095	853	3,287	1,541	6,390	4,644
99400	The Winchcombe School	458	122.0	6,513	22,856	1,504	4,323	73	1,294	1,226	955	3,681	1,726	7,156	5,201
97300	Woolhampton Church of England Primary School	92	0.0	1,308	0	302	868	15	260	246	192	739	347	1,437	1,045
97400	Yattendon Church of England Primary School	74	1.0	1,052	187	243</									

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 –
 - BIT Manager & Senior EP
 - BIT EP
 - Primary BIT Advisor
 - Secondary BIT Advisor
 - BIT Worker
 - BIT Worker
 - BIT Worker
 - Exclusions Officer
 - 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, an EP 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.

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		
Amount to be De-Delegated	213,370	217,630	235,290	7.51%

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. The underspend in 2017/18 has been brought forward into 2018/19 budgets 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	Kennet 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
Kennet (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	Kennet 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 Nervet
Basildon	Theale Green (Academy)

De-delegation Proposals 2019/20

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		
Amount to be De-Delegated	231,390	173,477	210,064	21.1%

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 ¹	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
TOTAL	58	33	19	41

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

¹ Includes formal support through appraisal

² 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
Total Cost	£52,340	£56,620
Income from Academies	£1,696	£1,730
Cost to Maintained Schools	£50,644	£54,890
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	£2,202	£2,286
Cost to Primary and Secondary Schools	£48,442	£52,604

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 1st 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

De-delegation Proposals 2019/20

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 6th 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) – Option 1

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 financial difficulty/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.

Budgeting and accounting functions relating to maintained schools (Sch 2, 74)

Cost: £48,715

0.31 FTE Accountants, 0.45 FTE Senior Accountant, 0.15 FTE Finance Manager
Total FTE 0.91

Accountancy (Statutory Functions) – Option 2

Description of Duties:

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

Overview of school budget submissions & budget monitoring reports.

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.

Budgeting and accounting functions relating to maintained schools (Sch 2, 74)

Cost: £48,715
0.31 FTE Accountants, 0.3 FTE Senior Accountant, 0.15 FTE Finance Manager Total FTE 0.76

Pension Scheme Administration
<p>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.</p>
Cost: £35,948
1.0 FTE Pensions Assistant
Internal Audit of Schools – Statutory Requirements
<p>Description of Duties: 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>
Cost: £46,154
0.3FTE Senior Auditor 0.5 FTE Auditor 0.07 FTE Audit Manager

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

Staffing Structure Required to deliver Option 1: 0.2 FTE Health & Safety Manager 2.0 FTE Senior Health & Safety Officers CREST IT System	
Total Cost of Service to Maintained Schools	£138k
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special, and PRU schools	-£5k
Total Cost of Service Proposed to be met by Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	£133k
Estimated Rate per Pupil	£8.04

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

Staffing Structure Required to deliver Option 2: 0.2 FTE Health & Safety Manager 1.0 FTE Health & Safety Officer CREST IT System	
Total Cost of Service to Maintained Schools	£65k
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special, and PRU schools	-£3k
Total Cost of Service Proposed to be met by Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	£62k
Estimated Rate per Pupil	£3.77

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

Resourced Schools

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Jane Seymour

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform the HFG / Schools' Forum of proposed action in response to concerns expressed by some mainstream schools with resourced units that they have a shortfall in funding, and to seek agreement from the HFG / Schools' Forum.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the HFG / Schools' Forum agree to the proposed action.

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

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1 Some mainstream schools with resourced units have raised concerns about the formula for funding resourced units, in that they say funding does not meet their budget requirements and they have, in some cases, been relying on carried forward underspends which are now running out.
- 3.2 It is important that resourced units are funded in a fair way which allows schools to meet the needs of the pupils.
- 3.3 Given the significant pressure on the HNB, it is also important that any review of resourced unit funding is robust and does not result in a system which over funds.
- 3.4 At the present time we have relatively little detailed information from schools with resourced units to determine what the specific pressures are, and whether all schools with resourced units are experiencing these types of pressures. It could be, for example, that pressures relate mainly to the way particular types of need are funded, rather than necessarily being general to all resourced schools.
- 3.5 We have limited information about resourced unit budget spend in academies as academies are not required to submit this information to the Local Authority.
- 3.6 In order to be able to target any review of resourced unit funding, it is proposed that a survey will be sent to all resourced units asking for information about their expenditure against different budget headings, budget surpluses and carry forwards, staffing (compared to assumed staffing ratios in the bandings), salary costs etc.
- 3.7 This information will enable a more targeted review of resourced school funding to take place.

- 3.8 It is proposed that the survey is sent out in January 2019.
- 3.9 The results of the survey may enable any necessary changes to be made to the resourced unit banding system in April 2019, but any increase in cost would need to be considered in the context of the HNB shortfall for 2019-20.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 That a survey is sent to all schools with resourced units in January 2019 to identify specific pressure areas and enable a targeted review of resourced school funding to take place.
- 4.2 That any potential changes required to the resourced unit banding system are identified and considered by the HFG / Schools Forum in March 2019, in the context of the HNB shortfall in 2019-20.

Proposed banding system for funding children with EHCPs attending PRUs

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Jane Seymour

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement for the proposed banding system for children with EHCPs who are placed in PRUs

2. Recommendation

2.1 It is recommended that the proposal is agreed.

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

3. Introduction/Background

3.1 Historically there have always been some children with Education, Health and Care Plans (or previously Statements) who attended Pupil Referral Units, usually on a short term placement pending an alternative placement.

3.2 The number of children with EHCPs attending PRUs is increasing and some children are staying in PRU placements on a longer term basis.

3.3 Previously, where children with EHCPs were attending PRUs, any top up funding required was agreed on a case by case basis by the SEN Manager and the Headteacher of the PRU Service. There was no formal banding system for children with EHCPs in PRUs.

3.4 Now that more children with EHCPs are attending PRUs, there is a need to formalise funding arrangements through a banding system to ensure that funding is fair and consistent and to give a clear framework for decision making.

3.5 A proposed banding system has been designed, with input from the PRUs, the SEN Team, the Educational Psychology Service and Finance.

4. Options for Consideration

4.1 Only one banding system is proposed, but the HFG / Schools Forum may wish officers to consider alternative models.

5. Proposals

5.1 The proposed banding system does not assume that children with EHCPs in PRUs will automatically need a higher level of funding than pupils without EHCPs. The base level

of funding in PRUs (£106 per day, equivalent to an annual top up cost of £20,140) provides staff to pupil ratios of 1 to 3. Some children with EHCPs will be able to have their needs met through these ratios. This will be band SEMH 1.

5.2 SEMH 1 corresponds to Range 5 level of needs from the West Berkshire Social Emotional and Mental Health Guidance. (See Appendix 1)

5.3 Two additional bands are proposed for children who have EHCPs who require a higher level of staffing because of the severity of their SEMH needs and / or because of other additional needs. These bands are based notionally on an additional 50% TA funding (SEMH 2) and an additional 100% TA funding (SEMH 3). This has been used as a means of calculating additional funding, but it is acknowledged that funding may not be used in this way and might be used to fund other types of additional support. The band values have been based on mid point of Band C.

5.4 SEMH 2 corresponds to Range 6 level of needs from the West Berkshire Social Emotional and Mental Health Guidance (See Appendix 1). SEMH 2 equates to an annual top up cost of £26,600.

5.5 SEMH 3 corresponds to Range 7 level of needs from the West Berkshire Social Emotional and Mental Health Guidance (See Appendix 1). SEMH 3 equates to an annual top up cost of £34,200.

5.6 It is anticipated that the vast majority of students with EHCPs who attend PRUs will be able to have their needs met through Bands SEMH 1, 2 and 3. There may very occasionally be students with such exceptional needs that they require funding over and above Band SEMH 3. These cases would be agreed on a case by case basis by the SEN Panel, but should be very rare.

5.7 This proposed banding system has been applied to children with EHCPs currently in the PRUs and would cost approximately £125,000 in the current financial year. It is estimated that the costs would be approximately £331,400 in the 2019-20 financial year. However, PRU placements for children with EHCPs are more cost effective than non maintained and independent special school placements.

5.8 Decisions on bandings would be made by the SEN Panel.

6. Conclusion

6.1 The proposed banding system would provide a fair and transparent means of allocating additional funding to children with EHCPs in PRUs who need additional support over and above the basic staffing ratios of the PRU.

7. Consultation and Engagement

7.1 The proposed banding system has been designed with input from the PRUs, the SEN Team, the Educational Psychology Service and Finance.

8. Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1: West Berkshire Social, Emotional and Mental Health Guidance

8.2 Appendix 2: PRU Top Up rates

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance



Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

West Berkshire Council

Range Descriptors Overview

Range 1	<p>Children will have been identified as presenting with some low level features of social, emotional mental health difficulties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They may sometimes appear isolated, have immature social skills, be occasionally disruptive in the classroom setting, be overactive and lack concentration • They may follow some but not all school rules/routines around behaviour in the school environment • They may experience some difficulties with social skills • They may show signs of stress and anxiety and/or difficulties managing emotions on occasions
Range 2	<p>Difficulties identified at range 1 continue/worsen and there has been no significant measured change in the target behaviour/social skill despite quality first teaching and range 1 interventions being in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEMH difficulties continue to interfere with pupils' social/learning development across a range of settings and pupils do not follow routines in school consistently • Pupils have continued difficulties in social interactions/relationships with both adults and peers, including difficulties managing a range of emotions • Pupils may have become socially and emotionally vulnerable, withdrawn, isolated, and unpredictable patterns of behaviour may be beginning to emerge that impact on learning • Pupil may show patterns of stress/anxiety related to specific times of the day • Pupils may have a preference for own agenda and be reluctant to follow instructions • Pupils may have begun to experience short term behavioural crisis
Range 3	<p>Difficulties identified at range 2 continue/worsen and there has been no significant measured change in the target behaviour/social skill despite quality first teaching and range 1 and 2 interventions being in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties interfere more frequently with pupils' social/learning development across a range of settings and pupils do not follow routines in school without adult support • Pupils may have experienced fixed term exclusion and more sustained difficulties in social interactions/relationships with both adults and peers, including difficulties managing a range of emotions • Pupils remain socially and emotionally vulnerable, withdrawn, isolated, and susceptible to unpredictable patterns of behaviour that impact on learning • Pupil patterns of stress/anxiety related to specific times of the day have become more common • Pupils have a preference for own agenda and are reluctant to follow instructions • Short-term behavioural crisis have become more frequent and are more intense
Range 4i	<p>Pupil continues to present with severe and persistent levels of social, emotional, mental health difficulties which are now more complex and which necessitate a multi-agency response.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is more likely to have experienced fixed term exclusion from school • Pupil does not have the social and emotional skills needed to cope in a mainstream environment without adult support for a significant proportion of the school day • Significant and increasing difficulties with social interaction, social communication and social understanding which regularly impact on classroom performance • Pupil is increasingly isolated and struggles to maintain positive relationships with adults or peers • Careful social and emotional differentiation of the curriculum essential to ensure access to the curriculum and progress with learning
Range 4ii	<p>Pupil continues to present with severe and persistent levels of social, emotional, mental health difficulties which continue to be complex and long term and which necessitate a continued multi-agency response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is at increased risk of exclusion • Pupil does not have the social and emotional skills needed to cope in a mainstream environment without adult support for a significant proportion of the school day • Significant and increasing difficulties with social interaction, social communication and social understanding which regularly impact on classroom performance • Pupil is increasingly isolated and struggles to maintain positive relationships with adults or peers • Careful social and emotional differentiation of the curriculum essential to ensure progress with learning
Range 5	<p>Significant and increasing social, emotional, mental health difficulties, often compounded by additional needs and requiring provision outside the mainstream environment, including several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate/ severe learning difficulties, mental health difficulties, acute anxiety, attachment issues • May have ADHD/ASD • Patterns of regular school absence • Disengaged from learning, significant under performance • Verbally and physically aggressive • Reliant on adult support to remain on task • Engaging in high risk taking activities both at school and within the community • Difficulties expressing empathy, emotionally detached, could have tendency to hurt others, self or animals • Issues around identity and belonging • Needing to be in control, bullying behaviours (victim & perpetrator) • Difficulties sustaining relationships • Over-friendly or withdrawn with strangers, at risk of exploitation • Provocative in appearance and behaviour, evidence of sexualised language or behaviours • Slow to develop age appropriate self-care skills due to levels of maturity or degree of Learning Difficulties • Physical, sensory and medical needs that require medication and regular review • Damage to property
Range 6	<p>Continuing significant and increasing social, emotional, mental health difficulties, often compounded by additional needs and requiring continued provision outside the mainstream environment, including several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant challenging behaviour • Requiring a range of therapeutic interventions or referral to specialist support services

	<p>(CAMHS, EPS, YOT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to manage self in group without dedicated support • Subject to significant neglect, basic needs unmet or preoccupied with hunger, illness, lack of sleep, acute anxiety, fear, isolation, bullying, harassment, controlling behaviours • Involved in substance misuse either as a user or exploited into distribution/selling • Poor attendance, requires high level of adult intervention to bring into school, even with transport provided • Refusal to engage, extreme abuse towards staff and peers, disengaged, wilfully disruptive • Significant and repeated damage to property • May require targeted teaching in order to access learning in dedicated space away from others • Health and safety risk to self and others due to increased levels of agitation and presenting risks • Sexualised language and behaviour, identified at risk of Child exploitation • Medical conditions, such as Asthma or Epilepsy, that may require particular support from Specialist Services
Range 7	<p>Continued long term and complex social, emotional, mental health difficulties, necessitating a continued multi agency response coordinated as annual SEN review, or multi agency reviews and met in specialist provision. Needs likely to include several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self harming behaviour • Attempted suicide • Persistent substance abuse • Extreme sexualised language and behaviour , sexually exploited • Extreme violent/aggressive behaviour • Serious mental health issues • Long term non-attendance and disaffection despite a range of appropriate strategies being employed and reviewed over time • Regular appearance in court for anti-social behaviour/criminal activity • Puts self and others in danger • Frequently missing for long periods • Extreme vulnerability due to learning difficulties, physical difficulties, Sensory impairment • Medical conditions that potentially life threatening and cannot be managed without dedicated support

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Quality First Teaching

Descriptor	<p>All children should be educated in a socially and emotionally differentiated learning environment and taught the social and emotional skills which underpin good behaviour. The key areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate whole school ethos • A positive focus on attendance • A positive behaviour policy which is socially and emotionally differentiated to meet the needs of all pupils • A classroom and playground environment which focuses on positive relationships and the development of social skills • The provision of planned opportunities for pupils to learn social and emotional skills • The recognition that some pupils may experience short term difficulties managing their emotions and behaviour
Assessment and Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems in place to ensure effective class and behaviour management strategies • Systems in place which ensure effective consequences to positive and negative behaviours (Rewards and sanctions) • Effective links between pastoral support, personal and social education, SEN and the curriculum • Accurate assessment of teaching and learning which includes emotional and developmental factors
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstream nurturing classroom environment with attention paid to nurturing principles • A quiet area in the classroom available for individual work or to allow pupils to calm/refocus • Attention paid to learning styles/any learning adjustments that may be necessary • Attention paid to emotional, social health and wellbeing
Human resources and staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School behaviour policy, with a range of strategies which are clearly communicated and monitored and consistently implemented • Provision by class teacher, additional classroom staff and a range of resources usually available in the classroom • Shared understanding of how social and emotional issues impact on behaviour • Close liaison and common approach with parents/carers • Staff support and training on issues related to emotional, social development and behaviour
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate differentiation of the curriculum and all supporting materials • Assessment of preferred styles to inform teaching • Use of behaviour targets within the classroom and playground • The planned teaching of personal social and emotional skills (eg a curriculum such as SEAL) • Planned teaching of social communication skills
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effective behaviour/inclusion policy that is regularly monitored and evaluated within the school • A range of additional provisions in place in school such as: school councils, peer counselling buddy schemes, circle time, breakfast clubs, lunchtime/after school activities, break time havens, life Skills teaching • Strategies in place to encourage parental involvement in the life of school • Structured systems in place to support internal transitions between classes/activities, around school • Strategies in place to monitor attendance and punctuality which enhance communication between home and school • Systems for observing, auditing and assessing a pupils behaviour, monitored by SLT • Early Years Learning Journals in place at foundation stage

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 1 - School based responses (Mild)

Descriptor	<p>Children will have been identified as presenting with some low level features of social, emotional mental health difficulties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They may sometimes appear isolated, have immature social skills, be occasionally disruptive in the classroom setting, be overactive and lack concentration • They may follow some but not all school rules/routines around behaviour in the school environment • They may experience some difficulties with social skills • They may show signs of stress and anxiety and/or difficulties managing emotions on occasions
Assessment and Planning	<p>Assessment will continue as part of normal school and class assessments, while the SENCO may initiate more specific assessment and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records kept should include observations and assessments of context, structured and unstructured times, frequency, triggers, ABCs • Behaviour plans may be in place for more difficult times of the school day • Individual Provision map in place demonstrating that an increasing range of individual support is in place that is additional to and different from mainstream • Progress should be measured by changes in behaviour and learning following each review cycle and should be regularly shared with parents • Learning styles should be re-visited with adjustments made to accommodate them • A planned programme of support in place related to assessments, with pupils involved in setting and monitoring their own targets • Parents involved on a regular basis and encouraged to support targets at home • Pupil views are gathered
Groupings for teaching	<p>Pupils will continue to be in a mainstream class with attention paid to organisation and pupil groupings as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for small group work based on identified need eg listening/thinking/social skills • Time limited mainstream classroom programme of support, which relates to assessments • Small group work to teach appropriate behaviours and emotional regulation • Individual programme (e.g. ELSA) based on specific need identified through assessments • A quiet area in the classroom available for individual work or to support pupils to calm/refocus • A nurturing classroom environment in which attention is paid to nurturing principles
Human resources and staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support/advice from SENCO with assessment, observation and planning • Appropriately skilled additional adults routinely used to support flexible groupings, observe pupils, differentiation and some 1:1 • Close monitoring to identify “hotspots” through observation with results used in planning • Support for times identified by risk assessments and strategies implemented to manage these • Close liaison and common approach with parents/carers
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In class more targeted differentiation of the curriculum and supporting materials to enable full access • Strategies developed are formally shared with school staff, parent/carer and are documented • Increased differentiation of social, emotional and behavioural learning as well as academic curriculum • Level and pace of instructions simplified with attention paid to appropriate amount of teacher talk – chunked instructions, simple sentences • Increased emphasis on identifying and teaching to preferred learning style

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned opportunities for pupils to reinforce social and emotional skills • Some use of specific group or 1:1 programmes around SEMH • Preparation for any change and the need for clear routines so that children feel safe
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<p>Further use of positive targeted strategies that include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further baseline assessments and support • Hearing and vision, other health checks • Incident logs, ABC charts, observations in a range of settings with analyses and adjustments made according to findings, consideration given to the use of positive diaries, visual time tables • Consideration given to the provision of parenting support/ family centre involvement

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 2 - School based responses (Mild)

Descriptor	<p>Difficulties identified at range 1 continue/worsen and there has been no significant measured change in the target behaviour/social skill despite quality first teaching and range 1 interventions being in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social, emotional, mental health difficulties continue to interfere with pupils' social/learning development across a range of settings and pupils do not follow routines in school consistently • Pupils have continued difficulties in social interactions/relationships with both adults and peers, including difficulties managing a range of emotions • Pupils may have become socially and emotionally vulnerable, withdrawn, isolated, and unpredictable patterns of behaviour may be beginning to emerge that impact on learning • Pupil may show patterns of stress/anxiety related to specific times of the day • Pupils may have a preference for own agenda and be reluctant to follow instructions • Pupils may have begun to experience short term behavioural crisis 	
Assessment and Planning	<p>School</p> <p>Assessment as range 1 plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detailed and targeted observation ie interval sampling, use and analysis of assessment tools (Boxall, SDQ) and assessment related to interventions • More detailed recording, monitoring of frequency, intensity, ABC over a range of contexts • Behaviour plans in place for more difficult times of the school day or less structured times (e.g. breaks, extra curricular activities) • Assessment of progress in response to interventions • Pupil self assessment and pupil views, and wider assessments for learning/other SEN, e.g. speech and language, sensory needs • Individual Provision map continues to be in place demonstrating that an increased range of individual support that is additional to and different from mainstream is necessary to ensure full inclusion and progress with learning • Planning includes individually focused plans/provision maps with clear targets and with appropriate steps taken to engage pupil and parents • Effective internal communication and liaison arrangements between relevant staff 	<p>LA</p> <p>Advice sought from recognised professionals external to the school, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour Intervention Team (telephone consultation or referral) • Children and Young Peoples' Integrated Therapies (CYPIT, e.g. Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy if child has an EHCP) • School nurse
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the provision at range 1, identified regular support to teach social skills/emotional literacy in order to support the behaviour learning targets • Mainstream class with regular, time limited programmes of small group work based on identified need • On-going opportunities for 1:1 support focused on specific individual targets 	
Human resources and staffing	<p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional adult, under the direction of teacher/SENCo, provides sustained targeted support on an individual/group basis • Increased parental/carer involvement; do you need to gather further info, e.g. genogram, family's strengths and needs, early years development • Encouragement and inclusion in extra curricular activities 	<p>LA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main provision by class/subject teacher with support from SENCO with additional advice from other professionals as outlined above

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a multi agency approach – consider convening a Team Around the Child (TAC) 	
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify level/pace/amount of teacher talk to pupil’s identified need • Individual targets within group programmes and/or 1:1 • A nurturing approach within the classroom which takes account of difficulties in the understanding of social rules and expectations • Emphasis on increasing differentiation of activities and materials and account taken of individual learning styles • Short term individual support focusing on listening, concentration, social skills • Regular small group work with an increasing emphasis on relationships, emotions, social skills, conflict resolution • Provision of opportunities for play, creative activities, drama/role play 	
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue with range 1 strategies + use of behaviour targets (if appropriate) within classroom or playground • Increase visual systems; prompt cards, behaviour plans, portable plans • Regular small group work on conflict resolution, social/emotional skills • Short term individual support • Additional circle time activities/small circles of support • Involvement from a wider range of services 	

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 3 (Moderate)

Descriptor	<p>Difficulties identified at range 2 continue/worsen and there has been no significant measured change in the target behaviour/social skill despite quality first teaching and range 1 and 2 interventions being in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social, emotional, mental health difficulties interfere more frequently with pupils' social/learning development across a range of settings and pupils do not follow routines in school without adult support • Pupils may have experienced fixed term exclusion and more sustained difficulties in social interactions/relationships with both adults and peers, including difficulties managing a range of emotions • Pupils remain socially and emotionally vulnerable, withdrawn, isolated, and susceptible to unpredictable patterns of behaviour that impact on learning • Pupil patterns of stress/anxiety related to specific times of the day have become more common • Pupils have a preference for own agenda and are reluctant to follow instructions • Short-term behavioural crisis have become more frequent and are more intense 	
Assessment and Planning	<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Range 2 plus more systematic application of assessment tools to gain detailed evidence over time with reviews • Involvement from BIT <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive handling plans in place where appropriate, providing careful details about safety, the trained staff who will be involved with the plan, the circumstances in which positive handling might be used, and how it will be recorded and communicated to parents or carers. This should be regularly reviewed and evaluated for impact • Risk assessments, if needed above that of a behaviour support plan • Behaviour and curriculum plans closely track levels of achievement, and all SAP/Behaviour plan targets are individualised and SMART • Individual provision map continues to be in place demonstrating provision at range 1-3 to support a pupil with long term needs that are likely to require further specialist assessment. Effective multi-agency working in place 	
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstream class but predominantly working on modified curriculum tasks with regular and consistent 1:1 support focused on specific SEMH/learning targets • Frequent opportunities for small group work based on identified need 	
Human resources and staffing	<p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily access to staff in school with experience of SEMH (Staff should be trained in nurture and attachment, and the principles of which should be embedded into practice) • An additional adult (a 'key adult'), under the direction of the teacher, may support pupil working on modified behaviour targets and curriculum tasks • Increased access to a combination of targeted individual, small group and whole class activities • Adults receive a form of supervision so that they feel 'held', and able to seek support without fear of blame or recrimination • TAC should be in place 	<p>LA</p> <p>Main provision by class/subject teacher with support from SENCo.</p> <p>Additional advice and support from recognised professionals external to the school (e.g. referral to BIT, Educational Psychology Service, EHA, icollege outreach).</p> <p>If enough evidence, with parental consent, consider referral to ASD or ADHD pathways (See CYPIT)</p>
Curriculum and Teaching	<p>Teaching focuses on both SEMH and curriculum outcomes throughout the school day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks and presentation differentiated and personalised to pupil's needs • Modified and individualised level/pace/amount of teacher talk 	

Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some 1:1 teaching for the introduction of new concepts and the specific teaching and reinforcement of classroom routines and expectations • Small steps targets within group programmes • Some 1:1 work task completion with adult support • Targets monitored with pupil daily • Consideration of an alternative, differentiated curriculum that allows flexibility to teach according to emotional need rather than chronological age
Resources & Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the strategies in ranges 1 – 2 with an individualised focus • Access to a quiet space, time out, calming strategies • Systems in place that support conflict resolution and restorative work within a framework of anti-bullying strategy and interventions • Continue to review any resources and develop them to match the pupil's needs • BIT may suggest an application to the Vulnerable Children's Grant (VCG)

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 4i (Severe)

Descriptor	<p>Pupil continues to present with severe and persistent levels of social, emotional, mental health difficulties which are now more complex and which necessitate a multi-agency response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is more likely to have experienced fixed term exclusion from school • Pupil does not have the social and emotional skills needed to cope in a mainstream environment without adult support for a significant proportion of the school day • Significant and increasing difficulties with social interaction, social communication and social understanding which regularly impact on classroom performance • Pupil is increasingly isolated and struggles to maintain positive relationships with adults or peers • Careful social and emotional differentiation of the curriculum essential to ensure access to the curriculum and progress with learning 	
Assessment and Planning	<p>School</p> <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As range 3 with increased involvement of a range of specialist professionals • Multi-agency work continues • Statutory assessment process (EHCP) is considered • Positive handling plans • Risk assessment, if necessary • School to self-assess; what's working well, what's not <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAP/behaviour plans, or provision map detailing strategies and appropriate short term targets • Planning meetings/TACs include parents, any offsite providers and are multi-agency 	<p>LA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued access to assessment advice and support from outside agencies • Consider requesting a Circle of adults • Consider a CAMHS referral • Vulnerable Children's Grant (VCG) may be suggested by BIT
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil offered one to one support from an adult in the mainstream environment (a key adult) – with reference to statutory funding • Where appropriate, managed move/fresh start of school • Nurture group provision (if in place and assessments indicate appropriateness) 	
Human resources and staffing	<p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily access to staff with experience and training in meeting the needs of pupils with SEMH • Icollege outreach 	
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils' curriculum is personalised • Activities focus on key skills and SEMH outcomes throughout the school day • More lessons outside mainstream timetabling 	
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<p>Continue to review resources and develop them to match the pupil's needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted intervention carefully employing a range of specialist strategies • Individual SEMH programme incorporating 1:1 and small group teaching • Specialist provision (e.g. nurture group) within mainstream may be appropriate to meet need for part of the week • Part-time timetable may be suggested (consult with Exclusions Officer) • All additional resources and exceptional arrangements are referenced in a personalised provision map • BIT may suggest an application to the Vulnerable Children's Grant (VCG) 	

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 4ii (Severe)

Descriptor	<p>Pupil continues to present with severe and persistent levels of social, emotional, mental health difficulties which continue to be complex and long term and which necessitate a continued multi-agency response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is at increased risk of exclusion • Pupil does not have the social and emotional skills needed to cope in a mainstream environment without adult support for a significant proportion of the school day • Significant and increasing difficulties with social interaction, social communication and social understanding which regularly impact on classroom performance • Pupil is increasingly isolated and struggles to maintain positive relationships with adults or peers • Careful social and emotional differentiation of the curriculum essential to ensure progress with learning 	
Assessment and Planning	<p>School</p> <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As range 4i with significant involvement from a range of specialist professionals • Multi-agency work continues • Statutory assessment process (EHCP) may be in process <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A behaviour plan, risk assessment or provision map detailing strategies and appropriate short term targets • Planning meetings include parents, any offsite providers and are multi-agency 	<p>LA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued access to assessment advice and support from outside agencies • Request a circle of adults • Consider making a referral to the Pupil Placement Panel (PPP) • Child to be known to Exclusions Officer
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstream provision in place but pupil may be taught for more significant amounts of time in a specialist environment outside of the mainstream classroom • Pupil offered one to one support from an adult for the majority of the school day - with reference to statutory funding • Managed move of school considered 	
Human resources & staffing	<p>School</p> <p>Continued daily access to staff with experience and training in meeting the needs of pupils with SEMH</p>	
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil's curriculum is highly personalised and pupils may be disapplied from some aspects of the national curriculum • Activities focus on key skills and SEMH outcomes throughout the school day • More lessons take place outside mainstream timetabling 	
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<p>Continue to review resources and develop them to match the pupil's needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted intervention carefully employing a range of specialist strategies • Individual SEMH programme incorporating 1:1 and small group teaching • Specialist provision (e.g. nurture group) appropriate to need could be in place for much of the week • All additional resources and exceptional arrangements are referenced in a personalised provision map 	

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 5 (Profound)

Descriptor	<p>Significant and increasing social, emotional, mental health difficulties, often compounded by additional needs and requiring provision outside the mainstream environment, including several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate/ severe learning difficulties, mental health difficulties, acute anxiety, attachment issues • May have ADHD/ASD • Patterns of regular school absences • Disengaged from learning, significant under performance • Verbally and physically aggressive • Reliant on adult support to remain on task • Engaging in high risk taking activities both at school and within the community • Difficulties expressing empathy, emotionally detached, could have tendency to hurt others, self or animals • Issues around identity and belonging • Needing to be in control, bullying behaviours (victim & perpetrator) • Difficulties sustaining relationships • Over-friendly or withdrawn with strangers, at risk of exploitation • Provocative in appearance and behaviour, evidence of sexualised language or behaviours • Slow to develop age appropriate self-care skills due to levels of maturity or degree of Learning Difficulties • Physical, sensory and medical needs such as that require medication and regular review • Damage to property
Assessment and Planning	<p>Statutory assessment process (EHCP) is likely to be complete and pupil may have been assessed as needing specialist provision</p> <p>Assessment will be an ongoing process to determine progress in learning, and also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of social skills, empathy, managing own behaviour and emotions, staying safe in school and in the community • There will be involvement from a range of specialist professionals in place, such as CAMHS, EP, YOT, EWO • Multi-agency work continues, and continual assessment to feed in to the cycle of annual reviews and/or TACs. <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAP, behaviour plan, risk assessment or provision map detailing strategies and appropriate short term targets • Risk assessment will describe procedures to keep safe the pupil, other staff and pupils, and property. There will be an assessment of the risk of absconding and procedures described to manage such an eventuality. • Planning meetings will include parents/carers, and are multi-agency
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil on dual/single roll in a specialist environment, e.g. icollege • Pupil offered one to one support from an adult for some of the school day • There will be a greater ratio of adults to pupils and staff will have specialisms in managing pupils who present with challenging behaviour.

PROFOUND - Range 5 continued	
Human resources and staffing	<p>Provision is within a specialist environment with appropriate staff/student ratios Continued daily access to staff with experience and training in meeting the needs of pupils with SEMH. Additional teams will include any of the following;</p> <p>Multi Agency Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Worker, Police • Health (e.g. school nurse), YOT, EHA/CAMHS, Educational Psychologist, EWO • The Edge (young people's drug and alcohol service) • Targeted Intervention Service (TIS) • Contact Advice and Assessment Service (CAAS) • Home Start (promote the welfare of families with at least one child under 5 years) • SAFE! (supporting victims of crime, aged 8-25 year olds) • Time to Talk (counselling service for 11-25 year olds)
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<p>Pupil requiring an alternative to mainstream education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning experiences address significant social, emotional and behavioural needs • Learning experiences out of school environment (e.g. Outdoor academy) • A differentiated behaviour management programme in addition to targeted support and reassurance in areas of learning the child finds particularly demanding • Structured social skills group work and/or intervention • Regular opportunities to consolidate learning/ promote confidence in the learning environment • Adult support to implement structured social skills, group work and/or intervention and to support during less structured times • Access to an adult who can intervene to support the pupil in recognising their emotions and managing their behaviour • Additional support around times of transition and change • Staff have expertise in managing significant and consistent difficulties with behaviour <p>Support and advice from outside agencies as appropriate</p>
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personalised to the specific needs of the pupil • Advice available from relevant specialist services • Placed in a specialist environment • Banding – Additional (SEMH 1)

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 6 (more profound)

Descriptor	<p>Continuing significant and increasing social, emotional, mental health difficulties, often compounded by additional needs and requiring continued provision outside the mainstream environment, including several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant challenging behaviour • Requiring a range of therapeutic interventions or referral to specialist support services (CAMHS, YOT) • Unable to manage self in group without dedicated support • Subject to significant neglect, basic needs unmet or preoccupied with hunger, illness, lack of sleep, acute anxiety, fear, isolation, bullying, harassment, controlling behaviours • Involved in substance misuse either as a user or exploited into distribution/selling • Poor attendance, requires high level of adult intervention to bring into school, even with transport provided • Refusal to engage, extreme abuse towards staff and peers, disengaged, wilfully disruptive • Significant damage to property • May require targeted teaching in order to access learning in dedicated space away from others • Health and safety risk to self and others due to increased levels of agitation and presenting risks • Sexualised language and behaviour , identified at risk of child exploitation
Assessment Planning	<p>Statutory assessment process (EHCP) is complete and pupil has been assessed as needing enhanced specialist provision</p> <p>Assessment will be an ongoing process to determine progress in learning, and also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of social skills, empathy, managing own behaviour and emotions, staying safe in school and in the community • There will be involvement from a range of specialist professionals in place, such as CAMHS, EP, YOT, therapeutic provision. • Multi-agency work continues, and continual assessment to feed in to the cycle of annual reviews/TACs. <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAP, behaviour plan, risk assessment or provision map detailing strategies and appropriate short term targets • Risk assessment will describe procedures to keep the pupil safe, other staff and pupils, and property. There will be an assessment of the risk of absconding and procedures described to manage such an eventuality. • Planning meetings will include parents/carers, and are multi-agency
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is likely to be on roll at special school • Pupil offered one to one support from an adult for most of the school day • There will be a greater ratio of adults to pupils and staff will have specialisms in managing pupils who present with challenging behaviour.
Human resources and staffing	<p>Multi Agency Interventions:</p> <p>Provision is within a specialist environment with appropriate staff/student ratios Continued daily access to staff with experience and training in meeting the needs of pupils with SEMH. Additional teams will include any of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Worker, Police • Health (e.g. school nurse), YOT, EHA/CAMHS, Educational Psychologist, EWO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Edge (young people's drug and alcohol service) • Targeted Intervention Service (TIS) • Contact Advice and Assessment Service (CAAS) • Home Start (promote the welfare of families with at least one child under 5 years) • SAFE! (supporting victims of crime, aged 8-25 year olds) • Time to Talk (counselling service for 11-25 year olds)
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to personalised interventions to help the child to regulate and reflect upon their emotions to develop resilience and reduce the severity of behaviour • Highly structured opportunities to consolidate learning and promote confidence in the learning environment • Consistent adult support to support the delivery of a personalised approach which ensures all necessary reasonable adjustments are identified and implemented • Staff have expertise in managing significant and consistent difficulties with behaviour • Risk assessment to minimise opportunities for severe incidents to occur • Regular multi-agency reviews as appropriate
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personalised to the specific needs of the pupil • Advice available from relevant specialist services • Banding – Significant (SEMH 2)

Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) Guidance

Range 7 (Exceptional)

Descriptor	<p>Continued long term and complex social, emotional, mental health difficulties, necessitating a continued multi agency response coordinated as annual SEN review or a multi professional meeting and met in specialist provision. Needs likely to include several of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self harming behaviour • Attempted suicide • Persistent substance abuse • Extreme sexualised language and behaviour, sexually exploited • Extreme violent/aggressive behaviour • Serious mental health issues • Long term non-attendance and disaffection despite a range of appropriate strategies being employed and reviewed over time • Regular appearance in court for anti-social behaviour/criminal activity • Puts self and others in danger • Frequently missing for long periods • Extreme vulnerability due to learning needs, physical needs, Sensory impairment
Assessment and Planning	<p>Statutory assessment process (EHCP) is complete and pupil has been assessed as needing enhanced, or more secure specialist provision</p> <p>Assessment will be an ongoing process to determine progress in learning, and also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of social skills, empathy, managing own behaviour and emotions, staying safe in school and in the community • There will be involvement from a range of specialist professionals in place, such as CAMHS, EP, YOT, therapeutic provision. • Multi-agency work continues, and continual assessment to feed in to the cycle of annual reviews. <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAP, behaviour plan, risk assessment or provision map detailing strategies and appropriate short term targets • Risk assessment will describe procedures to keep safe the pupil, other staff and pupils, and property. There will be an assessment of the risk of absconding and procedures described to manage such an eventuality. • Planning meetings will include parents/carers, and are multi-agency
Groupings for teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil is on roll at special school. May be out of area and/or residential • Pupil offered one to one support from an adult for most of the school day • There will be a greater ratio of adults to pupils and staff will have specialisms in managing pupils who present with challenging behaviour.
Human resources and staffing	<p>Provision is within a specialist environment with appropriate staff/student ratios Continued daily access to staff with experience and training in meeting the needs of pupils with SEMH. Additional teams will include any of the following;</p> <p>Multi Agency Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Worker, Police • Health (e.g. school nurse), YOT, EHA/CAMHS, Educational Psychologist, EWO • The Edge (young people's drug and alcohol service) • Targeted Intervention Service (TIS)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact Advice and Assessment Service (CAAS) • Home Start (promote the welfare of families with at least one child under 5 years) • SAFE! (supporting victims of crime, aged 8-25 year olds) • Time to Talk (counselling service for 11-25 year olds)
Curriculum and Teaching Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to a personalised curriculum and intervention programme within a safe environment which includes an emphasis on helping the child to develop an understanding of emotions and different emotional responses, in order to develop resilience and reduce the severity of behaviour • Personalised learning programme to consolidate learning and promote confidence in the learning environment • High level and consistent adult support to ensure the delivery of a personalised approach which includes all necessary reasonable adjustments which are identified and implemented • Staff have expertise in managing complex difficulties with behaviour • Risk assessment to minimise opportunities for severe incidents to occur • Regular multi-agency reviews as appropriate
Resources and Intervention Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personalised to the specific needs of the pupil • Advice available from relevant specialist services • Banding – Exceptional (SEMH 3)

Appendix

Services/Organisations	Area of Support	Contact details
Behaviour Intervention Service (BIT)	Children with SEMH and behavioural needs	07585 986658 Beth.cartwright@westberks.gov.uk OR BIT@westberks.gov.uk
Children Young People and Families Services	Info on pathways for ASD, ADHD. Referrals to services such as Occupational Therapy and Speech and Language	https://cypf.berkshirehealthcare.nhs.uk/
Cognition and Learning Team (CALT)	Advice, training and guidance for pupils with SEN	Rhian.ireland@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Advice and Assessment Service (CAAS)	Safeguarding or welfare concerns	child@westberks.gov.uk 01635 503090
Cruse	Bereavement	westberkshire@cruse.org.uk
Educational Psychology Service (EPS)	Support for vulnerable groups of children	Hazel.loomes@westberks.gov.uk
Educational Welfare Service	Supporting regular school attendance	Linda.curtis@westberks.gov.uk
Emotional Health Academy (EHA)	Emotional well-being support and signposting	Emotional.health.triage@westberks.gov.uk
Exclusions Officer	Support around exclusions, fresh starts, pupil placement panel	Ros.arthur@westberks.gov.uk 01635 503409
Home Start	Support for families (with at least one child under 5 years) suffering stress or difficulty	office@home-startwb.org.uk
Icollege	Alternative Education	office@icollege.org.uk
Outdoor Academy	Outdoor activities	info@outdooracademy.co.uk
Safe Sex Berkshire	Promoting safe sex	https://www.safesexberkshire.nhs.uk/
SAFE!	Support for victims of crime	safe@safeproject.org.uk
SENDIASS	Independent SEND advice for parents and young people	westberksiass@roseroad.org.uk
Specialist Inclusion Support Service (SISS)	Support from Brookfields and Castle Special schools	Rhian.ireland@westberks.gov.uk
Targeted Intervention Service (TIS)	Supporting young carers, those on the edge of care, domestic abuse, mental health etc	tis@westberks.gov.uk
The Edge	Drug and alcohol	theedge@westberks.gov.uk

	service	
The Ethnic Minority & Traveler Service (EMTAS)	Support for ethnic minority children and their families. This includes children for whom English is an additional language and children from Gypsy or Traveler backgrounds.	Hazel.davies@westberks.gov.uk
Time to talk	Free counselling for 11-25 years olds	office@t2twb.org
Virtual School	Offering support to Looked After Children (LAC)	Robin.douglas@westberks.gov.uk
Young Carers	Support for young carers	Youngcarers@westberks.gov.uk
Youth Offending Team (YOT)	Help for young people to help turn them away from crime	yot@westberks.gov.uk

Here follows some further signposting and resources. This list is not comprehensive and is a working document:

Websites

Organisation	Website
Charlie Waller Memorial Trust – Depression, let's get talking about it	https://www.cwmt.org.uk/resources
Contact A Family	https://contact.org.uk/
Mentally Healthy Schools	https://www.mentallyhealthyschools.org.uk
Mind Mental Health Charity	www.mind.org.uk
Mood Juice – Self-help resource	http://www.moodjuice.scot.nhs.uk/
National Self-Harm Network	http://www.nshn.co.uk/
Nurture Group Network	https://www.nurturegroups.org/
OCD-UK Leading national charity	http://www.ocduk.org
The Centre for Separated Families	https://www.separatedfamilies.info/
Trauma and Attachment Clinic	https://beaconhouse.org.uk/trauma-and-attachment/
Young Minds – Mental Health charity for young people	www.youngminds.org.uk

Books

Children's Books around divorce:

Two Homes by Claire Masurel

Dinosaurs Divorce (A Guide for Changing Families) by Marc Brown

Standing on My Own Two Feet: A Child's Affirmation of Love in the Midst of Divorce by Tamara Schmitz

Books for parents around divorce:

The truth about children and divorce by Robert E. Emery Ph.D. (ISBN 0452287162).

Mom's house, Dad's house by Isolina Ricci (ISBN 0743277120)

Other

Bhreathnach, E. *The Scared Gang Series*.

Blakemore, S.J. *Inventing Ourselves: The secret life of the teenage brain*.

Bomber, L. *Inside I'm Hurting*.

Bomber, L. *What About Me?*

Bomber, L. & Siegel, D. *Settling Troubled Pupils to Learn: Why Relationships Matter in School*.

Ciarrochi, J. *Get Out of Your Mind and Into Your Life for Teens: A Guide to Living an Extraordinary Life (An Instant Help Book for Teens)*.

Creswell, C. & Willetts, L. (2007). *Overcoming Your Child's Fears and Worries: A self-help guide using cognitive behavioural techniques*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Dummett, N. & Williams, C. (2008). *Overcoming Teenage Low Mood and Depression: A five areas approach*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Fennell, M. (1999). *Overcoming Low Self-Esteem: A self-help guide using cognitive behavioural techniques*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Geddes, H. *Attachment in the classroom*.

Gilbert, I. *The Little Book of Bereavement for Schools*.

Gilbert, P. (1997). *Overcoming Depression: A self-help guide using cognitive behavioural techniques*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Golding, K., Fain, J., Frost, A., Mills, C., Worrall, H., Roberts, N., Durrant, E., & Templeton, S. Observing children with attachment difficulties in school

Kennerley, H. (1997). *Overcoming Anxiety: A self-help guide using cognitive behavioural techniques*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Mears, K. & Freeston, M. (2008). *Overcoming Worry*. London: Constable & Robinson

West Berkshire SEMH Guidance 2018

Morgan, N. *Blame My Brain: the Amazing Teenage Brain Revealed.*

Ratner, H. *Brief Coaching with Children and Young People: A Solution Focused Approach.*

Siegel, D. & Bryson, T. *The Whole Brain Child: 12 Proven Strategies to Nurture Your Child's Developing Mind.*

Siegel, D. *Brainstorm. The Power and Purpose of the Teenage Mind.*

Taransaud, D. *You Think I'm Evil: Practical Strategies for Working with Rebellious and Aggressive Adolescents.*

Glossary of Terms

Name in full	Abbreviation
Antecedent Behaviour Consequence	ABC
Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder	ADHD
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	ASD
Behaviour Intervention Team	BIT
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service	CAMHS
Children and Young People's Integrated Therapies	CYPIT
Contact Advice and Assessment Service	CAAS
Education Health and Care Plan	EHCP
Education Welfare Officer	EWO
Educational Psychology Service	EPS
Emotional Literacy Support Assistant	ELSA
Looked After Child	LAC
Pupil Placement Panel	PPP
Senior Leadership Team	SLT
Social Emotional Aspects of Learning	SEAL
Social Emotional Mental Health	SEMH
Special Educational Needs	SEN
Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator	SENCO
Support and Achievement Plan	SAP
Team Around the Child	TAC
Youth Offending Team	YOT

Thanks to Bradford's SEMH guidance document which was used as a template to generate this document.

West Berkshire Council Schools Pupil Referral Unit & Home Tuition Charges 2018/19

iCollege TOP UP RATES From 1/4/18 to 31/3/19	Daily Rate	Daily Rate Payable by School	Annual Top Up Equivalent for School	Daily Rate Payable by LA (High Needs Block)	Annual Top Up Equivalent for LA	Annual Equivalent TOTAL per place
Place Funding						10,000.00
Standard Top Up Rate	£106.00					20,140.00
Total Cost per Place						30,140.00
Top Up Charges:-						
Non permanent placements - all phases		£84.80	16,112.00	£21.20	4,028.00	30,140.00
KS4 curriculum placements		£84.80	16,112.00	£21.20	4,028.00	30,140.00
Permanent Exclusions		(school pays their basic entitlement formula funding to LA as per the finance regulations)		£106.00	20,140.00	30,140.00
6th Form				£106.00	20,140.00	30,140.00
*SEN placements for SEMH (as per EHCP):						
SEM1				£106.00	20,140.00	30,140.00
SEM2				£140.00	26,600.00	36,600.00
SEM3				£180.00	34,200.00	44,200.00

* Note that if a school places a pupil with an existing EHCP in iCollege on a short term placement, the school will be responsible for the charge and the school will continue to receive the top up funding for the pupil. SEMH funding from the LA only applies where a decision has been made by the LA to permanently place the pupil in iCollege or is using iCollege as a holding placement until an alternative high needs placement is found.

The only exceptions to schools paying for placements are as follows:

1. Permanent exclusion. LA pays the full rate, but pupil led funding is removed from the school.
2. SEMH placement. LA pays the full rate; any top up funding the school receives for the pupil ceases.
3. The pupil has been on the school roll for no more than 6 weeks (30 school days) following a *planned move from another school* (i.e. not following the usual annual admission or a change of address), and has not been on the last October school census, and was not a fresh start (a fresh start pupil would revert to being the responsibility of the original school).
4. There are exceptional circumstances which have prevented or revoked a permanent exclusion, usually due to the pupil being a LAC or a pupil with SEN.

Where it is not clearcut, the Head of Education will consider the circumstances and decide, reporting all such decisions to the Heads Funding Group.

HOME TUITION RATES From 1/4/18 to 31/3/19	Weekly Rate Payable by School (for 10 hours tuition)	Annual Equivalent Rate
(for pupils unable to attend school because of ill health for more than 15 days)		
Primary	£103.66	3,939.08
Secondary	£129.34	4,914.92
Note that transition weeks will be charged at half rate (usually 12 weeks for long term users and 6 weeks for all others)		

This page is intentionally left blank

High Needs Place Funding 2018/19

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Jane Seymour

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 The purpose of the report is to advise Heads' Funding Group and Schools Forum members of planned places allocated currently to special schools, resourced schools, FE providers and mainstream sixth forms and likely numbers of pupils in those institutions requiring planned place funding in 2019-20.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the report is noted and any implications for the HNB budget are incorporated in to the report which will be brought to the next meeting on the draft HNB budget for 2019-20.

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

3. Introduction/Background

3.1 Place funding is allocated by the Education & Skills Funding Agency for children and young people with high level needs who are under 16 and attend a special or resourced school. Place funding is also allocated by the Education & Skills Funding Agency for young people with high level needs who are over 16 and attend a mainstream school, special school, resourced school or FE College.

3.2 Place funding for children under 16 in resourced schools, special schools and PRUs is held within the HNB and allocated to schools by the Local Authority.

3.3 Place funding for children in academies and FE Colleges is top sliced from the HNB and allocated to institutions by the ESFA. Similarly, place funding for children of post 16 age in maintained mainstream and special schools is currently top sliced from the HNB and allocated to schools by the ESFA.

3.4 From September 2019 there will be a change to these arrangements. From that date place funding for post 16 pupils in maintained mainstream, special schools and PRUs will be held within the HNB and allocated to schools by the Local Authority.

3.5 Any place funding which is held in the HNB for allocation by the Local Authority can potentially be transferred to other institutions which receive their planned place funding from the Local Authority, if it is deemed that planned place funding needs to be reallocated to meet needs in the local area.

3.6 The number and location of planned places currently agreed by the ESFA are shown below, together with proposed planned places for 2019-20 (although this requires further discussion) and also the actual places currently filled.

SCHOOL / INSTITUTION	Planned Places 2018/19	Planned Places 2019/20	Difference 18/19 & 19/20 Planned Places	ACTUAL Numbers Sept 18
Primary schools with special resources				
Fir Tree (ASD Resource)	5	5	0	4
Speenhamland (PD Resource)	10	10	0	7
The Winchcombe (Speech Lang Resource)	15	15	0	11
Theale Primary (ASD Resource)	10	10	0	9
Westwood Farm Infant (HI Resource)	5	5	0	5
Westwood Farm Junior (HI Resource)	5	5	0	4
Secondary (special resources / post 16 only)				
Denefield	0	0		0
John O'Gaunt	0	0		0
Kennet (inc. PD & HI Resource)	32	32	0	32
Little Heath	5	2	-3	3
Park House	2	2	0	2
St. Bartholomew's	2	2	0	2
The Downs	1	1	0	1
The Willink	2	2	0	2
Theale Green (inc. ASD Resource)	15	15	0	11
Trinity (inc. SpLD Resource and ASD Resource)	42	43	+1	42
Special schools				
Brookfields	218	218	0	220
The Castle	147	147	0	168
PRU Service	66	66	0	TBC
FE Colleges				
Newbury College	91	134	+43	144
West Berkshire Training Consortium	4	5	+1	5
Available for allocation		8		
TOTAL	677	722		

Schools / institutions which receive their planned place funding through the Local Authority

3.7 The ESFA will base 2019/20 planned place funding on the place funding allocated for 2018/19 for schools which receive their planned place funding through the Local Authority. There will be no opportunity for Local Authorities to request additional planned places for these schools, although it is possible to move places between schools.

3.8 Little Heath School has received 5 planned places for young people with EHCPs in the Sixth Form, based on historic data, but is only likely to have 2 young people in this category in September 2019, so these surplus places could be reallocated from September 2019 when this funding comes under the control of the Local Authority. This would give 3 planned places to allocate.

3.9 A decision will need to be taken on how these places are reallocated. There is a shortfall in planned place funding for Brookfields and The Castle special schools. This is most significant at The Castle School, although there are also children waiting for places at Brookfields who cannot be admitted because of the shortage of planned places. Where children are admitted to the special schools over and above planned places, these places are funded at £7,500 per place (not £10,000) and the funding is taken from the special school top up budget. This has been allowed for in the 2019-20 special school planned place budget.

3.10 The speech and language resource at The Winchcombe School currently has 11 pupils and has 15 planned places. Consideration will need to be given to the possibility of reducing planned places in 2019-20, which would free up additional planned places for allocation to the special schools.

Schools / institutions which receive their planned place funding from the ESFA (top sliced from HNB)

3.11 The Fir Tree ASD Resource is growing in size and will have more pupils in September 2018. It is currently unclear what the numbers will be in September 2018, so a request has not been made to the ESFA for additional planned places. The school will be paid planned place funding for any pupils above the planned place number of 5. Some allowance has been made for this in the resourced schools (academies) top up budget.

3.12 Trinity will have an additional pupil in 2019-20, so one additional place has been requested from the ESFA. If agreed, this will be top sliced from the HNB.

3.13 West Berkshire Training Consortium has 5 students with EHCPs and will continue to have 5 students in September 2019, so one additional place has been requested from the ESFA. If agreed, this will be top sliced from the HNB.

3.14 New regulations require Local Authorities to fund all places for high needs students at FE Colleges within their area, regardless of where the students are resident and which Local Authority has financial responsibility for them. An annual import/ export adjustment will be made to the 2019-20 HNB to reflect planned places which West Berkshire has funded for students from other Local Authorities (as well as planned places for West Berkshire students which has been paid by other Local Authorities).

3.15 It has therefore been necessary to request from the ESFA an additional 43 places for Newbury College. If agreed, this will be top sliced from the HNB. This top slice will be offset by the import / export adjustment, but there may be (as in 2018-19) a shortfall. It is not possible to predict this at present.

3.16 Newbury College currently has 144 high needs students. It is difficult to predict how many high needs students they will have in September 2019. 134 places have been requested in case 2019 numbers are lower than current numbers.

4. Proposals

4.1 See above.

5. Consultation and Engagement

5.1 Schools were asked to confirm their numbers as being correct.

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

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Amin Hussain

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the overall calculation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2019/20, and the current position for each of the funding blocks.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To note the overall position of the draft 2019/20 budgets.

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 DSG consists of 4 funding blocks:
- Schools
 - Central Schools Services
 - Early Years
 - High Needs.
- 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 Funding can be transferred between blocks but there is a restriction of 0.5% for the transfer between the Schools Block and the High Needs Block. All transfers are subject to Schools Forum approvals.
- 3.4 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. Overall Position

4.1 Table 1 summarises for 2018/19 and 2019/20 the estimated DSG funding to be received for each funding block, and the estimated expenditure. Detailed breakdowns on the funding calculation is contained in Appendix A, and expenditure per service within each block is set out in Appendix B. Note that this is an early draft, and only provides an indication of the likely position.

5. Schools Block

5.1 The final funding for 2019/20 will be determined by the October 2018 pupil numbers multiplied by West Berkshire's primary and secondary units of funding. Based on the October 2017 census the total amount is £98.6m made up of:

- Primary Unit of Funding £3.9k x 13,313 = £51.9m
- Secondary Unit of Funding £4.9k x 9,129 = £45m
- Allowance for business rates = £1.5m
- Allowance for growth = £0.2m

5.2 The 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, the above number is notional.

5.3 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 schools have been consulted on the formula and this is the subject of a separate report in this agenda.

5.4 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.

6. Central Schools Services Block

6.1 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.

6.2 The Council's Executive had agreed to meet the statutory and regulatory duties costs in 2018/19, this was a one year only decision and there will be a requirement to find significant savings in this block in 2019/20.

6.3 If costs in the 2019/20 budget remain the same there will be a shortfall by the end of the year and it is being reviewed by Council as to how the 2019/20 shortfall will be addressed.

6.4 Further details and proposals on this block will be brought to a later meeting of the Schools' Forum.

7. Early Years Block

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 The impact of funding allocated for the additional 15 hours against actual take up will also need to be managed, as will allocations for pupil premium grant and the Disability Access Fund.
- 7.4 The fixed sum allocation for maintained nursery schools has been guaranteed until 2019/20, but there is no news yet on what will happen beyond this date.
- 7.5 All providers will need to be on a single rate in 2019/20.
- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 It is currently too early to make an accurate forecast for the current year, and funding for next year will need to be based on the January 2019 census. A more detailed report containing latest estimates will be brought to a later meeting of the Schools' Forum.

8. High Needs Block

- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 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.
- 8.3 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.

- Hospital funding (£45,450) – based on 18/19 budget uplifted per the grant allocation table

- 8.4 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.
- 8.5 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. Since the High needs Block is showing a significant over spend this does not now seem possible.
- 8.6 The budget setting assumes no transfers from other Blocks, however the National Funding Formula does 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. £490k. This would go some way to addressing the deficit position for 2019/20 but does not address the underlying problem of funding within the High Needs Block.
- 8.7 Initial indications are that the demand in terms of numbers of high needs pupils and unit costs of provision is continuing to rise, and savings will need to be found once again in order to prevent a growing deficit in this block.
- 8.8 Another report on this matter will set out in detail the possible options for making savings which will be brought to a later meeting of the Schools' Forum.

Gross DSG Funding Calculation - Budget Estimate for 2019/20 - V1			
	2018/19 Revised Budget	Year End forecast	Draft 1 Budget 2019/20
SCHOOLS BLOCK	Oct '17 census		Oct '17 census
Pupil Numbers			
School Census - Mainstream Primary	13,313		13,312.5
School Census - Mainstream Secondary	9,133		9,128.0
Add: Reception Uplift			
Less: Pupils/Places in Resource Units			
Total Pupil numbers	22,446.0		22,446.0
DSG Primary Unit of Funding	£3,874.53		£3,898.74
DSG Secondary Unit of Funding	£4,924.85		£4,936.23
DSG Primary based on pupil numbers	£51,581,618		£51,902,019
DSG Secondary based on pupil numbers	£44,978,655		£45,057,887
Growth Funding	£202,000		£202,000
Rates Funding	£1,248,663		£1,464,180
In Year DSG Allocation	£98,010,936	£98,010,936	£98,626,085
TRANSFER TO/FROM other Funding Blocks	£0		£0
Transfer -to/from reserves			£17,905
Total Schools Block	98,010,936	98,010,936	98,643,990
Schools Block Forecast Reserve	0	-93,786	-93,786
Forecast increase to reserve	-93,786		0
Forecast use of reserve			17,905
Balance	-93,786	-93,786	-75,881
	2018/19 Revised Budget	Year End forecast	Draft 1 Budget 2019/20
CENTRAL SCHOOL SERVICES BLOCK			Oct '17 census
Pupil Numbers			
School Census - Mainstream	22,446.0		22,446.00
DSG CSSB Unit of Funding	£44.22		£43.11
In Year DSG Allocation	£992,562	£992,562	£967,647
TRANSFER TO/FROM other Funding Blocks	£60,000	£60,000	£0
Transfer -to/from reserves			£26,550
Total Central School Services Block	1,052,562	1,052,562	994,197
Central Schools Services Block Forecast Reserve	0	-26,550	-26,550
Forecast increase to reserve	-26,550		0
Forecast use of reserve			26,550
Balance	-26,550	-26,550	0
	2018/19 Revised Budget	Year End forecast	Draft 1 Budget 2019/20
EARLY YEARS BLOCK (Provisional)	Jan 2018 census		Jan 2018 census
Total Early Years Block	9,609,432	9,609,432	10,209,585
Early Years Block Forecast Reserve	0	37,074	37,074
Forecast increase to reserve			-37,074
Forecast use of reserve	37,074		0
Balance	37,074	37,074	0
	2018/19 Revised Budget	Year End forecast	First Draft Budget 2019/20
HIGH NEEDS BLOCK			
Previous Year High Needs Budget	17,004,142		19,631,232
Adjustments:			
Hospital tuition			45,450
Remove resource unit funding			
Remove pupil number element			-2,573,661
Adjust to funding floor + 0.5%			
Baseline Funding			17,103,021
Per Pupil Adjustments			
Special School Rate	£4,209		£4,209.00
Special School Numbers	429		429
Import/Export Rate	£6,000		£6,000.00
Import/Export Numbers (PROVISIONAL)	128		128
Pupil Number Allocation	£2,573,635		£2,573,661
In Year DSG Allocation	19,577,777	19,461,107	19,676,682
TRANSFER TO/FROM other Funding Blocks	-£27,000	-£27,000	
Transfer -to/from reserves		£116,670	-£979,255
Total High Needs Block	19,550,777	19,550,777	18,697,427
High Needs Block Forecast Reserve	0	546,895	979,255
Forecast increase to reserve			-979,255
Forecast use of reserve	546,895	432,360	0
Balance	546,895	979,255	0
	2018/19 Revised Budget	Year End forecast	Draft 1 Budget 2019/20
TOTAL In YEAR DSG FUNDING	128,223,707	128,107,037	129,517,073
Total increase to Reserves	-£120,336	£0	-£1,016,329
Total use of reserves	£583,969	£432,360	£44,455
Prior Year Adjustment to funding	£0		£0
	£463,633	£432,360	-£971,874
TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	128,687,340	128,539,397	128,545,199

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

Appendix B

DSG Budget for 2019/20 - Version 1														
B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
Description	Cost Centre	Agresso 2018/19 Original Budget	In Year Virements from SF agreement	Agresso 2018/19 Revised Budget	add back SSRs	add back HN 6th form & academy recoupment	add back De-Delegations	Gross Revised 2018-19 Budget	Technical DSG Adjustments by DfE	Remove "one-off" Budgets or FYE	Base Budget 2019-20	Budget Adjustments (staffing/contracts)	Change in relation to expected demand	Draft Budget 2019-20
Schools Block														
Primary Schools (excluding nursery funding)	90020	48,786,120		48,786,120			634,100	49,420,220			49,420,220		364,628	49,784,848
Academy Schools Primary	DSG top slice	0		0		3,125,920		3,125,920			3,125,920		21,609	3,147,529
Secondary Schools (excluding 6th form funding)	90025	14,784,820		14,784,820				14,875,900			14,875,900		95,303	14,971,203
Academy Schools Secondary	DSG top slice	0		0		30,286,300		30,286,300			30,286,300		238,057	30,524,357
DD - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary)	90230	120,020	259,100	379,120			-120,020	259,100		-259,100	0			0
DD - Trade Union Costs	90113	43,680		43,680	4,760		-48,440	0			0			0
DD - Support to Ethnic minority & bilingual	90255	151,750	38,300	190,050	21,720		-173,470	38,300		-38,300	0			0
DD - Behaviour Support Services	90349	196,830	17,190	214,020	20,940		-217,770	17,190		-17,190	0			0
DD - CLEAPSS	90424	3,170		3,170			-3,170	0			0			0
DD - School Improvement	90470	0		0				0			0			0
DD - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	90423	147,590		147,590	14,720		-162,310	0			0			0
School Contingency - Growth Fund	90235	205,000	72,710	277,710				277,710		-75,710	202,000			202,000
Schools Block Total Expenditure		64,438,980	387,300	64,826,280	62,140	33,412,220	0	98,300,640	0	-390,300	97,910,340	0	719,597	98,629,937
Schools Block DSG		-64,501,120	-481,000	-64,982,120	-62,140	-33,412,220	0	-98,394,340	0	0	-98,394,340	0	-249,650	-98,643,990
SSR		62,140	0	62,140	-62,140	0	0	0	0	0	0	62,140	0	62,140
Balance Over/(Under) Spend		0	-83,700	-83,700	0	0	0	-83,700	0	-390,300	-484,000	62,140	469,947	48,087
Central School Services Block														
National Copyright Licences	90583	159,610		159,610				159,610			159,610		-23,280	136,330
Servicing of Schools Forum	90019	43,580		43,580	26,750			70,330			70,330		1,350	42,350
School Admissions	90743	244,860		244,860	71,330			316,190			316,190		5,930	234,740
ESG - Education Welfare	90354	201,900		201,900	71,330			273,230			273,230		3,110	205,000
ESG - Asset Management	90422	0		0				0			0			0
ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	90460	197,540		197,540	35,660			233,200			233,200		99,630	332,830
Central School Services Block Total Expenditure		847,490	0	847,490	205,070	0	0	1,052,560	0	0	1,052,560	-12,890	-88,420	951,250
Central School Services Block DSG		-1,052,560	-26,000	-1,078,560	-205,070	0	0	-1,078,560	0	0	-1,078,560	84,363	-984,197	-984,197
SSR		205,070	0	205,070	-205,070	0	0	0	0	0	0	205,070	0	205,070
Balance Over/(Under) Spend		0	-26,000	-26,000	0	0	0	-26,000	0	0	-26,000	276,543	-88,420	162,123
Early Years Block														
Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	90010	876,070		876,070				876,070			876,070			876,070
Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	90037	1,269,090		1,269,090				1,269,090			1,269,090			1,269,090
Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	90036	6,199,460		6,199,460				6,199,460			6,199,460			6,199,460
Additional 15 hours		0		0				0			0			0
Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	90052	48,280		48,280				48,280			48,280			48,280
Disability Access Fund	90051	23,370		23,370				23,370			23,370			23,370
2 year old funding	90018	719,480		719,480				719,480			719,480			719,480
Central Expenditure on Children under 5	90017	223,300		223,300	35,360			258,660			258,660		13,510	272,170
Pre School Teacher Counselling	90287	45,000		45,000	14,140			59,140			59,140			59,140
Early Years Inclusion Fund	90238	75,000		75,000				75,000			75,000			75,000
Support Service Recharges		0		0				0			0			0
Early Years Block Total Expenditure		9,479,050	0	9,479,050	49,500	0	0	9,528,550	0	0	9,528,550	13,510	0	9,542,060
Early Years Block DSG		-9,576,410	84,000	-9,492,410	-49,500	0	0	-9,492,410	0	0	-9,492,410	49,500	-717,175	-10,209,585
SSR		49,500	0	49,500	-49,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	49,500	0	49,500
Balance Over/(Under) Spend		-47,860	84,000	36,140	0	0	0	36,140	0	0	36,140	63,010	-717,175	-618,025
High Needs Block														
Special Schools - Place Funding Pre 16	90540	2,860,000		2,860,000				2,860,000			2,860,000		0	2,860,000
Special Schools - Place Funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0		0		790,000		790,000			790,000		0	790,000
Special Schools - Top Up Funding	90539	3,300,420		3,300,420				3,300,420			3,300,420		160,490	3,460,910
Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	90548	1,098,070		1,098,070				1,098,070			1,098,070		-176,840	921,230
Resource Units - Place Funding Maintained Pre	90584	242,000		242,000				242,000			242,000		-32,000	210,000
Resource Units - Place Funding Academies Pre	DSG top slice	0		0		599,830		599,830			599,830		-23,830	576,000
Mainstream - Place funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0		0		40,000		40,000			40,000		-10,000	30,000
Academies - Place Funding Post 16	DSG top slice	0		0		80,000		80,000			80,000		-2,000	78,000
Resource Units - Top Up Funding Maintained	90617	293,020		293,020				293,020			293,020		-46,960	246,060
Resource Units - Top Up Funding Academies	90026	854,270		854,270				854,270			854,270		109,920	964,190
Non WBC Resource Units - Top Up Funding	90618	107,000		107,000				107,000			107,000		53,190	160,190
Mainstream - Top Up Funding Maintained	90621	541,560		541,560				541,560			541,560		94,580	636,140
Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	90622	185,170		185,170				185,170			185,170		80,320	265,490
Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	90624	75,000		75,000				75,000			75,000		-8,300	66,700
Pupil Referral Units - Place Funding	90320	660,000		660,000				660,000			660,000		0	660,000
Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	90625	542,950		542,950				542,950			542,950		214,750	757,700
Pupil Referral Units - Top Up EHCP Pupils	90628	0		0				0			0		331,400	331,400
Non WBC PRUs - Top Up Funding	90626	0		0				0			0		0	0
Non Maintained Special School Top Up	90575	840,100		840,100				840,100			840,100		122,120	962,220
Independent Special School Place & Top Up	90579	2,436,400		2,436,400				2,436,400			2,436,400		192,320	2,628,720
Further Education Colleges Top Up	90580	1,396,140		1,396,140				1,396,140			1,396,140		-20,960	1,375,180
Further Education - Place Funding	DSG top slice	0		0		570,000		570,000			570,000		288,000	858,000
LAL Funding	90555	82,400		82,400				82,400			82,400		16,000	98,400
HN Outreach Special schools	90585	50,000		50,000				50,000			50,000			50,000
HN Outreach PRU	90582	61,200		61,200				61,200			61,200			61,200
Disproportionate No. of HN pupils	90627	100,000		100,000				100,000			100,000			100,000
Applied Behaviour Analysis (APB)	90240	75,000		75,000				75,000			75,000		15,820	90,820
Special Needs Support Team (CALT)	90280	319,170		319,170	70,714			389,884			389,884		-64,224	325,660
Elective Home Education Monitoring	90288	27,990		27,990	7,072			35,062			35,062		-6822	28,240
Sensory Impairment	90290	172,750		172,750	7,072			179,822			179,822		60,178	240,000
Home Tuition	90315	245,000		245,000	7,071			252,071			252,071		-7,071	245,000
Equipment For SEN Pupils	90565	0	10,000	10,000				10,000		-10,000	0		10,000	
SEN Commissioned Provision (Engaging)	90577	456,000		456,000	7,071			463,071			463,071		84,079	527,150
ASD Teachers (Advisory Service)	90830	141,550		141,550	21,214			162,764			162,764		-16,554	146,210
Vulnerable Children	90961	50,000		50,000				50,000			50,000			50,000
Therapy Services (Area Health Contract)	90295	240,760		240,760	7,076			247,836			247,836		13,639	261,475
Hospital Tuition	90610	45,000		45,000				45,000			45,000		-9,000	36,000
Early Development & Inclusion Team														

High Needs Block Budget 2019/20

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Ian Pearson, Michelle Sancho, Jane Seymour

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report sets out the current financial position of the high needs budget for 2018/19 and the position known so far for 2019/20, including the likely shortfall.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 To note the predicted shortfall and request a further report on options for savings to meet the shortfall in HNB funding for 2019-20.

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 Setting a balanced budget for the High Needs Block continues to be a challenge; funding received for this block has only seen minimal increases for several years, yet the demand in terms of numbers of high needs pupils and unit costs of provision has continued to rise. Place funding has remained static in spite of increasing numbers, and in 2015/16 local authorities took on responsibility for students up to the age of 25 with SEND in FE colleges without the appropriate funding to cover the actual cost. The number of children with EHCPs is increasing, mainly, but not entirely due to the change in age range up to 25 years.

3.2 Up until 2016-17, West Berkshire was setting a balanced high needs budget. Since then, the budget has been under pressure on an annual basis, with savings identified each year to reduce the overspend. A decision was made to set a deficit budget for the first time in 2016/17.

3.3 Savings of £219k were implemented in 2017/18 and a further £306k in 2018/19. Despite these savings a budget was set in 2018/19 which included a planned overspend of £703k. This budgeted over spend has been revised to **£447k** as a result of a better than forecast deficit brought forward from 2017/18.

3.4 The pressure on the high needs block is a national issue, and many local authorities have significant over spends and have also set deficit budgets. South East regional benchmarking data shows that in West Berkshire overspending on the HNB as a % of the total HNB budget is one of the lowest in the region, but nevertheless it is an issue of ongoing concern.

3.5 Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 in Appendix A show where the predicted 2019-20 costs exceed 2018-19 budgets.

3.6 The net shortfall in the 2019-20 HNB budget, as estimated at this stage, is £2.5m. This includes an overspend of £870k which is forecast to be transferred to reserves in 2018/19 and paid back in of £870K in the next financial year.

3.7 Details of the services paid for from the high needs budget and the corresponding budget information are set out in Appendix A, together with an explanation of the reasons for budget increases.

4. Summary Financial Position

4.1 The latest estimate of expenditure in the High Needs Block budget for both 2018/19 and 2019/20 is set out in Table 1. This is first draft stage, and will be refined over the next few months, particularly in relation to the largest variable element, which is top up funding. The figures are based on all services continuing at current staffing levels and contract costs, with no change in the funding rates for top ups and the current/known number and funding level of pupils.

4.1 Most of the DSG allocation for the high needs block is now confirmed. Part of it is estimated and will be based on the actual number of pupils in special schools in the October 2018 census, and import/export adjustments based on the January 2019 census and February 2019 ILR. A funding increase of 1% on the 2017 baseline is expected in 2019/20.

TABLE 1	2018/19 Budget £	2018/19 Forecast £	2019/20 Estimate £	2020/21 Estimate £
Place Funding	5,841,830	5,841,830	6,080,000	6,080,000
Top Up Funding	11,227,150	11,054,830	11,787,030	11,787,030
PRU Funding (top ups only)	542,950	882,700	1,089,100	1,089,100
Other Statutory Services	1,262,500	1,406,050	1,438,680	1,438,060
Non Statutory Services	774,320	780,120	801,470	801,470
Support Service Recharges	127,290	127,290	127,290	127,290
Total Expenditure	19,776,040	20,092,820	21,323,570	21,322,950
HNB DSG Allocation – confirmed	-19,664,777	-19,557,777		
HNB DSG Allocation - estimated			-19,676,682	-19,676,682
Transfers to Other Blocks	27,000	27,000		
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	308,635	308,635	870,678	2,517,566
Total DSG Funding	-19,329,142	-19,222,142	-18,806,004	-17,159,116
Shortfall	446,898	870,678	2,517,566	4,163,834

4.2 There is a forecast shortfall of **£2.5m** in the 2019/20 HNB which may change as the budgets are finalised. The position will be clearer at the time of the next report to the Heads Funding Group / Schools Forum, both in terms of the 2018-19 out turn ie over spend and also the 2019-20 budget requirements. However, there will be a significant shortfall in the budget which will need to be addressed.

4.3 Appendix A sets out the detail of the budgets included within the High Needs Block, and the reasons for the pressure on the 2019-20 HNB budget.

4.4 Options available in order to make savings will be considered in more detail at the next meeting of the Heads Funding Group / Schools Forum.

5. Appendices

Appendix A

High Needs Budget Detail

1. PLACE FUNDING – STATUTORY

- 1.1 Place funding is agreed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and has to be passed on to the institution, forming their base budget. Academy and post 16 places are included in the initial HNB allocation but the agreed place numbers are then deducted and paid to the institution direct (DSG top slice). From 2018/19 pre 16 resource unit place funding is reduced from £10,000 to £6,000 per place, and each pupil within the unit is included in the main school formula funding allocation.
- 1.2 The ESFA will not fund any overall increases to places. If additional places are needed in academies or post 16 institutions, a request can be made to the ESFA. However, any additional places agreed would be top sliced from West Berkshire's HNB allocation in 2019-20.
- 1.3 Requests have been made for the following:
 - 1 additional place at West Berkshire Training Consortium to reflect actual student numbers
 - 1 additional place at the Trinity ASD Resource to reflect actual pupil numbers.
 - 43 additional places at Newbury College to reflect actual student numbers.
- 1.4 The reason it has been necessary to request a significant increase in planned places for Newbury College is that new regulations require the Local Authority in which an FE College is based to pay for planned places for all students with high needs, regardless of where they are resident. An import / export adjustment will be made to the HNB in 2019-20 based on January census data, so this funding should be recouped from the relevant Local Authorities.
- 1.5 It should be noted that the Fir Tree ASD Resource continues to grow in size and is likely to need more than its current 5 planned places. Additional places have not been requested from the ESFA as it is not yet clear how many places will be needed for September 2018. Any additional places needed will be funded from the top up budgets.
- 1.6 The actual number of places occupied in West Berkshire's special schools is greater than the planned places which are funded. There continues to be an increase in demand for places in special schools. **Table 1** currently shows no increase to special school planned places, as there is no additional planned place funding to allocate unless there is surplus planned place funding in other institutions which can be reallocated. If no place funding can be released from other institutions, and if it is decided that additional planned places should be funded at the special schools, this is a pressure on the High Needs Block.

TABLE 1 – Place Funding Budgets	2018/19 Budget			2019/20 Estimate		
	No. of Places Funded by EFA	£	Current No. of Pupils	Proposed No. of Places Funded for 19/20	£	Difference in number of places
Special Schools – pre 16 (90540)	286	2,860,000	(296)	286	2,860,000	0
Special Schools – post 16 (DSG top slice)	79	790,000	(94)	79	790,000	0
Resource Units Maintained – pre 16 (90584)	35	242,000	(30)	35	210,000	0
Resource Units Academies – pre 16 (DSG top slice)	95	599,830	(89)	96	576,000	+1
Mainstream Maintained – post 16	8	40,000	(5)	5	30,000	-3
Mainstream Academies – post 16 (DSG top slice)	13	80,000	(11)	13	78,000	0
Further Education	95	570,000	(149)	139	858,000	+44
PRU Place Funding (90320)	66	660,000	(66)	66	660,000	0
Available for allocation	0			3	18,000	+3
TOTAL	677	5,841,830	(740)	722	6,080,000	+45

2. TOP UP FUNDING – STATUTORY

2.1 Top up funding is paid to the institutions where we are placing pupils who live in West Berkshire (we do not pay our institutions top up funding for pupils who live outside West Berkshire). **Table 2** shows the budget and forecast for 2018/19 and the estimate for 2019/20.

TABLE 2	2017-18 Budget		2018-19 Budget			2019-20 Estimate	Difference 18-19 budget & 19-20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 07)	Over/(under) £	Estimate £	
Special Schools Maintained (90539)	3,237,280	3,262,595	3,300,420	3,359,080	58,660	3,460,910	160,490
Non WBC special schools (90548)	1,086,890	1,050,611	1,098,070	958,040	-140,030	921,230	-176,840
Resource Units Maintained (90617)	202,620	240,168	293,020	253,400	-39,620	246,060	-46,960
Resource Units Academies (90026)	768,370	723,750	854,270	822,190	-32,080	964,190	109,920
Resource Units Non WBC (90618)	55,000	105,340	107,000	147,260	40,260	160,190	53,190
Mainstream Maintained (90621)	534,010	574,177	541,560	632,280	90,720	636,140	94,580
Mainstream Academies (90622)	191,410	193,660	185,170	243,000	57,830	265,490	80,320

TABLE 2	2017-18 Budget		2018-19 Budget			2019-20 Estimate	Difference 18-19 budget & 19-20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 07)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Mainstream Non WBC (90624)	66,960	78,694	75,000	80,470	5,470	66,700	-8,300
Non Maintained Special Schools (90575)	891,130	717,499	840,100	807,650	-32,450	962,220	122,120
Independent Special Schools (90579)	2,012,700	1,954,571	2,436,400	2,384,930	-51,470	2,628,720	192,320
Further Education (90580)	1,309,980	1,155,852	1,396,140	1,293,060	-103,080	1,375,180	-20,960
Disproportionate HN Pupils (90627)	100,000	100,972	100,000	73,470	-26,530	100,000	0
TOTAL	10,456,350	10,157,889	11,227,150	11,054,830	-172,320	11,787,030	559,880

2.2 Most top up budgets are under pressure, with the type of placement creating the greatest pressure shown below in order of cost.

- Independent special schools
- West Berkshire maintained special schools
- Non maintained special schools
- Resourced units in academies

2.3 The predictions of cost for 2019-20 take in to account known pupils whose needs can no longer be met in local schools, together with some cases which are due to go to the SEND Tribunal. It is not possible to predict all pupils who may need placements in 2019/20. The figures assume a middle ground between the best case scenario and the worst case scenario (financially) in terms of Tribunal outcomes.

2.4 Independent and non maintained special schools

Both of these budgets are currently underspent, but will be under pressure in 2019-20. This is partly due to the full year costs of placements made during 2018-19 hitting the budget in 2019-20. There was also one case upheld by the SEND Tribunal with an annual cost of over £100,000. Pressure continues to be mainly for SEMH and ASD placements, plus some HI placements.

2.5 West Berkshire maintained special schools

This pressure reflects both increasing numbers in our special schools and the need to compensate for inadequate planned place funding through the top up budget.

2.6 Resourced units in academies

This pressure is mainly due to numbers at Trinity and Fir Tree ASD resources growing, as planned. These additional pupils may have been otherwise placed in more expensive special school placements. In fact it is likely that the decrease in non

West Berkshire special school placement costs is partly attributable to the increasing numbers in these provisions.

2.7 EHCPs in maintained mainstream schools and academies

There is also pressure on the budgets for EHCPs in mainstream schools (both maintained and academies). This relates more to an increase in the average cost of an EHCP in a mainstream school, rather than a very significant increase in overall numbers of EHCPs.

2.8 Non West Berkshire resourced units

This increase is mainly created by increasing use of an ASD Resource in Bracknell for young people whose needs cannot be met in our own ASD Resourced units. These placements are more cost effective than specialist ASD school placements.

2.9 Non West Berkshire special schools

Costs against this budget have been going down, due to two pupils leaving a special free school, one to be electively home educated and one to attend a PRU. Additionally, two pupils have been placed at the Fir Tree and Trinity ASD Resources who would otherwise have attended a special free school.

2.10 Resourced units in West Berkshire maintained schools

These costs have been reducing slightly, due to smaller numbers than expected in the Winchcombe Speech and Language Resource and some movement of children out of the West Berkshire area from other resourced units.

2.11 FE Colleges

There is a current underspend of £103,080 on this cost centre. This is due to three post 16 high needs pupils being supported in alternative provision. However this needs to be treated with caution as FE Colleges are only just returning their 18-19 student numbers. We are not recommending reducing this budget by as much as £103K as we are predicting three possible Independent Specialist FE Placements September 2019. Based on current predictions, the recommendation is that this budget is reduced by £20,960.

We are looking to open a new post 19 provision in conjunction with the Castle School. The course would be a supported internship with the aim that pupils on the course move into employment after one year. The top up effect should be neutral as the pupils would have received equivalent top up at FE College.

2.12 EHCPs in Non West Berkshire mainstream schools

These costs should be slightly reduced next year due to two pupils in non West Berkshire mainstream schools moving to special schools. However, it is a budget which is based on a small group of pupils and can fluctuate significantly.

3. PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS (PRU) – STATUTORY

3.1 **Table 3** shows the budgets for PRU top ups.

TABLE 3 PRU Budgets	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 07)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
PRU Top Up Funding (90625)	875,870	1,086,906	542,950	757,700	214,750	757,700	214,750
PRU EHCP Pupils (90628)	0	0	0	125,000	125,000	331,400	331,400
Non WBC PRU Top Up Funding (90626)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	875,870	1,086,906	542,950	882,700	339,750	1,089,100	546,150

3.2 The current year budget was based on schools making an agreed 80% contribution for pupils that they placed. Permanent exclusions and sixth form are funded 100% by the High Needs Block less the average pupil led funding contribution recovered from schools. The estimate for 19/20 PRU Top Up Funding is based on the current year forecast as at period 7. The 18/19 forecast is based on an estimate of the current mix of placements. Further details can be found in a separate report.

3.3 The number of pupils with EHCPs being placed in PRUs is increasing as this can be an appropriate and cost effective provision for some young people. Under the new funding arrangements for PRUs these placements have to be funded from the SEN budget. Our estimate of these costs is £331,400 for 2019-20. However, these placements are more cost effective than independent and non maintained special school placements.

4. OTHER STATUTORY SERVICES

4.1 **Table 4** details the budgets for other statutory services.

TABLE 4 Other Statutory Services	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 07)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Applied Behaviour Analysis (90240)	76,000	52,850	75,000	96,580	21,580	90,820	15,820
Sensory Impairment (90290)	215,710	221,312	172,750	246,330	73,580	240,000	67,250
Engaging Potential (90577)	455,160	456,177	456,000	492,680	36,680	527,150	71,150

TABLE 4 Other Statutory Services	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 07)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Equipment for SEN Pupils (90565)	10,000	3,397	0	0	0	10,000	10,000
Therapy Services (90295)	267,460	266,257	240,760	261,470	20,710	261,470	20,710
Elective home Education Monitoring (90288)	27,660	23,482	27,990	27,990	0	28,240	250
Home Tuition Service (90315)	345,000	320,100	245,000	245,000	0	245,000	0
Hospital Tuition (90610)	45,000	1,646	45,000	36,000	-9,000	36,000	-9,000
TOTAL	1,441,990	1,345,221	1,262,500	1,406,050	143,550	1,438,680	176,180

4.2 Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA)

4.2.1 This budget supports a small number of children with EHC Plans for whom the Authority has agreed an ABA programme. ABA is an intensive intervention programme for children with autism which aims to modify behaviours which are typical of ASD in order to allow children to function more successfully in school and in society.

4.2.2 This budget also covers the cost of children with EHC Plans accessing other bespoke educational packages where this is the most appropriate and cost effective way of meeting their needs including SEN Personal Budgets.

4.2.3 The increase in costs represents a small number of children with ASD and high levels of anxiety who were school refusers and required a bespoke package to support elective home education provided by parents.

4.3 Sensory Impairment

4.3.1 Support for children with hearing, visual and multi sensory impairments is purchased from the Berkshire Sensory Consortium Service. This includes support from qualified teachers of HI and VI, audiology and mobility support.

4.3.2 This budget is under pressure because of an increase in the number of children with severe hearing and visual impairments who require a high level of visits from teachers of the deaf / visually impaired.

In 2017 there were 154 in total on the caseload (HI and VI combined). This included both children with and without EHCPs. In 2018 there were 175 on the caseload, an increase of 21 or 14%. What is even more significant is the increase (within the overall increase) of children with severe and profound HI or VI who need the highest level of support on the Sensory Consortium Service matrix. In particular, there has been an increase from 6 to 15 children with very severe VI – these children need an extremely high level of support (eg, braille teaching) to be maintained in mainstream schools. They would obviously be much more costly if placed in specialist VI schools.

4.4 Engaging Potential

4.4.1 Engaging Potential is an independent special school commissioned to provide alternative educational packages for 14 young people in Key Stage 4. Students placed at Engaging Potential are those who have Statements or EHC Plans for social, emotional and mental health difficulties and whose needs cannot be met in any other provision. This can include young people who have been excluded from specialist SEMH schools. The unit cost of a place represents good value for money compared to other independent schools for SEMH which typically start at around £70K per annum. The increase in cost for 2019-20 relates to reduced income for young people placed by other Local Authorities.

4.5 Equipment for SEN Pupils

4.5.1 This budget used to fund large items of equipment such as specialist chairs and communication aids for pupils with EHC Plans. The budget has been reduced a number of times in previous HNB savings programmes and was removed entirely in 2018-19 on the basis that schools would meet these costs. However, this created a pressure for nurseries as they do not have delegated SEN budgets, and for resourced schools which have a disproportionate number of children with specialist equipment needs. It was agreed in 2018-19 that a one of amount of £10,000 would be made available to meet these needs. It is recommended that a £10,000 per annum budget is restored for this purpose.

4.6 Therapy Services (Contract with Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust)

4.6.1 The therapy services budget covers the costs for children with SEN who have speech and language therapy or occupational therapy in their EHC Plans.

4.6.2 Therapy services are provided by the Authority solely to children who have the need for a service stipulated and quantified in their EHC Plan. It is a statutory duty for the Local Authority to provide these therapies in these circumstances.

4.6.3 A number of reductions have been made to this budget in previous HNB savings programmes. In 2018-19 this budget was reduced in anticipation of a 10% reduction in the contract cost but only a 5% reduction was achieved, so there is a pressure for 2019-20.

4.7 Elective Home Education Monitoring

4.7.1 The elective home education monitoring service consists of one part time teacher who monitors children who are electively home educated. There is a statutory duty to monitor arrangements for EHE made by parents. Elective Home Education numbers are growing, both locally and nationally.

4.8 Home Tuition

4.8.1 The Home Tuition Service is a statutory service providing home tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full-time school. It is currently commissioned by WBC from the iCollege which provides all management.

4.8.2 A report on proposed changes to this service will be brought to the next cycle of meetings.

4.9 Hospital Tuition

4.9.1 Hospital tuition is a recent addition to HNB funding. WBC is now obliged to pay the educational element of specialist hospital placements, usually for severe mental

health issues. These placements are decided by NHS colleagues and we have little influence over the placement or duration of stay. We are negotiating with the settings to ensure we are only charged for the education a young person actually receives and would benefit from. As numbers and costs are impossible to predict, it is proposed that the 2019-20 budget is based on the 2018-19 projected spend.

5. NON STATUTORY Services

5.1 **Table 5** details the non statutory service budgets for 2017/18, 2018/19 and estimates for 2019/20. The latest forecast is that in the majority of cases these budgets should be on-line, other than the LAL Service (see paragraph 5.3 below). These services are non statutory so there is more potential scope to make savings, although a reduction in any of these budgets is likely to increase pressure on statutory budgets.

5.2 The table shows the budget for these services in 2019/20 assuming that the services continue and there are no changes to staffing levels.

5.3 The LAL budget was reduced by 50% in 2018-19 on the basis that schools would pay 50% of the cost of these places. As a result of charging being introduced, referrals to LALs reduced for the first time. Only 33 of 48 places were taken up, resulting in a shortfall in income. Assuming that the status quo remains, and charging continues at 50% in 2019-20, and assuming that the rate of take up would be similar next year to this, there would be a shortfall of approximately £16,000 in 2019-20.

TABLE 5 Non Statutory Services	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Language and Literacy Centres LALs (90555)	116,200	116,200	82,400	91,700	9,300	98,400	16,000
Specialist Inclusion Support Service (90585)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	0
PRU Outreach Service (90582)	77,000	77,000	61,200	61,200	0	61,200	0
SEN Pre School Children (90238)	In Early Years Block	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cognition & Learning Team (90280)	311,840	314,449	319,170	315,670	-3,500	325,660	6,490
ASD Advisory Service (90830)	139,560	139,567	141,550	141,550	0	146,210	4,660
Vulnerable Children (90961)	63,980	63,980	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	0
Early Development and Inclusion Team (90287)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	40,000	0

Dingley's Promise (90581)	0	0	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	0
TOTAL	798,580	801,196	774,320	780,120	5,800	801,470	27,150

5.4 Language and Literacy Centres (LALs)

5.4.1 This budget funds the primary LALs at Theale and Winchcombe schools. The LALs provide intensive literacy support for primary children with severe specific literacy difficulties. 48 places per year are available across the two LALs.

5.4.2 See also paragraph 5.3 above.

5.5 Specialist Inclusion Support Service

5.5.1 This service provides outreach support from West Berkshire's special schools to mainstream schools to support the inclusion of children with learning and complex needs in their local mainstream schools.

5.5.2 This budget has been subject to reductions in the previous financial years with the special schools providing the service absorbing the cost.

5.6 PRU Outreach

5.6.1 The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy / outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the iCollege and are starting to attend a mainstream school. Schools may request Outreach for any pupil causing concern but it is dependent on capacity.

5.7 SEN Pre School Children

5.7.1 This budget provides one to one support to enable children with SEN to access non maintained and voluntary pre- school settings.

5.8 Cognition and Learning Team

5.8.1 The Cognition and Learning Team (CALT) provides advice, support and training to mainstream schools to help them to meet the needs of children with SEN. Staff are experienced SENCOs with higher level SEN qualifications.

5.8.2 Many primary schools are reliant on this service to supplement their own SEN provision and expertise, especially schools where the Head has to act as SENCO or where there is an inexperienced SENCO.

5.8.3 This is a partially traded service. All schools receive a small amount of free core service, but the majority of support now has to be purchased by schools.

5.9 ASD Advisory Service

5.9.1 The ASD Advisory Service provides advice, support and training for mainstream schools on meeting the needs of children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder. The purpose of the service is to enable children with ASD to be successfully included in mainstream schools wherever possible.

5.9.2 The context for this service is vastly increasing numbers of children with ASD diagnoses and mainstream schools having more and more difficulty meeting the needs of these children. The majority of our placements in non West Berkshire special schools, independent special schools and non maintained special schools are for children with ASD.

5.10 Vulnerable Children

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

5.10.2 The budget has gradually been reduced from £120K over the past few years. The criteria have strengthened, with funding allocated for shorter periods and fewer extensions. However this is a well used resource that helps schools support vulnerable pupils with complex needs.

5.11 Early Development and Inclusion Team

5.11.1 The service comprises of 1.7 teachers who are specialists in early years and SEND. Children under 5 who are identified by Health professionals as having significant SEND are referred to this service. Staff initially visit children in their homes (if they are not yet in an early years setting) in order to promote their educational development and model strategies and resources for parents to use to support their child's progress.

5.11.2 EDIT teachers also assist with the transition to early years settings and schools, providing support and training for staff to help them to meet the child's needs, and continuing to visit for a period of time to provide ongoing support and advice. They also help to coordinate support which the family is receiving from other professionals.

5.11.3 The service is currently supporting approximately 100 children. It has been reduced in size in recent years from 3.4 to 1.7 staff.

5.12 Dingley's Promise

5.12.1 Dingley's Promise is a charitable organisation which provides pre school provision for children under 5 with SEND in West Berkshire, Reading and Wokingham. It is the only specialist early years SEND setting in the private, voluntary and independent early years sector in West Berkshire. It provides an alternative to mainstream early years settings, where experience and expertise in SEND can vary greatly. Parents are able to take up their early years entitlement at Dingley's Promise, rather than at a mainstream early years setting, if they wish. However, Dingley's Promise are only able to claim the standard hourly rate for providing the early years entitlement as mainstream settings, in spite of offering specialist provision, higher ratios and more one to one support.

5.12.2 Historically, Reading and Wokingham Local Authorities gave grants to Dingley's Promise from their HNB budgets to top up the hourly rate, in recognition of their specialist offer, but West Berkshire did not. In 2017-18, the service was running at a loss and there was a risk it would cease to be viable in this area without some Council funding. Dingley's Promise as an organisation is active in funding raising and seeking grants but these sources of funding are unreliable. It was agreed in 2018-19 that a grant of £30,000 would be made to Dingley's Promise in order to maintain the service in this area.

5.12.3 An option would have been to place these children at our maintained special schools as an alternative to supporting Dingley's Promise, but this would have had the following disadvantages:

- We would still need to provide planned place and top up funding to the special school for these children

- This would increase numbers in our special schools both in the short term and the longer term, at a time when there is already significant pressure for places
- Parents may not yet be ready to consider special school for their child

5.12.4 If Dingley's Promise had closed, children may have been admitted to mainstream early years settings which might have struggled to meet their needs. Alternatively, parents may have chosen to keep them at home until they reached statutory school age, which could have result in primary schools receiving children with SEND who were ill prepared for the transition to school. Parents may also sought EHC Plans earlier than they might otherwise have done, with associated costs to the HNB budget.

This page is intentionally left blank

HNB Benchmarking

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Jane Seymour

Item for: Information **By:** All HFG members

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide comparative information on HNB spending across Local Authorities in the South East

2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 N/A

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

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1 The Forum has requested information on comparative spending on the High Needs Block across Local Authorities.
- 3.2 The spreadsheet attached at Appendix A shows West Berkshire's 2017-18 High Needs Block budgets compared to HNB budgets for the 19 other Local Authorities in the South East and compared to the South East average. This information comes from the DfE's HNB Benchmarking Tool. The data shows planned spend (ie. budget) as opposed to actual spend. This is the most up to date information on the HNB Benchmarking Tool. The information has not yet been updated for 2018-19.
- 3.3 HNB budgets are grouped in to 5 groups as follows:
- Planned places
 - Top up for maintained schools, academies, free schools and FE Colleges
 - Top up for non maintained and independent special schools
 - SEN Support Services
 - Alternative Provision
 - Hospital Education
- 3.4 Planned spend against each of these headings is shown as spend per head of the 2 to 18 year old population in the Local Authority.

- 3.5 The data should be treated with a degree of caution because of potential inaccuracy in data entry by Local Authorities, but gives a broad idea of comparative spend across Local Authorities.
- 3.6 The West Berkshire budget for **Planned Places** was £127 per head compared to a South East average of £126 per head. The range across the 19 Local Authorities in the South East was £84 to £173. West Berkshire has a relatively high planned place budget compared to other unitary authorities, mainly because we fund all of the places at Brookfields School even though less than half of them are occupied by West Berkshire children. However, this funding is effectively recouped through the import / export adjustment. Local Authorities with a high spend on planned places are likely to have a lower spend on non maintained and independent special school places as are they are maintaining more of their own in house provision.
- 3.7 The West Berkshire budget for **top up funding in maintained schools, academies, free schools and FE colleges** was £206 per head, slightly above the South East average of £196 per head, but below the England average of £216. The range across the South East was £86 to £297. More work would need to be done to disaggregate the components of the per head figure, which includes mainstream schools (both maintained and academy), special schools (both maintained and free) and FE Colleges. A high per head spend on this top up budget is not necessarily negative as it may correspond to a lower per head spend on non maintained and independent special schools.
- 3.8 West Berkshire's per head budget for **non maintained and independent special schools** was £122, slightly higher than the South East average of £111. The range was £21 to £189. West Berkshire's spend compares very favourably with spend in Wokingham, Bracknell and Windsor and Maidenhead, at £167, £182 and £189 respectively. However, spend in Reading and Slough is much lower at £85 and £21 respectively. There may be social and cultural factors involved in these discrepancies. More highly educated and affluent parents tend to prefer independent special schools to local provision and are more likely to appeal to the SEND Tribunal to obtain these placements, even though local provision can meet needs. Certain ethnic groups, on the other hand, have a strong preference for mainstream over special provision and this may partly account for the very low spend in Slough. Larger Local Authorities would be expected to have a lower per head spend as they are able to maintain more of their own provision. However, this is not consistently the case, with Buckinghamshire, East Sussex, Surrey and West Sussex all having a higher per head spend than West Berkshire and higher than the SE average. Some large county LAs do fit the expected pattern of a lower per head spend, for example, Hampshire, Kent and Oxfordshire. There are some unitaries with a lower per head spend than West Berkshire, including Brighton and Hove, Portsmouth and Southampton. This warrants further investigation. It would be useful to look at the mainstream to special school placement ratio for children with EHCPs in those areas to see whether greater inclusivity in mainstream schools is a factor. Brighton and Hove has a very high spend on SEN support services which might be helping to maintain more children in mainstream schools. It should be borne in mind that there are some factors unique to West Berkshire influencing this spend, including an exceptionally high number of children with ASD and the presence of Mary Hare School for the Deaf in Newbury which attracts children from all over the country.

- 3.9 The West Berkshire per head budget for **SEN Support Services** was £44, lower than the SE average of £52. The range was £14 to £101.
- 3.10 West Berkshire's per head budget for **Alternative Provision** was £15 compared to a SE average of £10. The range was from £0 to £29.
- 3.11 West Berkshire's per head budget for **Hospital Education** was £1 compared to a SE average of £2. The range was £0 to £16.
- 3.12 The West Berkshire **Therapies** budget shows in the Benchmarking Tool as £8 per head compared to a SE average of £3 per head and a range of £0 to £14 per head. This is the biggest discrepancy between West Berkshire and the SE average and needs further investigation. It is curious that 11 Local Authorities have reported £0 spend on therapies as there are very clear statutory duties on LAs to provide speech and language therapy and occupational therapy when it is written in to an EHCP Plan as an educational need. (It is rarely possible to argue that these therapies do not constitute an educational need as they are necessary to give access to the curriculum). It seems very unlikely that there are LAs who are not funding any therapies. Most of the LAs who reported £0 budget for therapies are showing a higher than average spend on SEN Support services, so it is possible that they may have included therapies under the SEN Support heading. Another possibility is that they are funding therapies from a central Council budget rather than the HNB (which used to be the case in West Berkshire). The only other explanation would be that in those areas the NHS is funding all therapy provision, but it seems very unlikely in the current financial climate that the NHS would take responsibility for services which it has no statutory duty to fund. This issue does require further work and will be raised with the local Clinical Commissioning Group and the Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, which is commissioned to provide the service.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 Some additional, more recent information has been obtained from other Local Authorities in the South East and is attached at Appendix B.
- 4.2 This information shows the overspend in 2017-18 on the HNB for each LA, as a total amount and as a % of the HNB. It also shows the projected overspend for 2018-19 based on June 2018 data.
- 4.3 Not all Local Authorities submitted the information so it is incomplete in parts, but does show the severity of the pressure on HNB budgets across the region.
- 4.4 The information has been anonymised as permission has not been given by the Local Authorities for it to be shared.
- 4.5 All but three of the LAs who responded were overspent on their HNB in 2017-18. Overspends ranged from 1.2% of the budget to 18.3% of the budget. West Berkshire's overspend was the second lowest at 1.8%
- 4.6 All but two of the LAs who responded were predicting an overspend in 2018-19.
- 4.7 Predicted overspend data for 2018-19 was produced in the summer. Predicted overspends ranged from 1.1% to 21% of the budget. West Berkshire's predicted overspend is now at 5%, having increased since the data was provided, but it is

possible that other LAs' projected overspends will also have increased since the data was produced.

- 4.8 Of the 13 LAs who responded and who had overspends in 2017-18, 8 (including West Berkshire) are predicting a higher overspend in 2018-19 than in 2017-18. Five are predicting a lower overspend in 2018-19 than in 2017-18. If these predictions turn out to be correct, it would be helpful to understand the strategies these LAs have used to bring their overspends down.

5. Options for Consideration

- 5.1 N/A

6. Proposals

- 6.1 N/A

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 For further discussion at HFG / Schools Forum.

8. Consultation and Engagement

- 8.1 N/A

9. Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix A – HNB Benchmarking Tool Data 2017-18
- 9.2 Appendix B – SE Regional Benchmarking Data provided by Local Authorities (anonymised)

	WBC	SE	RDG	WOK	BRACK	W/MHD	SLOUGH	BR/HOVE	BUCKS	EAST SSX	HANTS	I/WIGHT	KENT	MEDWAY	MILTON K	OXON	PORTSM	S/HAMP	SURREY	W/SSX	ENGLAND
Place funding	127	126	105	134	86	84	173	96	140	100	130	120	154	94	160	95	156	144	103	136	120
Top up	206	196	235	86	177	179	297	174	284	156	151	254	233	193	285	185	152	204	192	143	216
Non- m/ independent	122	111	85	167	182	189	21	107	150	133	67	83	90	180	96	54	76	110	166	126	91
SEN support	44	52	37	14	80	69	67	101	60	70	33	60	75	13	29	64	45	36	46	39	55
Alt Prov	15	10	2	0	19	18	0	15	5	8	0	10	11	2	0	3	0	0	29	13	12
Hosp Ed	1	2	5	2	1	1	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	2	3	4
Therapies	8	3	10	7	4	0	0	0	14	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

This page is intentionally left blank

Overspend on HNB 2017-18

Local Authority A	C	£2,440,776 (4.1%)
Local Authority B	C	£9.4M (9.47%)
Local Authority C	U	£290,000 (1.2%)
Local Authority D	U	£2.2M (% not given)
Local Authority E	U	£4,045,000 (18.3%)
Local Authority F	U	£2.9M (% not given)
Local Authority G	C	£5.9M (3%)
Local Authority H	U	Info not provided
Local Authority I	C	NIL
Local Authority J	U	Info not provided
Local Authority K	U	Info not provided
Local Authority L	U	£679K (5.1%)
Local Authority M	C	Info not provided
Local Authority N	U	NIL
Local Authority O	C	£467K (2.8%)
Local Authority P	U	NIL
Local Authority Q	C	£15M (11%)
Local Authority R	C	£2.466M (3.3%) but reduced to £0.4M by reserves/SB transfers
West Berkshire	U	£309K (1.8%)

Projected overspend on HNB 2018-19

Local Authority A	C	£6,000,000 (9.9%)
Local Authority B	C	£10,000,000 (10%)
Local Authority C	U	£276K (1.1%)
Local Authority D	U	£1.3M (% not given)
Local Authority E	U	£1.5M (7%)
Local Authority F	U	£2.2M (% not given)
Local Authority G	C	£9.4M (4.7%)
Local Authority H	U	Information not provided
Local Authority I	C	NIL
Local Authority J	U	Information not provided
Local Authority K	U	Information not provided
Local Authority L	U	£205K (1.5%)
Local Authority M	C	Information not provided
Local Authority N	U	NIL
Local Authority O	C	£795K (4.5%)
Local Authority P	U	£400K (4%)
Local Authority Q	C	£30M (21%)
Local Authority R	C	£3.9M (5%)
West Berkshire	U	£547K (2.8%) inc to £977,588 (5%)

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools: deficit recovery

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

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 nine schools that have set a deficit budget in 2018/19.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the report be noted.

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 and Summary

- 3.1 The Schools' Forum received a report, "School Budgets 2018/19 and Schools in Financial Difficulty" on 16 July 2018, which listed nine schools that had set a deficit budget in 2018/19.
- 3.2 The report set out West Berkshire Council's strategy for supporting the growing number of schools setting a deficit budget, and for supporting schools at risk of going into deficit. A one year fixed term 0.8FTE term time only Senior Accountant post has been created in the Schools Finance team. For the period 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2019 the post holder will work with the schools that have set a deficit budget in 2018/19. The work undertaken to date is summarised in Table 1.

TABLE 1 - Deficit Schools Monitoring Progress Summary As at 21.11.18	Number of Schools			
	Yes	Late	No	Total
2018/19 budget submitted by agreed date	9			9
2018/19 submitted budget sense and arithmetically checked by Schools Accountancy	9			9
Licensed deficit papers completed in full	8		1	9
Licensed agreement letters from Head of Education and Finance sent	9			9
P3 Budget Monitoring reports submitted to Schools Accountancy by 14.07.18	2	7		9
P3 feedback given to submitted Budget Monitoring reports	9			9
P4 Budget Monitoring reports submitted Schools Accountancy*	2		7	9
P4 feedback given to submitted Budget Monitoring reports	2		7	9
P5 Budget Monitoring reports submitted to Schools Accountancy by 14.09.18	7	1	1	9
P5 feedback given to submitted Budget Monitoring reports	8		1#	9
P6 Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports submitted to Schools Accountancy by 12.10.18	5	4		9
P6 feedback given to submitted Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports	5		4	9
P7 Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports submitted to Schools Accountancy by 14.11.18	6	3		9
P7 feedback given to submitted Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports	0		9	9
Schools forecasting a year end deficit in excess of their license as at P7	2		7	9
Governor Minutes received (reminder sent to schools 18.09.18)	6		3	9
1st Task Force meeting arranged	9		0	9
1st Task Force Meeting taken place	7		2	9
Deficit schools who have received or booked support visits	4		5	9
<i>* no date given as submission not required as closed for summer holidays</i>				
# agreed by Head of Education that 1 school did not have to submit				

- 3.3 All schools except one have now submitted their Period 5 reports and Schools Accountancy have given detailed feedback on all submissions. All schools submitted their P6 Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports. Feedback was given to all schools who were to receive a '1st Task Force' meeting before the submission deadline for P7 reports. All schools have submitted their P7 Budget Monitoring and Forecast reports. Reviews are underway with priority being given to those who are still to have their '1st Task Force' meeting.
- 3.4 At P7, two schools are forecasting a deficit in excess of their licence. If this is still the position at the next "Task Force" meeting following P9 forecasts, intervention may be required.
- 3.5 In addition to the nine schools above, one additional school is forecasting an in year deficit, as detailed in Table 2.

TABLE 2 - Other Deficit Position As at 21.11.18	Number of Schools
Non licensed deficit schools forecasting in year a deficit and requesting support	1
Non deficit schools who have received or booked support visits	1

- 3.6 All schools will receive an email in November recommending that they carry out a self-check of their financial position for next year (if not already done so). This should be emailed back to Schools Accountancy to determine whether any further support is required.
- 3.7 In recent years the Department for Education's Annual Financial Benchmarking data has been released increasingly late. The Senior Accountant has produced

local benchmarking data based on the 2017/18 submission and emailed this information on 11th October 2018 to all schools that had responded.

- 3.8 The Schools Forum has previously agreed that schools in deficit using the WBC Finance service to work with them on their deficit recovery have associated costs refunded directly from the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund direct rather than schools needing to submit individual bids to the Schools Forum to reimburse this cost.

4. Progress to date

4.1 The Willows Primary School

It was agreed that the school would 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 Period 6 Budget Monitoring and Forecast report was received and a detailed review and feedback completed. The first review meeting took place on 18th October.

4.2 Beenham Primary School

Feedback on the Period 7 submission has been emailed to both the Headteacher and Finance Officer, and budget change suggestions made by the Senior Accountant have been actioned. The budget changes reflect the significant changes in staffing that have occurred. The first review meeting took place on 16th November. At the suggestion of the Senior Accountant an appointment was made to work with the Finance Officer on the preparation of the Period 6 Budget Monitoring and Forecast report on 8th October. A second visit with both the Headteacher and Finance Officer has been arranged for early December (both will be funded by the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund).

4.3 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. The budget changes are for the most part to reflect unexpected insurance receipts and Vulnerable Children's Grant funding. To date no budget change requests have been received for processing by Schools Accountancy. The first review meeting is due to take place on 23rd November 2018. The School Business Manager has resigned.

4.4 John Rankin Schools Federation

Detailed feedback of the Period 5 submission was sent to the Executive Headteacher and Finance Manager, including requests that savings be identified to cover overspends already incurred and budget changes reflecting the identified savings be submitted to assist the federation with future monitoring and forecasting. No budget change requests have been received to date. A verbal feedback of the Period 6 submission was given to the Finance Manager. The first review meeting took place on 12th October. A support visit took place on 5th November 2018 and a further visit is booked for 13th December 2018.

4.5 Parsons Down Schools Federation

Detailed feedback of the Period 6 submission was sent to the Executive Headteacher and School Business Manager. Some requests to transfer budgets to cover overspends have been received and actioned. The governors have reported

that they have found this approach helpful in monitoring and controlling the budget. If required support will be provided for the interim Headteacher who will be in post during the spring term.

4.6 St Finians Catholic Primary School

Detailed feedback of the Period 6 submission was sent to the Headteacher and School Business Manager. The first review meeting took place on 6th 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 5th December, (this will be funded by the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund).

4.7 Westwood Farm Schools Federation

Detailed feedback of the Period 5 submission was sent to the Executive Headteacher and School Business Manager. The “1st Task Force” meeting will take place on 10th December 2018.

4.8 The Willink School

Detailed feedback of the Period 6 submission was sent to the Headteacher and Finance Manager. The Senior Accountant made a support visit to the on 1st October 2018 and the “1st Task Force” meeting took place on 9th November 2018. The Finance Manager has resigned.

5. Appendices

5.1 Appendix A: Individual School Deficit Information

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2018/19 – Month Seven

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 10th December 2018

Report Author: Ian Pearson

Item for: Discussion **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.

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. Background

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring fenced specific grant which can be spent on school/pupil activity as set out in The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018.
- 3.2 For 2018-19, there are four DSG funding blocks: Schools Block, High Needs Block, Early Years Block and a new Central Schools Services Block. The funding for each of the four 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 The 2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant allocation is £129m. This includes £35.5m which funds Academies and post 16 high needs places and is paid direct by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). The remaining grant, after any planned carry forwards, is £92.8m, and this is what the DSG budget is built from.
- 3.5 Over spends, unless funded from outside the DSG, should be recovered by top slicing the following year's DSG allocation. Under spends must be used to support the schools' budget in future years. (Either creating a reserve or increasing the budget).
- 3.6 The Local Authority and Schools' Forum are responsible for ensuring that the DSG is deployed correctly according to the Regulations. 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 7 (31 October 2018)

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

Table 1 - DSG Block Net Budgets	Revised Budget(Planned Overspend)	Forecast Overspend				
		Month Three	Month Six	Month Seven	Month Nine	Month Ten
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Schools Block (inc ISB)	64,829	0	0	0		
Central Schools Services Block	847	0	0	0		
Early Years Block	9,479	0	0	0		
High Needs Block	17,669	0	247	315		
Total Net Expenditure	92,824	0	247	315	0	0
Support Services Recharges	444	0				
Total Expenditure	93,268	0	247	315	0	0
DSG Grant	-92804		87	116		
Net Position Over/-Under	464	0	334	431	0	0

- 4.2 The budget was set with an over spend of £464k against the DSG, as per the decision made by the Schools' Forum. The forecast over spend position at Month Seven against expenditure budgets is £315k with a further £116k under achievement on the High Needs funding primarily due to a reduction in the import/export adjustment. This gives a net overspend of £431k as at Period Seven.
- 4.3 Explanations for variances per funding block are summarised in the following paragraphs.

5. Schools Block

- 5.1 Table 3 sets out the current forecast of the Schools Block. The original budget includes under spend carried forward from 2017-18. The budget change is due to additional de-delegated budget transfers. At this stage in the year, no variance is forecast against budget. 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.

Table 3 - Schools Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	64,439	390	64,829	64,829	0
Support services	62		62	62	0
Schools Block DSG	-64,985		-64,985	-64,985	0
Net Position	-484	390	-94	-94	0

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 unpredictable 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.

Table 4 - Early Years Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
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
Net Position	37	0	37	37	0

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 current forecast for the Central Schools Services Block. The budget for this new Block was built after transferring funding from the Early Years Block and 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.

Table 5 - Central Schools Services Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	847	0	847	847	0
Support services	205		205	205	0
CSSB Block DSG	-1,079		-1,079	-1,079	0
Net Position	-27	0	-27	-27	0

7.2 At this point there is no forecast variance to budget.

8. High Needs Block

8.1 Table 6 sets out the current forecast of the High Needs Block. The budget was set after carry forwards with a £447k over spend. The budget was increased by £100k, after Schools Forum agreed to utilise £100k of the 2017-18 improved position for invest to save proposals. If this sum is not utilised it would improve the budget position. The revised budget is set at an over spend of £547k.

Table 6 - High Needs Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	17,569	100	17,669	17,984	315
Support services	127		127	127	0
HN Block DSG	-17,249		-17,249	-17,133	116
Net Position	447	100	547	978	431

8.2 At Period seven there is an adverse variance of £431k which is split by overspend against expenditure, £315k and an £116k under achievement on the grant allocation which is due to the lower than predicted amount of the import export adjustment.

8.3 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.
- £37k - over spend in SEN Commissioned Provision largely as a result of a forecast under achievement in income of £32k. Savings will be realised elsewhere as a result of placing a pupil in our own provision. There is also a forecast over spend on the repairs and maintenance budget. This is a reduced pressure compared to month 6.
- £104k – 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 which resulted in 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 EHCP PRU Placement budget – this is new funding for pupils placed at the PRU where they are on a single roll and the request is agreed by the SEN Assessment Team.
- Other over and under spends within the Top Up funding areas are demand led and can be as a result of changes to bandings for existing pupils or 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 £895k (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 year's payments become apparent.

10. Appendices

Appendix A– DSG 2018-19 Budget Monitoring Report Month 7

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2018-2019 Budget Monitoring Month 7							
Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2018-19	Net Virements Agreed 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	259,100	379,120	379,120	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	17,190	214,020	214,020	0	
90424	DD - CLEAFSS	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	75,710	280,710	280,710	0	
	Schools Block Total	64,438,980	390,300	64,829,280	64,829,280	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	822,190	-32,080	Slight reduction in FTE compared to budget.
90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	3,300,420		3,300,420	3,359,080	58,660	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	958,040	-140,030	Known movements to other settings including one placement costing in excess of £100k
90575	Non LEA Special School (CoFA)	840,100		840,100	807,650	-32,450	Various movements of placements.
90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	2,436,400		2,436,400	2,384,930	-51,470	Various movements of placements.
90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,396,140		1,396,140	1,293,060	-103,080	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	253,400	-39,620	Number of pupils lower than expected at one site
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	632,280	90,720	Increasing numbers of pupils entitled to Funding
90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	185,170		185,170	243,000	57,830	Increasing numbers of pupils entitled to Funding
90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	75,000		75,000	80,470	5,470	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	EHCP PRU Placement			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	11,937,530	167,430	
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	
90237	SEN High Needs Contingency		90,000	90,000	90,000		2017/18 C/F budget agreed by SF.
90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	75,000		75,000	96,580	21,580	Based on current demand
90280	Spec Needs Spprt Team	319,170		319,170	315,670	-3,500	
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	91,700	9,300	Fewer than expected places requested therefore recharges lower.
90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	0	10,000	10,000	8,910	-1,090	2017/18 C/F budget agreed by SF. Likely to be fully spent at Y/E
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	456,000		456,000	492,680	36,680	Premises Expenses pressure. Places now filled by WB pupils so factored into underspends elsewhere.
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	36,000	-9,000	Estimate of funding required for Financial Year for known cases
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	100,000	2,136,820	2,285,080	148,260	
	High Needs Block Total	17,568,920	100,000	17,668,920	17,984,610	315,690	
	Total Expenditure across funding blocks	92,334,440	490,300	92,824,740	93,140,430	315,690	
	SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES	444,000		444,000	444,000	0	
	TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE	92,778,440	490,300	93,268,740	93,584,430	315,690	
90030	DSG Grant Account	-92,778,440	-490,300	-93,268,740	-93,584,430	-315,690	
	NET DSG EXPENDITURE	0	0	0	0	0	

Agenda Item 17

Schools Forum Work Programme 2018/19

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 3	Apprenticeship Funding	02/01/19	08/01/19			information	Tracy Sherriff
	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	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	Amin Hussain
	Schools Funding Benchmarking Information	02/01/19	08/01/19	15/01/19	21/01/19	Information	Amin Hussain
	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	Amin Hussain
Term 4	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	Amin Hussain
	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	Discussion	Amin Hussain

This page is intentionally left blank