

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum

Monday 11th March 2019 at 5.00 pm
at Shaw House Church Road Newbury
RG14 2DR

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 5 March 2019

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, 11 March 2019 (continued)

Forum Members: Reverend Mark Bennet, Anthony Chadley, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Lynne Doherty, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Alan Henderson, Jon Hewitt, Lucy Hillyard, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, Mollie Lock, Sheila Loy, Patrick Mitchell, Ian Nichol, 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 date 21st January 2019	1 - 6
3 Actions arising from previous meetings	7 - 8
4 Declarations of Interest	
5 Membership	

Items for Decision

6 Primary Schools in Financial difficulty - Bids for Funding from Brightwalton, John Rankin and The Willows (Melanie Ellis)	9 - 12
7 Invest to Save Proposals (Michelle Sancho)	13 - 14
8 Final DSG Budget 2019-20 (Amin Hussain)	15 - 22
9 Final High Needs Budget (Jane Seymour)	23 - 40
10 Final Early Years Budget (Avril Allenby)	41 - 46

Items for Information

11 Growth Fund 2018-19 (Amin Hussain)	47 - 50
12 Schools: Deficit Recovery (Melanie Ellis)	51 - 64
13 DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 10 (Ian Pearson)	65 - 74



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, 21 JANUARY 2019**

Present: Reverend Mark Bennet, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Lynne Doherty, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Lucy Hillyard, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, Mollie Lock, Sheila Loy, Patrick Mitchell, Chris Prosser, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Jayne Steele (Newbury College), Bruce Steiner (Chairman) and Suzanne Taylor

Also Present: Melanie Ellis (Chief Accountant), Amin Hussain (Schools Finance Manager), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service), Jane Seymour (Service Manager, SEN & Disabled Children's Team), Annette Yellen (Accountant for Schools Funding and the DSG), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)) and Michelle Sancho (Principal EP & Service Manager)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Anthony Chadley, Alan Henderson, Jon Hewitt, David Ramsden and Charlotte Wilson

PART I

49 Minutes of previous meeting dated 10th December 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on the 10th December 2018 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

50 Actions arising from previous meetings

The Schools' Forum received an update regarding actions recorded during the previous meeting. Actions Dec18 – Ac1 and Ac2 had been completed and therefore could be removed from the list of actions arising for the previous meeting. The action Jun18-Ac1 regarding the Secondary School Governor vacancy would be discussed under Membership (Item 5).

51 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

52 Membership

Jessica Bailiss reported that there was still a secondary governor representative vacancy on the Schools' Forum, which had been the case for some time. It was therefore suggested that a formal election process be conducted to help fill the position.

Jessica Bailiss reported that an election was currently underway to fill the position of Primary Governor Representative on the Schools' Forum. The result of the election would be announced on 24th January 2019.

RESOLVED that an election be conducted for the position of Secondary Governor Representative on the Schools' Forum.

53 Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)

Amin Hussain introduced the report (Agenda Item 6), which set out the final primary and secondary school funding formula for 2019/20. Consultation had taken place on the Funding Formula and, as a result, a 2% per pupil cap on gains and 0% Minimum Funding Guarantee had been approved.

The final schools block Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding for 2019/20 was £100.09m. After deducting £0.555m for the growth fund this left £999.535m to be allocated to schools.

Appendix A showed the school formula allocations for each school. Overall there was £3m of extra funding going into West Berkshire Schools. Amin Hussain added that the final decision would be taken by the Council's Executive in February.

The Chairman reminded the Forum of the recommendations set out in the report:

- 1) To note the final formula rates and allocations to schools, to be approved by the Council's Executive on 14th February 2019.
- 2) For schools that gained funding under the new formula, additional funding be capped at 2% per pupil (as per the National Funding Formula).
- 3) For schools that lost funding under the new formula, a minimum funding guarantee of an additional 0% per pupil increase be applied (maximum affordable).

Keith Harvey proposed that the Schools' Forum agree the recommendations set out in section two of the report (as above) and this was seconded by Chris Prosser. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the recommendations as set out in section two of the report were agreed.

54 Central Schools Block Budget Proposals 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)

Amin Hussain introduced the report (Agenda Item 7) that set out the budget proposal for services funded from the Central Schools' Services (CSSB) Block of the DSG and proposed measures to enable the budget for this block to be balanced.

Amin Hussain drew attention to the recommendations under section 2.1 of the report, which suggested balancing the CSSB by using the 2018/19 underspends of £68,155 and releasing £63,649 of unutilised Education Support Grant (ESG) from Council reserves. For 2020/21 it was anticipated that costs would need to reduce further to bring the block into balance.

Keith Harvey queried what the longer term outlook was for the CSSB, which had faced a continuous deficit. Ian Pearson explained that the issues faced by the block were a result of the funding formula. Firstly assumptions were made about the per pupil element and secondly the way the formula was applied to different sized local authorities was unfair. The agreed approach going forward was to lobby Government on the issue, so that a fairer way to fund smaller local authorities be sought. Councillor Lynne Doherty would be supporting this area of work and writing to local MPs.

The Chairman drew the Forum's attention to the recommendations set out in section two of the report, which proposed that the CSSB be balanced by:

- 1) Using the 2018/19 underspends totalling £68,155
- 2) Releasing £63,649 of unutilised Education Support Grant for Council reserves.

Graham Spellman proposed that the Schools Forum agree the recommendations set out above and this was seconded by Catie Colston. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the recommendations set out in section two of the report were agreed by the Schools' Forum.

55 High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2019/20 (Jane Seymour)

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 8) which set out the current financial position of the High Needs Block Budget (HNBB) for 2018/19 and the position known so far for 2019/20, including the likely shortfall.

Jane Seymour reported that as set out on page 49 of the report, the HNBB continued to be under great pressure. Savings of £219k were implemented in 2017/18 and a further £306k in 2018/19. However, despite these savings there would still be an overspend of just under £500k in the current year due to increasing needs and pressure upon the HNB.

Jane Seymour reported it was announced in December 2018 by the Education Secretary that additional funding would be available for high needs and West Berkshire would receive an additional sum of £381k in 2019/20. This had improved the situation slightly for 2019/20 however, there was still a forecast shortfall of £1.8m.

There was increasing pressure on Place Funding Budgets. The budget for this area was £5.8m however the estimated spend was over £6m and this was largely due to the fact that the Local Authority now had to cover the cost of planned places at Newbury College. Top Up Funding was another area of pressure that was facing a shortfall of just under £700k.

Jane Seymour drew attention to page 55 of the report, which showed the pressure being faced by the PRU Budget due to increased numbers of children with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Fewer schools had also been placing students at iCollege due to the charging system that was in place, which had placed further pressure on the budget.

Budgets for other statutory services were detailed under section four of the report and it could be seen from the figures that spend was increasing. The Sensory Impairment budget was under pressure because of an increase in the number of children with severe hearing and visual impairments requiring support.

Jane Seymour drew attention to the non-statutory services on page 59 of the agenda. The latest forecast for the budgets for these services was that most should be balanced apart from the Learning and Literacy (LAL) service. As a result of charging being introduced, referrals to the service had reduced for the first time. Jane Seymour reported that also included within the report was detail on the impact of each of the services.

Jane Seymour reported that a five year Special Educational Needs (SEN) Strategy had been agreed and was being rolled out. The aim of the strategy was to decrease spending and increase capacity in mainstream schools. It was hoped that local provision would be increased by September 2020.

A discussion had taken place at the Heads Funding Group (HFG) regarding a range of savings proposals, which were included within Appendix B to the report. The HFG had recommended that the only savings that should be taken from the HNBB in 2019/20 were those which would not have a negative impact on children with SEND and on schools. This had included:

- 1) Bringing the Home Tuition Service in house, which would deliver and estimated saving of £23k, and;
- 2) Reducing the charge for PRU places from 80% of the cost to 50%. This would aim to increase take up of PRU places and achieve a saving by reducing HNB spend on PRU Top Ups.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 21 JANUARY 2019 - MINUTES

Ian Pearson added that when the Schools' Forum had been through the cycle of making savings within the HNB previously, an initial discussion would take place at the HFG. The HFG would recommend areas that savings could be delivered on and then the Schools' Forum would make a decision on which savings options required further investigation. A more detailed proposal would then be formed by Officers and brought back to the HFG and Schools' Forum for final decision. However, at the last meeting of the HGF, headteachers had found it particularly difficult to agree on further savings to the HNB that would not be detrimental to meeting the needs of pupils.

Ian Pearson explained that there were two competing pressures. Firstly there was already pressure being faced by schools and secondly, further HNB savings were likely to be counterproductive resulting in additional costs in future years.

Keith Harvey reported that he had carried out his own analysis of the pressure on the HNB over time, which was detailed within Appendix D to the report. Keith Harvey reported that issues within the high needs budget had ranged across a number of years and in light of this he had looked at the budget for 2015/16 in comparison to the current budget. The allocation from the Government in this time had only increased by 2.3% however inflation had risen by almost 9%. In this time the budget for the PRU in West Berkshire has decreased from £3.6m to £1.8m in 2018/19. The biggest apparent pressure was top up funding, which was 40% higher in 2018/19 than in 2015/16.

Keith Harvey explained that he had drawn his own conclusions that had not been universally agreed on by the HFG. In his opinion cutting non statutory provision led to increase spending on Top Up Funding. Further savings to non-statutory services could also lead to increased numbers of children requiring EHCPs. Keith Harvey felt that in his view cuts had been taken far enough. He was aware that other local authorities were facing similar pressures and it was not a local issue.

Ian Pearson suggested that the Schools' Forum take a view on whether to agree the recommendations from the HFG on page 66 of the report. This would however not solve the problem and in Ian Pearson's view, there were three options:

- 1) The Schools' Forum could take a view that no further savings should be taken in 2019/20 beyond the recommendations of the HFG.
- 2) The Schools' Forum could look in more detail at the savings options and request that Officers bring back further detail on selected options to the next meeting in March 2019.
- 3) The Schools' Forum could ask Officers to carry out further work on saving options to try and deliver an agreed figure. This would not necessarily mean the savings would be agreed and implemented but would place the Forum in a better position to make a decision on savings at the next meeting in March 2019 if required.

Keith Harvey asked if all the savings options were agreed, if the budget would be brought into balance. Ian Pearson stated that it would not be possible to balance the budget within the required timescales, even if all the saving options were taken. The Department for Education (DfE) were aware of the issue and Officers would be providing them with a report on the Local Authority's position in summer 2019, which would demonstrate the size of the problem. Identifying savings would show a willingness to tackle the problem. Councillor Lynne Doherty reported that the pressure was growing and a letter was being formed to continue efforts to lobby Members of Parliament. There was soon to be a Spending Review and it was hoped that as part of this it would be recognised that funding assigned to High Needs was insufficient.

Patrick Mitchell stated that there had been a long discussion at the HFG and it was concluded that any further savings would have a detrimental effect on children. A transfer of funding from the main Schools Block to the High Needs Block had been viewed as

SCHOOLS FORUM - 21 JANUARY 2019 - MINUTES

unpalatable and therefore the decision had been taken not to pursue this option. By continuing to accumulate a deficit it was sending the message that funding for High Needs services was not enough.

Hillary Latimer concurred and stated that to reduce the deficit further would send the message that schools could manage. Children would however, not be receiving the support that they required.

Jonathon Chishick asked what the implications would be of not addressing the shortfall. Ian Pearson confirmed that at this stage any deficit would be carried forward. Patrick Mitchell asked what would happen if the whole DSG pot for West Berkshire went into deficit. Melanie Ellis reported that there was little information on this situation currently. Ian Pearson felt that the DfE would need to review their rules. Local authorities had to submit recovery plans in the summer period of 2019 and a deficit would be shown. It was likely that this would also be the case of other local authorities. The DfE would then need to decide on what action to take, which could potentially include imposing cuts.

Graham Spellman concurred that cutting expenditure further was counterproductive and would not help the overall shortfall. A political push back was required. Ian Pearson added that positively the deficit had reduced from £2.6m to £1.8m.

The Chairman asked the Schools' Forum to reflect on the recommendations put forward by the HFG. Antony Gallagher proposed that the Schools' Forum agree the savings set out on page 66 of the agenda and this was seconded by Keith Harvey. At the vote the motion was carried. It was also agreed by the Schools' Forum that no further work should take place to identify further saving options.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum agreed the HFG recommendation's as follows and that no further work should be undertaken by Officers to identify further options for savings in the HNB:

- 1) To bring the Home Tuition Service in house, which would deliver and estimated saving of £23k, and;
- 2) Reduce the charge for PRU places from 80% of the cost of 50%. This would aim to increase take up of PRU places and achieve a saving by reducing HNB spend on PRU Top Ups.

56 **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2019/20 (Amin Hussain)**

Amin Hussain introduced the report (Agenda Item 9) that set out the overall calculation of the Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG) and funding settlement for 2019/20. The report set out the 2019/20 DSG settlement for each block, as announced by the Government.

Amin Hussain reported that the figures for the High Needs Block and Early Years Block were subject to change. Details for each block would be confirmed in March 2019

Regarding the High Needs Block, Amin Hussain reported that West Berkshire would receive an additional sum of £381k in 2019/20.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

57 **Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2018/19 (Amin Hussain)**

Amin Hussain introduced the report (Agenda Item 10) which informed the Schools' Forum of payment made to schools from the Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Funding budget in 2018/19.

Amin Hussain drew attention to section four of the report regarding budgets and payments made in 2018/19. Two schools had made an application for growth funding.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 21 JANUARY 2019 - MINUTES

Theale Primary School and Bradfield Primary School. Only Theale Primary School met the Growth Fund Criteria and the relevant payment of £13,743 had been approved by the Head of Education. Further work was taking place with Bradfield Primary School.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

58 **DSG Monitoring 2018/19 Month 9 (Ian Pearson)**

Amin Hussain introduced the report (Agenda Item 11) which set out the current financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and highlighted any under or overspends.

The forecast position at the end of December 2018 was shown in table one on page 104 of the report. It was highlighted that the month nine figure of £499k included the deficit budget of £35k.

Amin Hussain drew attention to the High Needs Block under section eight on page 106 and highlighted that the main variances against expenditure were listed under section 8.4 and were driving the overspend within the block.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

59 **Forward Plan**

Jessica Bailiss drew attention to the Work Programme on page 113 of the agenda and reported that the Work Programme for 2019/20 would come to the next meeting of the Schools' Forum in March 2019 for agreement.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the Work Programme.

60 **Any Other Business**

Graham Spellman noted that there had not been a report on schools' deficit recovery and he was concerned given that the end of the financial year was approaching. Melanie Ellis explained that a report would come to the next meeting of the Forum in March 2019. There had been little change to report regarding schools' positions due to the Christmas period.

61 **Date of the next meeting**

The next meeting would take place on Monday 11th March 2019, 5pm at Shaw House.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 5.45 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

Agenda Item 3

Actions from previous meeting

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Jan19 - Ac1	21st January 2019	Membership	An election be conducted for the position of Secondary Governor Representative on the Schools' Forum.	Jessica Bailiss	An election for this position was coordinated in February however, no nominations were received. The election will run again in March 2019.

Ongoing Actions

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Dec18 - Ac2	10th December 2018	Funding for Children with EHCPs who attend PRUs	The banding system be reviewed overtime and to be brought back to the Schools' Forum at later stage.	Jane Seymour	Date to be confirmed.

This page is intentionally left blank

Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty – Bids for Funding 2018/19

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 11th March 2019

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

Item for: Decision **By:** All Primary Maintained Schools Representatives

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To summarise the bids that have been received from schools in deficit to access funding from the 'primary schools in financial difficulty' de-delegated fund.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 To recommend to Schools' Forum approval of the following bids:

- (1) John Rankin Federation £2,833
- (2) The Willows Primary School – WBTP SCITT £29,460.12
- (3) Brightwalton CE Aided Primary School £7,494.37

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 Since April 2013, local authorities have been required to delegate to all schools the contingency previously held for schools in financial difficulty. Each phase in the maintained sector then has the option to de-delegate and pool this funding, with allocations made to schools that need it. This decision is made on an annual basis.

3.2 Primary schools have opted to continue to de-delegate this funding in 2018/19.

3.3 The budget for 2018/19 has been set with an initial budget of £120,020, which Schools Forum agreed to increase to £379,120. Bids have been approved totalling £87k in 2018/19.

3.4 The criteria agreed by the Schools' Forum for allocating this funding to schools is as follows:

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

- 1. *The school has sought and followed the advice of the Schools' Accountancy Service **prior** to going into deficit*

2. *The school has (up to) a five year robust deficit recovery plan in place which has been discussed with and verified by the Schools' Accountancy Service.*
3. *Additional funding may be payable for one of the following exceptional unforeseen circumstances which has taken the school into deficit:*
 - a) *Short term downturn in pupil numbers - to maintain current staffing structure where evidence can be provided that the numbers are likely to recover within a 2 - 3 year period and where downsizing of staff and resultant redundancy costs in order to balance the budget on a short term basis would not be an efficient use of resources.*
 - b) *Sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers in a school causing concern (i.e. Ofsted category of notice to improve or worse – to maintain current staffing levels on a temporary basis where to reduce the staffing levels immediately in order to balance the budget would be detrimental to the recovery of standards in the short term.*
 - c) *Unforeseen sudden permanent downturn in pupil numbers –to cover staffing costs during a short term interim period whilst restructuring takes place and in order where possible to avoid redundancies (such as through natural wastage).*
 - d) *Redundancy payments, where the staffing reductions are required in order to balance the budget, but these costs will put the school further into a deficit position and taking the school longer to recover the deficit.*
 - e) *Any other one off costs incurred on recovery of the deficit, such as specialist consultancy advice/support (it was agreed by Schools' Forum on 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).*
 - f) *Additional Circumstance (from April 2018): Schools not currently in deficit but required to restructure to avoid going into deficit, may also make a bid for reimbursement towards their one-off redundancy costs.*

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

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

4. John Rankin Federation

- 4.1 Funding sought £2,833 for one off unbudgeted costs associated with the setting up of the after school club, which forms a key part of the deficit recovery plan. The bid meets the criterion 3e set by the Schools' Forum. The costs have been incurred as a result of plans to recover the deficit and avoid further going into deficit.
- 4.2 The schools Main School Budget and PPG ended 2017/18 with a deficit of £141k. By the end of 2018/19, the school plans to be £131k in deficit. By the end of £2019/20 the school plans to be £68k in deficit and plans to come out of deficit in 2020/21.
- 4.3 The school has secured a stable management structure. All aspects of the schools organisation have been scrutinised and adjusted. Over the last two years, the

school has raised pupil outcomes and gained a GOOD grade with Ofsted at the infant school. The school now has a positive reputation.

- 4.4 The school has an in year balanced budget in 2018/19. The school is now working on two main fronts to eradicate the historic, inbuilt deficit, by taking over the running of the afterschool club and generating income through the Executive Head Teacher supplying professional services externally.
- 4.5 The bid is in regard to the after school club. The taking over of this is crucial to the financial recovery of the school. Unbudgeted costs for setting up the club have occurred. After job descriptions were evaluated the actual costs for the club leader and deputies and the administration time for the TUPE process were greater than predicted.
- 4.6 The bid meets the criterion 3e set by the Schools' Forum, and was recommended for approval by the Heads Funding Group.

5. The Willows Primary School – West Berkshire Training Partnership School Centred Initial Teacher Training (WBTP SCITT)

- 5.1 Funding sought £29,460.12 which is the closing deficit balance of the SCITT. The deficit belongs to the SCITT but as its finances are operated through the Willows Primary School, the school would suffer financially if it has to recover the deficit. This would impact negatively on the schools' deficit recovery plans. The SCITT has now closed and has no way of addressing the deficit. The Newly Qualified Teachers that the WBTP SCITT produced were of benefit to many schools in West Berkshire.
- 5.2 The Willows Primary School submitted a Main School Budget (MSB) deficit recovery plan in 2018/19, planning for return to a surplus position of just over £5.5k in 2020/21. At the time the recovery plans were submitted, the WBTP SCITT deficit had not been identified. As at P9, 2018/19, the school is on track with its recovery plan for the MSB.
- 5.3 Without the financial support requested, the recently appointed Headteacher will find it difficult to implement the school improvement plan to raise pupils' outcomes and the quality of teaching and learning.
- 5.4 The bid meets the criterion 3e set by the Schools' Forum, and was recommended for approval by the Heads Funding Group.

6. Brightwalton CE Aided Primary School

- 6.1 Funding sought £7,494.37 for redundancy costs. The funding would enable the school to balance the budget and avoid going into deficit.
- 6.2 The school is not currently in deficit but during budget planning for 2018/19 it became clear that despite stringent cutbacks, the school would be getting by on a reduced carry forward, which might leave it open to a deficit situation, should something unforeseen happen. An unexpected reduction in pupil numbers by 6% resulted in a reduction in funding of £7870 during 2018/19. Further cuts saved the school from going into deficit.

- 6.3 To counterbalance rising costs, the school has reduced staff hours and is making a redundancy, however the associated payout will move the school into deficit.
- 6.4 The bid meets criterion 3d set by the Schools' Forum, and was recommended for approval by the Heads Funding Group.

7. Recommendation and Conclusion

- 7.1 The Heads Funding Group recommends that the bids be supported.

Invest to Save Proposals 2018/19

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 11 March 2019

Report Author: Michelle Sancho

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report summarises the actions undertaken with regards the Invest to Save proposals.
- 1.2 A request to carry over funds into 2019/20 is presented for consideration.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To carry over unused funds into 2019/20 to enable the completion of planned activities.

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 Heads Funding Group / Schools Forum agreed to use £100K on projects which would help to generate savings in the High Needs Block. The funding for the projects was agreed as one off funding only.
- 3.2 A range of Invest to Save proposals were approved including behaviour training and support, delivery of the PPEP Care Module on ASD for Schools and the setting up of an online forum for SENCOs.
- 3.3 Autumn Term 2018 was used to plan the implementation of the behaviour training and start the PPEP Care module. Two more PPEP Care modules are scheduled to take place, one in spring 2019 and one in summer 2019.
- 3.4 The behaviour training started in January 2019 and is due to be evaluated in summer 2019. An educational psychologist has been assigned as project lead.

4. Proposal

- 4.1 Due to the Invest to Save funds being issued in the 18/19 financial year but delivery of the behaviour and PPEP Care training and support taking place over the academic year (up to July 2019), it is necessary to request that unused funds are carried over into the 19/20 financial year. This will enable activities that have already been initiated to continue throughout the academic year.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 Progress has been made in the implementation of the Invest to Save proposals. Activities have been planned to meet the needs of schools involved. This has

resulted in activities throughout the academic year. Some of the allocated funding is projected to be spent in 19/20. Approval is being sought to carry over allocated funds into 19/20.

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

Report being

considered by: Schools Forum 11th March 2019

Report Author: Amin Hussain

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

1. Purpose of the Report

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

2. Recommendations

- (1) To note the DSG funding allocations, detailed in Appendix A.
- (2) Agree an overall deficit budget in 2019/20 of £1,824,646.

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

3. Introduction

3.1 In 2019/20, the DSG will consist of four funding blocks:

- Schools
- Central Schools Services
- Early Years
- High Needs

3.2 Funding can be transferred between blocks (subject to certain restrictions) however there will be no movement between blocks in 2019/20.

3.3 This report sets out the 2019/20 DSG settlement for each block, as announced by the Government in December 2018. This forms the basis for determining the budget for 2019/20. The early years block is estimated based on the January 2018 census, and a small element of the high needs block is not yet confirmed. Carry forwards from 2018/19 also need to be taken into account, as any under spend of DSG needs to be added to the 2019/20 allocation, and any over spend subtracted.

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,

TABLE 1	2018/19 Revised Budget £	2018/19 Forecast £	2019/20 Estimate £
Schools Block			
DSG Funding	98,397,000	98,397,000	100,103,000
Expenditure Budget	-98,303,000	-98,303,000	-100,103,000
<i>Difference</i>	94,000	94,000	0
Central Schools Services Block			
DSG Funding	1,243,463	1,243,464	1,108,030
Expenditure Budget	-1,243,463	-1,243,464	-1,108,030
<i>Difference</i>	0	0	0
Early Years Block			
DSG Funding	9,663,324	9,730,898	10,209,506
Expenditure Budget	-9,522,740	-9,166,954	-9,861,023
<i>Difference</i>	140,584	563,944	348,483
High Needs Block			
DSG Funding	19,710,142	19,603,142	19,574,871
Expenditure Budget	-19,776,040	-20,098,580	-21,748,000
<i>Difference</i>	-65,898	-495,438	-2,173,129
TOTAL			
DSG Funding	129,013,929	128,974,504	130,995,407
Expenditure Budget	-128,845,243	-128,811,998	-132,820,053
<i>Difference</i>	168,686	162,506	-1,824,646

This is the final position assuming the proposals for the early years and high needs blocks are agreed (detailed in other reports on the agenda). It is proposed that the high needs block will set a deficit budget and the early years block will have a surplus which will be carry forward into 2019/20.

5. Schools Block

- 5.1 Reports to previous meetings have set out in detail how the funding for this block has been derived. The school funding formula has now been set (as detailed in the January report) using the national funding formula rates and a minimum funding guarantee. No funding from this block is being transferred to other blocks (or vice versa).
- 5.2 It is estimated that there will be an under spend of £94k on this block in 2018/19 due to in year business rate revaluations (schools are funded for rates on a like for like basis). There will be an under spend in the growth fund, but it has been agreed that this will be carried forward and added to the 2019/20 budget allocation towards paying for the set up costs of the new primary school.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview – 2019/20

- 5.3 The final funding for 2019/20 has been determined by the October 2018 pupil numbers multiplied by West Berkshire's primary and secondary units of funding.
- 5.4 The sum for growth funding is calculated based on pupil data from the October 2018 census.
- 5.5 The total allocation excluding the growth fund is 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 Schools Forum 09.12.2018 approved a 0% on MFG and 2 % Cap on gains.
- 5.6 The budget has no transfers from other Blocks, though the National Funding Formula does allow for 0.5% of the Schools Block funding, £490k, to be transferred into another Block (specifically High Needs Block). This was not approved by Schools Forum 09.12.2018.
- 5.7 The 2019/20 Schools Block allocation, this does not include the carry forward (£94k) from 18/19, is shown in table below;

Categories	(£'m)
Primary unit of funding (£3.89*13,293)	51.826
Secondary unit of funding (£4.94*9,352)	46.164
Funding through the premises and mobility factors	1.4642
Growth funding	0.5554
Total schools block	100.009

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.
- 6.3 The grant funding for the CSSB is £976k, leaving a shortfall of £132k. It was agreed at schools forum to balance the block are shown in the table below, with a comparison to 2018/19:

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview – 2019/20

Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 Budget Requirement
	£	£
Total Budget Requirement	1,243,463	1,108,030
Funding:		
Central Schools Services Block DSG	- 992,560	- 976,226
Early Years Block transfer	- 27,053	
High Needs Block transfer	- 32,850	
One off Council funding	- 191,000	-
Copyright underspend 18/19 & 17/18 cf		- 53,155
Capita 1 underspend 18/19		- 15,000
Release of ESG unutilised grant		- 63,649
Total Funding	- 1,243,463	- 1,108,030

- 6.4 For 2019/20, costs have been brought down by £135k mostly by staffing reductions, however the grant has reduced by £16k. This leaves a funding shortfall of £132k, and it was agreed at schools forum to balance this by using underspends from 2018/19 and releasing unutilised ESG funding from Council reserves.

Early Years Block

- 7.1 The Government require that all providers be on the same local universal formula rates by 2019/20 so there will be no minimum funding guarantee or funding caps in 2019/20.
- 5.2 West Berkshire has introduced a single base rate. Using last year's calculations, going forward this will be a base rate of £4.30 with a quality supplement of 0.66p per hour.
- 5.3 The deprivation supplement based upon the current arrangements with the funding being linked to the early year's pupil premium, with an increase in the supplement from 0.47p to £1.47. The hourly rate to providers for 2 year olds will increase from £5.45 to £5.65
- 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 provisional DSG allocation received in December is based on the January 2018 census and therefore assumes no change to hours of early year's provision, other than the estimated full year effect of the introduction of 30 hours provision for three and four year old children of working parents. In order to set the budget for 2019/20, the January 2018 census data is being used, and in calculating the funding the assumption is being made that there will be no change to this data in January 2019 census data.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview – 2019/20

7.5 The proposed budget for this block is shown in table below with details on the proposals are set out in another report.

	2019/20 Yr 1 Budget
	£
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers	
PVI Providers (90036)	6,344,848
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,323,979
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	917,912
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	652,969
Pupil Premium Grant (53%) and deprivation funding	131,455
Total Delegated Funds	9,371,163
Centrally Managed Funds	
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	266,300
Pre School Teacher Counselling (90287)	60,690
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370
SSRs	49,500
Total Centrally Managed Funds	489,860
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	9,861,023
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,645,562
Transfer to Central Schools Services Block	
IN YEAR NET POSITION	215,461
Early Years DSG Block Funding carried forward	-£563,944
OVERALL NET POSITION	-348,483

8 High Needs Block

8.1 The latest estimate of expenditure in the High Needs Block budget for 2019/20 is set out in the table below. 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.

8.2 As demands in terms of number of pupils and levels of provision continue to grow and impact on this block, plans will need to be address the deficit going forward. Savings have been identified as set out in another report on this agenda. These savings will not clear the deficit and a strategy to bring spend down to the annual funding allocation will need to be developed over the coming months.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview – 2019/20

8.3 The Department of Education announced in December 2018 an additional £381k of high needs funding for 2018-19 and 2019-20 in recognition of the cost pressures that Local Authorities are experiencing on the high needs block. This has been included in the forecast figure.

8.4 The proposed budget for this block is as follows:

	2019/20 £
Place Funding	6,086,000
Top Up Funding	12,119,960
PRU Funding (Top Ups Only)	1,089,100
Other Statutory Services	1,467,980
Non Statutory Services	857,670
Support Services Recharges	127,290
Total Expenditure	21,748,000
HNB DSG Allocation - confirmed	-18,921,309
HNB DSG Allocation - provisional	-768,000
Additional high needs funding	-381,000
Transfer to Other Blocks	
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	495,438
Total DSG Funding	-19,574,871
Shortfall	2,173,129

4.5 There is a forecast shortfall of £2.17m in the 2019/20 HNB which may change as the budgets continue to be finalised.

6. Conclusion

9.1 Setting a balanced DSG budget remains a challenge, particularly the high needs block, where difficult decisions have had to be taken which will impact on all schools. A key part of the decision making has been to ensure that the deficit doesn't actually grow and plans are being made to manage the overall deficit in 2019/20.

9.2 The challenge will be no easier for 2020/21, where no additional funding is expected yet costs and demand continue to rise.

7. Appendices

Appendix A – DSG Funding Calculation 2019/20

Block Categories	(£'m)
Schools block	100.009
Central school services block allocation	0.976
High needs block allocation	18.509
Early years block	9.646
Total DSG allocation	129.140

School Block

	(£'m)
Primary unit of funding (£3.89*13,293)	51.826
Secondary unit of funding (£4.94*9,352)	46.164
Funding through the premises and mobility factors	1.4642
Growth funding	0.5554
Total Schools block	100.009

CSSB

	(£'m)
CSSB unit of funding (£s)	43.11
CSSB pupils (headcount for Primary and Secondary)	22,645
Total CSSB block	0.9762

Early Years

	(£'m)
Initial funding allocation for universal entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds	6.622
Initial funding allocation for additional 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of 3 and 4 year olds	2.051
Initial funding allocation for 2 year old entitlement	0.655
Initial funding allocation for Early Years Pupil Premium	0.035
Initial funding allocation for Disability Access Fund	0.024
Initial allocation for maintained nursery school supplementary funding	0.258
Provisional Total Early Years block	9.646

High Needs Block

	(£'m)
Actual 2019-20 high needs NFF allocation	17.103
Basic entitlement factor, ACA-weighted (unit rate * Actual number of pupils)	1.818
Import / Export adjustments (based on January 2018 school census and February R06 2017/18 ILR.)	0.768
2019-20 Additional high needs funding	0.381
Deduction to High Needs Block for direct funding of places by ESFA	-1.561
Provisional Total High Needs block	18.509

This page is intentionally left blank

High Needs Block Budget 2019/20

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 11th March 2019

Report Author: Ian Pearson, Michelle Sancho, Jane Seymour

Item for: Decision **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. It also seeks a decision on the proposal to fund a SEND Strategy Officer from HNB in order to take forward projects in the SEND Strategy to achieve long term savings.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the predicted shortfall and agree the proposal to fund a SEND Strategy Officer.

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 significant 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, is **£2.18m**. This includes an 18/19 overspend of £495k which is forecast to be transferred to reserves and paid back in the next financial year, 19/20.

3.7 The net shortfall in the 2019-20 HNB budget was reported as £1.86m in the last report to the Heads' Funding Group / Schools Forum.

3.8 The increase can be explained as follows:

- Possible £32,000 increase in resourced unit place funding; to be confirmed at Schools Forum meeting.
- £198,028 increase in top up costs, mainly due to schools' fee increases and new placements, including some children who have moved in to the area, plus some additional students with EHCPs in FE Colleges.
- £33,295 increase in other statutory services, mainly due to an increase in individual packages for children with EHCPs, including Personal Budgets. These are usually children who cannot easily be placed in a school, eg. Due to high anxiety, where the Local Authority is supporting an Elective Home Education package.
- £56,200 for the proposed SEND Strategy Officer post, for discussion by the Heads Funding Group.

3.9 An extensive review of SEN provision and services took place during 2018, with full involvement of all stakeholders, including parents and schools. This resulted in a new 5 year SEND Strategy for West Berkshire which was approved by West Berkshire Council and the Berkshire West Clinical Commissioning Group in November 2018. The Strategy seeks to address rising costs in the High Needs Block. It has 5 key priority areas:

- Improve the capacity of mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with SEND
- Expand local provision for children with SEND in order to reduce reliance on external placements
- Improve post 16 opportunities for young people with SEND, including better access to employment
- Improve preparation for adulthood, including transition from children's to adults' services in Social Care and Health
- Improve access to universal and targeted Health services for children with SEND

3.10 Work is now under way to implement the strategy, which should achieve savings in the High Needs Block over the next five years, but savings will take time to be realised. It is likely that in the short term (starting in 2020-21) costs will actually increase whilst new provision is being set up, as there will be an element of double funding whilst new provision grows before out of area placements start to reduce.

3.11 This report includes a proposal to fund a SEND Strategy Officer post from the HNB in order to progress projects in the SEND Strategy which will make long term savings. See section 6.

3.12 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 will continue to 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.

4.2 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.

4.3 The Department of Education announced in December 2018 an additional £381k of high needs funding for 2018-19 and 2019-20 in recognition of the cost pressures that Local Authorities are experiencing on the high needs block. This has been included in the forecast figure.

4.4

Table 1	2018/19 Budget £	2018/19 Forecast £	2019/20 £	2020/21 Estimate £
Place Funding	5,841,830	5,841,830	6,086,000	6,086,000
Top Up Funding	11,227,150	11,030,080	12,119,960	12,119,960
PRU Funding (Top Ups Only)	542,950	884,030	1,089,100	1,089,100
Other Statutory Services	1,262,500	1,435,230	1,467,980	1,467,980
Non Statutory Services	774,320	780,120	857,670	857,670
Support Services Recharges	127,290	127,290	127,290	127,290
Total Expenditure	19,776,040	20,098,580	21,748,000	21,748,000
HNB DSG Allocation - confirmed	-19,664,777	-19,557,777	-18,921,309	-18,921,309
HNB DSG Allocation - provisional			-768,000	-768,000
Additional high needs funding	-381,000	-381,000	-381,000	
Transfer to Other Blocks	27,000	27,000		
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	308,635	308,635	495,438	2,173,129
Total DSG Funding	-19,710,142	-19,603,142	-19,574,871	-17,516,180
Shortfall	65,898	495,438	2,173,129	4,231,820

4.5 There is a forecast shortfall of **£2.17m** in the 2019/20 HNB which may change as the budgets continue to be finalised.

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. Options for savings have previously been presented. However, the Schools Forum at its last meeting decided that no savings should be taken other than those generated by bringing the Home Education Service in house.

5. Recommendation of Heads' Funding Group

The Heads' Funding Group on 27th February recommended that the proposal to fund a SEND Strategy Officer from the HNB should be agreed.

6. Appendices

Appendix A – High Needs Budget detail

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 was 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 2019. 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	£	Current No. of Pupils	Proposed No. of	£	Difference in number
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 –	35	242,000	-30	35	234,000	0
Resource Units Academies –	95	599,830	-89	96	576,000	1
Mainstream Maintained – post 16 (DSG top slice)	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
TOTAL	677	5,841,830	-740	719	6,086,000	42

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 Top Up Budgets	2017-18 Budget		2018-19 Budget			2019-20 Estimate	Difference 18-19 budget & 19-20 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (Under) £	Estimate £	
Special Schools Maintained (90539)	3,237,280	3,262,595	3,300,420	3,362,730	62,310	3,463,450	163,030
Non WBC special schools (90548)	1,086,890	1,050,611	1,098,070	984,610	-113,460	1,065,960	-32,110
Resource Units Maintained (90617)	202,620	240,168	293,020	274,240	-18,780	270,350	-22,670
Resource Units Academies (90026)	768,370	723,750	854,270	815,680	-38,590	946,530	92,260
Resource Units Non WBC (90618)	55,000	105,340	107,000	135,180	28,180	143,580	36,580
Mainstream Maintained (90621)	534,010	574,177	541,560	650,410	108,850	667,330	125,770
Mainstream Academies (90622)	191,410	193,660	185,170	247,080	61,910	267,460	82,290
Mainstream Non WBC (90624)	66,960	78,694	75,000	83,920	8,920	73,030	-1,970
Non Maintained Special Schools (90575)	891,130	717,499	840,100	803,420	-36,680	1,030,380	190,280

TABLE 2 - continued	2017-18 Budget		2018-19 Budget			2019-20 Estimate	
Top Up Budgets	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (Under) £	Estimate £	Difference 18-19 budget & 19-20 prediction
Independent Special Schools (90579)	2,012,700	1,954,571	2,436,400	2,321,260	-115,140	2,683,020	246,620
Further Education (90580)	1,309,980	1,155,852	1,396,140	1,267,940	-128,200	1,408,870	12,730
Disproportionate HN Pupils (90627)	100,000	100,972	100,000	83,610	-16,390	100,000	0
TOTAL	10,456,350	10,157,889	11,227,150	11,030,080	-197,070	12,119,960	892,810

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
- Non maintained special schools
- West Berkshire 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 £128,200 on this cost centre. This is due in part to three post 16 high needs pupils being supported in alternative provision. This budget will need to increase slightly for 2019-20 due to an increased number of students with EHCPs in FE colleges and due to some potential Independent Specialist FE Placements for September 2019.

Plans are in place to open a new post 19 provision in September 2019 in conjunction with West Berkshire Training Consortium and the Castle School. The course will be a supported internship with the aim that students on the course move into employment after one year. The top up effect should be broadly neutral as the students would have received equivalent top up at FE College. Over time this provision should help to reduce costs but costs per place are relatively high in the first year whilst the course is being established. Costs will be reviewed in year 2 of the course.

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 top up Budgets	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	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	126,330	126,330	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	884,030	341,080	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 9. 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 iCollege top up rate will increase from April 2019 in line with inflation. The top up rates will therefore increase by 3% for the financial year 2019/20. However, it is hoped the implementation of the revised percentage split for placements will reduce the costs to the high needs block which will offset this inflation increase.

3.4 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	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	
Other Statutory Services	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20
Applied Behaviour Analysis (90240)	76,000	52,850	75,000	119,570	44,570	119,120	44,120
Sensory Impairment (90290)	215,710	221,312	172,750	246,330	73,580	236,000	63,250
Engaging Potential (90577)	455,160	456,177	456,000	491,670	35,670	527,150	71,150
Equipment for SEN Pupils (90565)	10,000	3,397	0	0	0	15,000	15,000
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	26,190	-1,800	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	45,000	0	36,000	-9,000
TOTAL	1,441,990	1,345,221	1,262,500	1,435,230	172,730	1,467,980	205,480

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 off amount of £10,000 would be made available to meet these needs. It was initially recommended that a £10,000 per annum budget should be restored for this purpose in 2019-20. However, equipment needs in resourced schools and nurseries has now exceeded £10,000 so it is recommended that this budget be re-established at £15,000 for 2019-20.

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 sits in the Education Welfare and Safeguarding Service and 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. This may be a pressure in due course.

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.

4.8.2 It was agreed at the last Heads Funding Group / Schools Forum that a saving of £23,000 could be achieved in 2019-20 by bringing this service in house.

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 no 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	2017/18 Budget		2018/19 Budget			2019/20	
Non Statutory Services	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	Difference 18/19 budget & 19/20
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	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
SEND Strategy Officer						56,200	56,200
TOTAL	798,580	801,196	774,320	780,120	5,800	857,670	83,350

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 year's settings, where experience and expertise in SEND can vary greatly. Parents are able to take up their early year's 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.

6.Proposal to fund SEND Strategy Officer

6.1 The creation of the West Berkshire SEND Strategy 2018-23 was supported by a full time SEND Strategy Officer who was in post from November 2017 to November 2018. This post was funded from temporary funding given to all Local Authorities for the specific purpose of carrying out a comprehensive SEND Review. It was one off funding and will not be repeated.

6.2 The SEND Strategy seeks to address rising costs in the High Needs Block and has 5 key priority areas:

- Improve the capacity of mainstream schools to meet the needs of children of SEND
- Expand local provision for children with SEND in order to reduce reliance on external placements
- Improve post 16 opportunities for young people with SEND, including better access to employment
- Improve preparation for adulthood, including transition from Children's to Adults' Services in Social Care and Health
- Improve access to universal and targeted Health services for children with SEND

6.3 The SEND Strategy was approved by West Berkshire Council and the Berkshire West Clinical Commissioning Group in November 2018. It is an ambitious five year strategy which has the potential to reduce costs in the High Needs Block by, in particular, creating new local provision, such as secondary ASD / SEMH provision linked to a mainstream secondary school; primary SEMH provision, MLD resourced provision and new post 19 provision.

6.4 Some work has been done to start implementation of the SEND Strategy but progress has been severely limited by the loss of the SEND Strategy Officer post in November 2018 when funding ceased. West Berkshire Council is unusual in having no dedicated capacity within the Education Service for SEND strategic work.

6.5 In order to ensure that the SEND Strategy can be moved forward in a timely way, it is proposed that a new SEND Strategy Officer is recruited, funded from High Needs Block. In order to attract candidates of suitable calibre, and in order to maintain momentum on projects in the SEND Strategy, it is suggested that the post should be offered on a temporary contract for 3 years initially.

6.6 The post was evaluated as a Band K which equates to a salary range from £36,153 to £43,757. Assuming an appointment at the mid-point of the scale, and taking on costs in to account, the estimated annual cost of the post would be £56,200.

6.7 Without this post there is a serious risk that the potential of the SEND Strategy to realise savings in the HNB will not be realised. It is difficult to be precise about the savings which could be achieved through creation of new provision. However, the following should provide a broad illustration of potential savings from one of the projects in the strategy.

6.8 A new 50 place secondary ASD / SEMH provision is proposed, linked to a local secondary school, with an intake of 7 students per year. Some financial modelling has been done which suggests that this provision could run at a unit cost of approximately £37,000 per place. Students from the target group for this provision are currently being placed in schools which cost an average of £62,000 per place per year, therefore there is the potential to save £25,000 per student and £175,000 per year group. It would take up to 7 years for the provision to be filled (including Post 16) with a total potential annual saving of 1.25 Million.

This page is intentionally left blank

Early Years Budget 2019/20

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 11th March 2019

Report Author: Avril Allenby

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the proposal for the Early Years budget, which is based upon the recommendations of the Early Years Funding Group.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 For the Forum to agree the budget model
- 2.2 To increase the single base rate to all providers from £4.30 to £4.40
- 2.3 To increase the funding rate for 2 year olds to £5:65
- 2.4 To increase the deprivation funding supplement allocated to the pupil premium pupils to make the total funding per hour £2:00.

<b style="color: #008080;">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. Funding Framework for 2019/20

- 3.1 The funding rate determined for West Berkshire for 2019/20, based on the national funding formula (WBC) remains the same as the 2018/19 rate of £4.70, made up as follows:

	Excluding ACA	ACA	Total
Base Rate	£3.53	£0.92	£4.45
Additional Needs	£0.20	£0.05	£0.25
Total	£3.73	£0.97	£4.70

- 3.2 Local Authorities are required to set an average funding rate for providers for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate (£4.70 for West Berkshire). This minimum funding level is referred to as the pass through rate. The Government will be monitoring compliance on this, and the "rules" surrounding this have been detailed.

- 3.3 The Early Years Pupil Premium Grant (EYPPG) is to continue.
- 3.4 A Disability Access Fund (DAF) payment of £615 per child per year will be made for children in receipt of Disability Living Allowance.
- 3.5 An SEN Inclusion fund also continues.
- 3.6 The additional funding for maintained nursery schools will continue for at least 2019/20. This will enable the lump sum to continue to be paid to these two WBC nursery schools.

4. Forecast Outturn for 2018/19

Table 1	2018/19 Budget Set	2018/19 Forecast	2018/19 Variance
	£	£	£
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers			
PVI Providers (90036)	6,199,460	6,055,008	-144,452
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,269,090	1,188,700	-80,390
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	876,070	893,603	17,533
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	719,480	553,555	-165,925
Pupil Premium Grant (53%) and deprivation funding (47%) (90052)	48,280	65,728	17,448
Total Delegated Funds	9,112,380	8,756,594	-355,786
Centrally Managed Funds			
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	223,300	219,660	-3,640
Pre School Teacher Counselling (90287)	45,000	45,000	0
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	75,000	84,360	9,360
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370	17,650	-5,720
SSRs	43,690	43,690	0
Total Centrally Managed Funds	410,360	410,360	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	9,522,740	9,166,954	-355,786
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,630,208	-9,644,948	-14,740
IN YEAR NET POSITION	-107,468	-477,994	-370,527
Early Years DSG Block Funding carried forward	-33,016	-£85,950	-52,934
OVERALL NET POSITION	-140,484	-563,944	-423,460

- 4.1 It should be noted that the funding regulations state that the funding for extended hours in 2019/20 will be “based on” January 2019 census data.

5. Budget Model for 2019/20

- 5.1 The Government require that all providers be on the same local universal formula rates by 2019/20 so there will be no minimum funding guarantee or funding caps in 2019/20.
- 5.2 West Berkshire should now introduce a single base rate. Using last year's calculations, going forward this will be a base rate of £4.30 with a quality supplement of 0.66p per hour.
- 5.3 The Early Years Funding Group propose that the base rate should increase to £4.40 with a quality supplement remaining 0.66p per hour.
- 5.4 The deprivation supplement based upon the current arrangements with the funding being linked to the early year's pupil premium, with an increase in the supplement from 0.47p to £1.47.
- 5.5 There has been a steady increase in applications for this funding but it is still very small in comparison to the funding attracted at statutory school age. As this is such an important time to be supporting young children who are disadvantaged and in many case are those with speech and language delay it was felt that an increase in funding would support this area of work.
- 5.6 The funding for two year olds has also been reviewed, both nationally and locally there has been a decrease in the number of children identified for and receiving this funding. This is partially due to the introduction of Universal Credit but also due to pressure on places from the introduction of the additional 15 hours for working parents. The staffing ratios for this group is higher which is reflected in the hourly rate. Therefore, to make places for 2 year olds more attractive and to encourage more providers to provide provision it was decided that an increase in the hourly rate would support this important provision.
- 5.7 The hourly rate to providers for 2 year olds will increase from £5.45 to £5.65.
- 5.8 The Local Authority is allowed to fund from the grant some centrally provided services, including staffing and IT costs in relation to overseeing the delivery of the free entitlement, sufficiency of places, eligibility checking, and administration of funding payments to providers. However funding for these services is limited by the requirement to set a "pass through rate" for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate.
- 5.9 Spend on provider payments has been set on the assumption that payments in Autumn 2019 and Spring 2020 will be similar to Autumn 2018 and Spring 2019 and that payments in the Summer term 2019 will be 13% higher than Spring 2019. (This forecast is in line with trends in early years numbers in previous years). However, because of the take up of extended hours has been lower than expected in the Autumn 2018 and Spring 2019 terms, allowance has been made for a further increase in extended hours of 14,000 hours on average in the financial year 2019/20.
- 5.10 In 2018/219 it was possible to increase the basic provider rate and the quality rate by 1.2% in 2018/19 to £4.30 and £0.66 per hour respectively. These funding rates gave a pass through percentage of 96.6%.

- 5.11 It should be noted that early years providers under the previous funding formula had no rate rises for five years. Since the introduction of the new national funding formula many providers have lower hourly rates and also more free entitlement hours to provide, which is having an impact on sufficiency and the offer to parents in West Berkshire. Therefore the proposed small increase helped to support the local childcare market and sufficiency of free entitlement places in West Berkshire.
- 5.12 It should be noted that 98 providers have gained from the final funding rates, 56 have remained static and a small number, 8 have seen a reduction in their funding rate at the end of the three year period of the minimum funding guarantee.
- 5.13 During the period since the introduction of the additional 15 hours for working parents there have been 6 settings that have closed, some due to financial pressures.
- 5.14 It is therefore proposed that the single base rate be increased to support all providers with the additional costs that have impacted on them over the past two years; rises in the minimum wage and pension costs alongside the introduction of the additional free entitlement to working parents.
- 5.15 The proposed Early Years Block Budget for 2019/20 and 2020/21 is set out in the table below:

Table 2	2019/20 Yr 1 Budget £	2020/21 Yr 2 Budget £
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers		
PVI Providers (90036)	6,344,848	6,344,848
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,323,979	1,323,979
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	917,912	917,912
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	652,969	652,969
Pupil Premium Grant (53%) and deprivation funding (47%) (90052)	131,455	131,455
Total Delegated Funds	9,371,163	9,371,163
Centrally Managed Funds		
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	266,300	271,600
Pre School Teacher Counselling (90287)	60,690	61,904
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000	90,000
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370	23,370
SSRs	49,500	49,500
Total Centrally Managed Funds	489,860	496,374
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	9,861,023	9,867,537
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,645,562	-9,667,456
Transfer to Central Schools Services Block		
IN YEAR NET POSITION	215,461	200,081
Early Years DSG Block Funding carried forward	-£563,944	-£348,483
OVERALL NET POSITION	-348,483	-148,402

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 Propose that the Forum agree the two year budget model for the Early Years block, as set out in section 5 of this report.
- 6.2 Based on our current estimates of forecast spend and funding for Early Years, the base rate will increase to £4.40 per hour for all providers and quality supplement at 0.66p per hour for providers who meet the criteria.
- 6.3 We support the uptake of funding and places for the most vulnerable two year olds with an increase to the hourly rate to providers for 2 year olds from £5.45 to £5.65.
- 6.4 To strengthen the provision which supports Pupil Premium and deprivation by an increase in the deprivation supplement from 0.47p per hour to £1.47 per hour.
- 6.5 However, Early Years numbers can be volatile from term to term and the final level of funding for 2019/20 will be partly based on January 2019 census data. Therefore if the final level of spend and/or funding for 2019/20 is significantly different from the budgeted level, it will be necessary to amend spending plans for 2020/21.

This page is intentionally left blank

Growth Fund 2018/19

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 11th March 2019
Report Author: Amin Hussain
Item for: Information **By:** All School representatives

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform School Forum Members of payments made to schools from the Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund budget in 2018/19.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To note the payments made to schools.

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 Under current school funding regulations, Local Authorities are allowed to top slice from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding for a Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund with the approval of their Schools' Forum.
- 3.2 We have a commitment to pay for the opening to for the new school Highwood copse.
- 3.2 The Growth Fund is to support primary and secondary maintained schools and Academies *required* to provide extra places/classes in order to meet basic need within the authority, and funding schools where very limited pupil number growth requires an additional class *as set out by infant class size regulations*. It is not payable where schools have chosen to put on an additional class, but actual pupil numbers do not require them to do so. The Schools' Forum agreed the criteria for the 2018/19 Growth Fund at its meeting on 5th December 2016, and set aside a budget of £162,000.
- 3.3 There was a Falling Rolls Fund to support good and outstanding primary and secondary schools with temporary falling rolls due to a population dip and where numbers are expected to rise again in 2 to 3 years' time. The purpose was to provide funding to enable the school to continue with their existing number of classes (but where current pupil numbers dictate that the number should be reduced) if population data suggests that this number of classes will be required again in the near future,

Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2018/19

thus avoiding a redundancy in the short term. The Schools' Forum agreed the criteria for the 2018/19 Falling Rolls Fund at its meeting on 5th December 2016, and set aside a budget of £40,000. At the meeting of the Schools' Forum on 11th December 2017, it was agreed not to continue with this fund, so no applications have been invited this year which would have become payable in the next financial year.

- 3.4 Following the receipt of the final October 2018 Census data, all schools were invited to make a funding request if they felt that their circumstances met the growth fund criteria. A review of the relevant pupil number data by Finance also identified schools that may potentially qualify for funding. To support their applications, schools were asked to submit information regarding increases in class and teacher numbers between the two academic years. Only growth in relation to basic need requirements in the area (and thus increases in PAN or bulge years approved by the local authority for this purpose) qualifies for this funding.

4. Budget and Payments Made 2018/19

- 4.1 Three schools have made successful applications for growth funding: Theale Primary, Bradfield Primary and John Rankin Infant school. All three schools met the Growth Fund criteria and the relevant payments has been approved by the Head of Education (the detailed calculations are in Appendix A):
- 4.4 It has been agreed by Schools' Forum that any unspent balance will be carried forward and added to next year's growth fund, to ensure that there is enough funding being built up for 2019/20 in order to pay formula funding for additional pupils in the new primary school, Highwood Copse, when it is planned to be opened in September 2019. As funding received through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is based on the previous year's pupil numbers, if additional funds are not set aside it will mean a reduction in funding available to allocate out to existing schools. The DSG allocation currently includes a growth fund allocation based on 2017/18 costs only and there is no other source of funding in the first year of a new school or as year groups are added.

5. Appendices

Appendix A – Growth Fund Calculations 2018/19

Growth Fund Calculations 2018/19

Bradfield Primary									
Year Group:	Pupil Numbers			No. of Classes			No. of Teachers FTE		
	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change
Reception	28	23	5			0.0			0.0
Year 1	25	20	5			0.0			0.0
Year 2	22	27	-5			0.0			0.0
SUB TOTAL Infant Classes	75	70	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Year 3	29	18	11			0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 4	18	17	1			0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 5	19	25	-6			0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 6	23	15	8			0.0		3.0	-3.0
TOTAL All Classes	164	145	19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	-12.0
Classes Required (assuming 30 pupils per class)									
Infants	3	3	0						
Total	7	6	1						
Funding Options:	No.	Rate	Funding	No. Mths	Payment	Max Payable per class:			
Infant Class Funding		£50,000	0	7	£0	£29,167			
or									
Additional class	19	£2,841	53,979	7	£31,488	£29,167			
or									
Increase in PAN		£1,421	0	7	£0	£14,583			
Reason for funding approved or for not meeting criteria:							Funding Approved:		
Growing school									£29,167
Head of Education approved									

Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2018/19

John Rankin Junior									
Year Group:	Pupil Numbers			No. of Classes			No. of Teachers FTE		
	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change
Reception			0			0.0			0.0
Year 1			0			0.0			0.0
Year 2			0			0.0			0.0
SUB TOTAL Infant Classes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Year 3	87	88	-1	3.0	3.0	0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 4	90	85	5	3.0	3.0	0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 5	86	81	5	3.0	3.0	0.0		3.0	-3.0
Year 6	85	59	26	3.0	2.0	1.0		2.0	-2.0
TOTAL All Classes	348	313	35	12.0	11.0	1.0	0.0	11.0	-11.0
Classes Required (assuming 30 pupils per class)									
Infants	0	0	0						
Total	12	11	1						
Funding Options:	No.	Rate	Funding	No. Mths	Payment	Max Payable per class:			
Infant Class Funding		£40,000	0	7	£0	£23,333			
or									
Additional class	35	£2,945	103,075	7	£60,127	£29,167			
or									
Increase in PAN		£1,473	0	7	£0	£14,583			
Reason for funding approved or for not meeting criteria:							Funding Approved:		
Growing school									£29,167
Head of Education approved									

Theale Primary									
Year Group:	Pupil Numbers			No. of Classes			No. of Teachers FTE		
	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change	Oct-18	Oct-17	Change
Reception	42	44	-2			0.0			0.0
Year 1	45	44	1			0.0			0.0
Year 2	43	45	-2			0.0			0.0
SUB TOTAL Infant Classes	130	133	-3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Year 3	45	46	-1	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Year 4	46	44	2	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Year 5	40	46	-6	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Year 6	45	29	16	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
TOTAL All Classes	306	298	8	11.0	10.0	1.0	11.0	10.0	1.0
Classes Required (assuming 30 pupils per class)									
Infants	5	5	0						
Total	11	10	1						
Funding Options:	No.	Rate	Funding	No. Mths	Payment	Max Payable per class:			
Infant Class Funding		£40,000	0	7	£0	£23,333			
or									
Additional class	8	£2,945	23,560	7	£13,743	£29,167			
or									
Increase in PAN		£1,473	0	7	£0	£14,583			
Reason for funding approved or for not meeting criteria:							Funding Approved:		
Growing school, increased pupil numbers									£13,743
Head of Education approved									

Schools: Deficit Recovery

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 11th March 2019

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

- 3.1 Schools are permitted to set a deficit budget if they meet certain conditions. This is termed a licensed deficit. The conditions of a licensed deficit are set out in the Scheme for Financing Schools (the legal contract the Council has with schools) and include a requirement to have a robust plan to repay the deficit within five years.
- 3.2 If the conditions are not met by the school, the Council has the power to issue a Notice of Concern, which ultimately could mean removal of a school's delegation.
- 3.3 Nine schools set a licensed deficit budget for 2018/19 totalling £870k.

4. West Berkshire Strategy for Schools in Deficit

- 4.1 The Council has adopted a strategy aimed to minimise the number and size of deficits. It is in two parts:
- (1) Procedures to support schools to reduce/eliminate or avoid a deficit
 - (2) Intervention for schools not meeting their deficit recovery plan.
- 4.2 Approval of a licensed deficit requires the school to do the following:
- (1) Submit monthly budget monitoring reports (M3 and then M5 to M11 inclusive)
 - (2) Submit a copy of draft governor meeting minutes (including Part 2) where the budget is discussed

Schools: Deficit Recovery

- (3) To attend meetings with the local authority when requested to address any budget concerns
- (4) Submit deficit recovery progress reports when requested, which will be reported to Schools' Forum
- (5) Submit five year detailed deficit recovery plan.

4.3 The Council Schools Finance team has been restructured to provide a dedicated resource to work with the schools that have set a deficit budget.

4.4 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.

5. 2018/19 Month Nine Position - Licensed Deficit Schools

5.1 Nine schools had a licensed Main School Budget (MSB) deficit in 2018/19, totalling £870k. At Period Nine, the forecast deficit for these nine schools is £604k. A summary is shown in the following table:

Schools with a Licensed Deficit	2018/19 Budget - Original	P9 Forecast	Variance
1 The Willink	-£311,588	-£257,345	-£54,243
2 John Rankin Federation	-£131,033	-£53,291	-£77,742
3 The Willows	-£130,797	-£91,997	-£38,800
4 Parson's Down	-£92,212	-£39,024	-£53,188
5 St Finians	-£61,542	-£62,837	£1,295
6 St Johns	-£46,000	-£8,686	-£37,314
7 Westwood Farm Federation	-£45,280	-£40,612	-£4,668
8 Beenham	-£36,153	-£50,502	£14,349
9 Kintbury St Mary's	-£15,576	£202	-£15,778
	-£870,181	-£604,092	-£266,089

5.2 The Willink School

The school has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2016/17	£2,630
2017/18	£98,684
2018/19	£311,588

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £257k, which is £54k better than the budgeted deficit of £312k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

The Willink Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	-£22,846	Overspend
Non Staff Budget	£31,756	Underspend
Total Expenditure	£8,910	Underspend
Total Income	£11,188	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	£20,098	UNDERSPEND
Teachers Pay Grant	£26,528	Unknown at time of budget build
Sixth Form	£1,200	Underbudgeted at budget build
SEN	£19,396	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	-£12,985	Overbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£34,139	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£54,237	FORECAST SAVING

The West Berkshire Council (WBC) Senior Accountant (Projects) made support visits to work with the school's Finance Manager on 4th October 2018 and 14th January 2019. The review meeting took place on 9th November 2018.

School's Progress Statement

"Agreed Licensed Deficit 2018-19: £311,590

P9 forecasts the end of financial year 2018-19 deficit as £257K. P10 outturn indicates a further reduction in deficit to £225K.

Improved budget monitoring and forecasting by our Finance Manager, with the advice of West Berks finance, has identified areas of over and underspend which has allowed greater scrutiny and deeper financial analysis.

The planned redundancies in support staff have taken effect. Opportunities have been taken to reduce support staffing through natural turnover, or re-evaluate job roles and replace on a lower salary grade when possible e.g. Examinations Officer on E grade replacing an Examinations Manager on G grade.

We have increased the number of cover supervisors, so reducing the cost of agency supply.

Further savings have been made in managing examinations; there are fewer exam entries post 16 than originally forecast.

The school will have the additional students in Year 7 and Year 12 in September 2019 - at least in line with the forecast in pupil numbers when the licensed deficit was set.

Our prognosis for the reduction in the deficit is that it will continue to be faster than that documented in the Licensed Deficit Agreement."

5.3 John Rankin Schools Federation

The Federation has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB/nursery)
2014/15	£28,693
2015/16	£169,724
2016/17	£122,680
2017/18	£189,992
2018/19	£131,033

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £53k, which is £78k better than the budgeted deficit of £131k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

John Rankin Schools Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	£12,450	Underspend
Non Staff Budget	£24,042	Underspend
Total Expenditure	£36,492	Underspend
Total Income	£20,292	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	£56,784	UNDERSPEND
Business rates adjustment	-£342	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£11,463	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	£915	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	£8,910	Underbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£20,946	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£77,730	FORECAST SAVING

The WBC Senior Accountant (Projects) made induction visits to work with the school's Finance Manager on 5th November and 11th December, and the review meeting took place on 12th October 2018.

A bid has been submitted for Schools in Financial Difficulty funding to cover the unexpected costs associated with the TUPE transfer and increased salaries upon evaluation by WBC Human Resources due to bringing the After School Club provision in house.

Schools Progress Statement

“Our plans in 2018/19 for deficit recovery included a range of initiatives; restructuring the leadership team, reducing the number of teaching assistance, taking the after school club ‘in house’, restructuring the school’s business management by introducing a ‘school business team’ to ensure stricter financial controls and robust organisational management. Our plans for the year are on track; a new leadership structure started in September 2018, teaching assistants and leadership full time equivalents have been reduced considerably, the after school club is now run by the school and the new school business team have had an overwhelming impact on the monitoring of the budget, increasing savings/income and improving efficiencies across the schools.”

5.4 The Willows Primary School

The school has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2016/17	£17,826
2017/18	£212,694
2018/19	£130,797

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £92k, which is £39k better than the budgeted deficit of £131k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

The Willows Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	£35,524	Underspend
Non Staff Budget	-£35,491	Overspend
Total Expenditure	£33	Underspend
Total Income	-£1,575	Reduced income
NET EXPENDITURE	-£1,542	OVERSPEND
Business rates adjustment	-£5,867	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£7,413	Unknown at time of budget build
Early Years	-£3,436	Overbudgeted at budget build
Schools in Financial Difficulty	£36,113	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	£1,845	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	£3,177	Underbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	£1,093	Underbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£40,338	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£38,796	FORECAST SAVING

The review meeting took place on 18th October 2018.

A bid has been submitted for Schools in Financial Difficulty funding to cover the West Berkshire Training Partnership School-Centred Initial Teacher Training £29,460.12 closing deficit.

School's Progress Statement

"The new leadership at the school is making significant progress to recover its licenced deficit earlier than predicted. Positive measures have been put in place to ensure that the budget and licenced deficit is being very well managed and controlled effectively."

5.5 Parsons Down Schools Federation

The Federation has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2017/18	£22,432
2018/19	£92,212

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £39k, which is £53k better than the budgeted deficit of £92k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

Parsons Down Federation Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	£58,350	Underspend
Non Staff Budget	-£47,496	Overspend
Total Expenditure	£10,854	Underspend
Total Income	£7,103	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	£17,957	UNDERSPEND
Business rates adjustment	-£1,172	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£8,894	Unknown at time of budget build
Schools in Financial Difficulty	£32,106	Unknown at time of budget build
Excluded pupils adj	-£1,214	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	-£1,524	Overbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	-£1,874	Overbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£35,216	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£53,173	FORECAST SAVING

The review meeting took place on 6th November 2018.

School's Progress Statement

"Forecast for the year end 2018-2019 is now £39,000. This is £53,000 better than the budgeted deficit of £92,000. This reduction in deficit is due to the robust actions taken by senior staff, including governors: we have applied for, and been allocated, a grant of £32,106 for schools that are in financial difficulty, we have restructured and reduced staffing and our leadership team and taken measures to stabilise our pupil numbers by reducing our Planned Admission Number (PAN) to 60. We have carried out a feasibility study to combine the schools onto one site which is integral to our deficit recovery plan. This will reduce running costs as we will be in one building rather than three. Despite reducing our PAN, the demographics of Thatcham mean that pupil forecasts we have just received for the next five years are lower than expected and, if correct, this presents an additional challenge to our deficit recovery plan which we will need to address."

5.6 St Finians Catholic Primary School

The school has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2017/18	£7,714
2018/19	£31,909

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £63k, which is £1k over the budgeted deficit of £62k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

St Finians Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	£6,495	Underspend
Non Staff Budget	-£2,419	Overspend
Total Expenditure	£4,076	Underspend
Total Income	-£4,861	Reduced income
NET EXPENDITURE	-£785	OVERSPEND
Teachers Pay Grant	£3,256	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	£184	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	-£2,760	Overbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	-£1,191	Overbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	-£511	REDUCED FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	-£1,296	FORECAST OVERSPEND

The WBC Senior Accountant (Projects) made a support visit to work with the Headteacher and School Business Manager on 22nd January 2019.

The review meeting took place on 6th November 2018. Whilst the school is forecasting a year end figure greater than the licensed deficit, the sum is at this time not considered significant so there is currently no plan to make a second review visit.

A bid will be submitted for Schools in Financial Difficulty funding to cover the reduced funding as a result of small cohort year.

School Progress Report

“Whilst we are forecasting a small overspend on the agreed deficit this has been out of the school's control due to the company providing afterschool clubs pulling out at short notice. We have already engaged a new provider and hope to increase the provision in the summer term, including running holiday clubs. We have continued to make savings on staffing”

5.7 St John the Evangelist Infant School

The school has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2016/17	£22,725
2017/18	£37,759
2018/19	£46,000

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £9k, which is £37k better than the budgeted deficit of £46k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

St John the Evangelist Infant School Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	-£18,836	Overspend
Non Staff Budget	-£1,408	Overspend
Total Expenditure	-£20,244	Overspend
Total Income	£39,099	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	£18,855	UNDERSPEND
Teachers Pay Grant	£3,927	Unknown at time of budget build
Early Years	£14,640	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	-£288	Overbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	£182	Underbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£18,461	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£37,316	FORECAST SAVING

The review meeting took place on 23rd November 2018 and was followed by a short support visit by the WBC Senior Accountant – Projects to work with the outgoing School Business Manager.

School’s Progress Statement

“St John the Evangelist school is on track as planned in its budget recovery. Key points in this recovery are that the Head teacher will become part time, working three days. This is equivalent to having the budgeted Executive Head and this will happen a term earlier. The numbers for the Nursery have been much better than budgeted which has had a favourable impact on funding. Census numbers for catering were higher which has increased funding for UIFSM. Catering costs are subject to continued scrutiny. Supply costs have been lower than expected.”

5.8 Westwood Farm Schools Federation

The Federation has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2015/16	£40,270
2016/17	£67,108
2017/18	£82,753
2018/19	£45,280

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £41k, which is £5k better than the budgeted deficit of £45k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

Westwood Farm Schools Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	-£13,318	Overspend
Non Staff Budget	-£19,793	Overspend
Total Expenditure	-£33,111	Overspend
Total Income	£14,074	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	-£19,037	OVERSPEND
Main School Budget Delegation	-£2,944	Overbudgeted at budget build
Business rates adjustment	-£1,665	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£7,972	Unknown at time of budget build
Early Years	£23,739	Underbudgeted at budget build
SEN	-£3,677	Overbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	£273	Underbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£23,698	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£4,661	FORECAST SAVING

The review meeting took place on 10th December 2018.

School Progress Report

“As at period 9 the schools remain on target to reduce the deficit from a budgeted £45,280 to £40,612 and remain hopeful to reduce further by the end of the year.

There have been a number of initiatives contributing to this:

- Increase of nursery hours offer from 15 to 30 hours
- Resignation of part time Assistant Headteacher (no plans to replace)
- Savings on unplanned maintenance through use of in-house caretaker repairs
- Consolidation of copier contracts across schools and loss of local printers (savings in consumables)

Whilst these and other projects undertaken (such as move from telephony to Voice over Internet Protocol) achieved other small ‘in year’ savings the long term impact suggests greater sustainability.”

5.9 Beenham Primary School

The School has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2016/17	£37,090
2017/18	£64,783
2018/19	£36,153

The Period Nine forecast is a deficit of £51k, which is £14k over the budgeted deficit of £36k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

Beenham Primary School Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	£805	Underspend
Non Staff Budget	-£16,440	Overspend
Total Expenditure	-£15,635	Overspend
Total Income	£326	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	-£15,309	OVERSPEND
Business rates adjustment	-£108	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£1,776	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	£3,567	Underbudgeted at budget build
Pupil Premium Grant	-£3,980	Overbudgeted at budget build
Universal Infant FSM	-£351	Overbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£904	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	-£14,405	FORECAST OVERSPEND

The WBC Senior Accountant (Projects) made a support visits to the school on 8th October and 4th December.

The first review meeting took place on 16th November. Given the significant forecast overspend a second review meeting took place on 15th February.

School Progress Report

“Budget recovery has been inhibited during the financial year 2018/19 due to:
Appointment of an additional lunchtime supervisor to meet the need of a high level Special Education Needs (SEN) pupil.

A member of staff with a long term debilitating illness.

Actions taken to reduce the deficit in year

The head is currently teaching for two days a week in the class where the member of staff is on long term sick leave.

The PE coach has changed his timetable to enable him to run a sports session over one lunchtime. This negates the need for a lunchtime supervisor on one day each week.

The school no longer has an Assistant Head.

Parents now contribute towards their child’s stationery costs.

School’s private fundraising has been used to purchase additional resources and equipment that would usually be purchased from the budget.”

5.10 Kintbury Primary School

The school has had the following Main School Budget deficit balances:

Financial Year	Deficit Balance (MSB only)
2017/18	£12,317
2018/19	£15,576

The Period Nine forecast is a surplus of £202, which is £16k better than the budgeted deficit of £16k. The main variances are shown in the following table:

Kintbury Primary School Main School Budget Summary Period 9 Forecast		
Breakdown of variance ORIGINAL budget to forecast		
Staffing Budget	-£2,445	Overspend
Non Staff Budget	£2,029	Underspend
Total Expenditure	-£416	Overspend
Total Income	£8,956	Additional income
NET EXPENDITURE	£8,540	OVERSPEND
Business rates adjustment	-£468	Unknown at time of budget build
Teachers Pay Grant	£2,887	Unknown at time of budget build
SEN	£4,796	Underbudgeted at budget build
TOTAL FUNDING	£7,215	ADDITIONAL FUNDING
TOTAL VARIANCE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET	£15,755	FORECAST SAVING

The review meeting took place on 13th November 2018.

School's Progress Statement

“The Period 9 forecast is a surplus of £202, which is £16K better than the budgeted deficit of £16K. We therefore expect to be out of deficit by the end of the financial year. Main savings have included the recruitment of two Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) from September 18. We did however still have a teaching staff overspend as a result of higher than budgeted supply costs due to illness and NQT training costs. Additional in year income from SEN support and Teachers Pay Grant has also aided the recovery.”

6. Schools going into Deficit

- 6.1 In addition to the nine schools above, one additional school has contacted WBC Senior Accountant (Projects) to inform the authority it is forecasting an in year deficit of £7k. A meeting has been held with the school to discuss possible mitigation measures.
- 6.2 A further eight schools are forecasting a year end deficit in their Period Nine Budget Monitoring and Forecast submission. None of these schools have requested support. One of the eight has submitted an application for Schools in Financial Difficulty funds for consideration at this meeting and a second intends to submit an application for consideration at the June meetings.
- 6.3 The total of these forecast deficits is £32k.
- 6.4 A table of all school balances is shown at Appendix A.

School Revenue Balance History	Main School Budget	Main School Budget	Main School Budget
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Primary Schools			
Aldermaston Church of England Primary School	29,611	17,144	45,363
Basildon Church of England Primary School	10,129	1,123	2,952
Beedon Church of England (Controlled) Primary School	13,640	12,317	26,861
Beenham Primary School	1,682	-37,090	-64,783
Birch Copse Primary School	3,526	6,373	25,169
Bradfield Church of England Primary School	70,852	585	4,077
Brightw alton Church of England Aided Primary School	21,794	21,741	9,232
Brimpton Church of England Primary School	18,723	5,300	3,506
Bucklebury Church of England Primary School	3,570	13,411	25,631
Burghfield St Mary's Church of England Primary School	6,871	1,740	16,310
Calcot Schools Federation	181,143	140,975	129,103
Chieveley Primary School	25,865	28,296	36,876
Cold Ash St Mark's Church of England Primary School	65,049	98,760	100,210
Compton Church of England Primary School	45,129	48,011	34,629
Curridge Primary School	14,801	18,900	26,022
Dow nsw ay Primary School	52,194	43,780	48,100
Enborne Church of England Primary School	7,753	-1,359	14,962
Englefield Church of England Primary School	42,956	43,903	35,110
Falkland Primary School	130,859	152,399	133,531
Francis Baily Primary School	45,505	54,110	38,684
Garland Junior School	112,450	85,642	52,629
Hampstead Norreys Church of England Primary School	8,843	2,264	5,766
Hermitage Primary School	32,780	38,182	11,226
Hungerford Primary School	72,788	39,169	52,054
The Ilsleys' Primary School	1,915	-1,697	-6,496
Inkpen Primary School	19,860	18,585	22,427
John Rankin Schools Federation	-169,724	-122,680	-189,992
Kennet Valley Primary School	32,990	41,326	27,068
Kintbury St Mary's Church of England Primary School	53,442	24,958	-12,317
Lambourn Church of England Primary School	31,667	-38,734	-30,171
Long Lane Primary School	10,120	-2,341	-17,060
Mortimer St John's Church of England School	-2,557	5,040	15,839
Mortimer St Mary's CofE Junior School	42,093	47,673	44,169
Mrs Bland's Infant School	5,279	6,444	9,150
Pangbourne Primary School	17,520	6,344	26,901
Parsons Dow n Schools Federation	95,901	16,147	-22,432
Purley Church of England Infant School	25,155	16,745	38,203
Robert Sandilands Primary School and Nursery	33,631	30,288	53,018
Shaw -cum-Donnington Church of England Primary School	28,356	30,768	32,043
Chaddle orth Shefford Federation Cof E Primary School	10,859	27,541	47,448
Springfield Primary School	30,989	34,296	47,541
Spurcroft Primary School	-102,459	-7,842	52,785
St Finian's Catholic Primary School	19,645	-7,714	-31,909
St John the Evangelist Cof E Infant and Nursery School	29,180	-22,724	-37,759
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	49,197	53,394	49,633
St Nicolas Church of England Junior School	1,129	5,508	35,737
St Paul's Catholic Primary School	52,375	36,856	47,990
Stockcross Church of England School	3,441	-6,324	1,155
Streatley Church of England Voluntary Controlled School	56,926	74,572	105,998
Sulhamstead and Ufton Nerve CofEVA Primary School	-6,145	-3,778	-5,514
Thatcham Park Church of England Primary School	6,149	46,340	76,275
Theale Church of England Primary School	15,403	8,835	7,723
Welford and Wickham Church of England Primary School	3,705	-10,940	3,471
Westw ood Farm Schools Federation	-40,270	-67,108	-82,753
The Willow s Primary School	68,364	-17,826	-212,694
The Winchcombe School	66,127	43,788	96,787
Woolhampton Church of England Primary School	28,386	14,560	17,985
Yattendon Church of England Primary School	11,173	6,043	11,832
Total Primary Schools	1,548,335	1,122,024	1,035,304

Schools: Deficit Recovery

School Revenue Balance History	Main School Budget	Main School Budget	Main School Budget
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Secondary Schools			
The Downs School	514,309	353,723	290,539
Little Heath School	89,429	187,470	287,347
The Willink School	75,709	-2,630	-98,684
Total Secondary Schools	679,446	538,563	479,201
Nursery Schools			
Hungerford Nursery School Centre for Children and Families	16,325	43,185	35,172
Victoria Park Nursery School	62,501	63,435	85,766
Total Nursery Schools	78,826	106,620	120,939
Special Schools			
Brookfields Special School	204,496	185,995	19,738
The Castle School	403,601	282,590	346,254
Total Special Schools	608,097	468,585	365,992
Pupil Referral Units			
iCollege Alternative Provision	592,083	464,944	252,095
Total PRUs	592,083	464,944	252,095
Total for all Schools	3,506,788	2,700,736	2,253,531

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2018/19 – Month 10

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 11th March 2019

Report Author: Amin Hussain

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

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 only 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 actual brought forward over spend, is £92.8m; the revised DSG budget is built with a planned over spend of £464k.
- 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. (by either creating a reserve or increasing the budget for one off expenditure).
- 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. Month 10 Forecast (31 January 2019)

4.1 The forecast position at Month Ten is shown in Table 1. A more detailed position per cost centre is shown in Appendix A.

Table 1 - DSG Block Net Budgets	Original Budget	Support Services	DSG Grant Funding	Planned +over/-under spend	Forecast Overspend					Variance to Plan
					Month Three	Month Six	Month Seven	Month Nine	Month Ten	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Schools Block (inc ISB)	97,913	-62	-64,985	-94	0	-94	-94	-94	-94	0
Central Schools Services Block	1,053	-205	-1,079	-26	0	-27	-26	-58	-71	-45
Early Years Block	9,529	-50	-9,492	37	0	37	37	46	-319	-356
High Needs Block	19,776	-127	-17,249	547	0	881	979	605	605	58
Total Net Expenditure	128,270	-444	-92,804	464	0	797	896	499	121	-343

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 Ten against expenditure budgets is £121k

4.3 The forecast overspend includes the £87k under achievement on the High Needs funding due to a reduction in the import/export adjustment.

4.4 The Department of Education announced in December 2018 an additional £380k of high needs funding for 2018-19 and 2019-20 in recognition of the cost pressures that Local Authorities are experiencing on the high needs block. This has been included in the forecast figure.

4.5 Explanations for variances per funding block are summarised in the following paragraphs.

5. Schools Block

5.1 Table 2 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.

Table 2 - Schools Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	97,913	390	64,829	64,829	0
Support services			62	62	0
DSG grant funding	-97,913		-64,985	-64,985	0
Net Position	0	390	-94	-94	0

5.2 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.

6. Early Years Block

6.1 Table 3 sets out the current forecast of the Early Years Block. The budget was set with an over spend due to the change in the carried forward amount from 2017/18.

Table 3 - Early Years Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	9,529	0	9,479	9,123	-356
Support services			50	50	0
DSG grant funding	-9,576		-9,492	-9,492	0
Net Position	-47	0	37	-319	-356

6.2 The Early Years Block is difficult to predict due to the volatile nature of both the funding (the final grant allocation will be determined by the January 2019 census), and payments to providers (payments are made according to actual number of hours of provision each term). The final grant for 2017/18 has been notified, and a claw back of £355k has been taken against a provision of £360k.

6.3 As at Month Ten there is a £356k forecast underspend please refer to Early Years block report for further details.

7. Central Schools Services Block

7.1 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 £26k brought forward under spend from 2017-18 which has been adjusted within this budget.

Table 4 - Central Schools Services Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	1,053	0	847	803	-45
Support services			205	205	0
DSG grant funding	-1,053		-1,079	-1,079	0
Net Position	0	0	-26	-71	-45

7.2 As at month Ten there is a £45k forecast underspend due to a lower than budgeted charge for Copyright Licenses and a reduction in administration costs for the Capita IT system.

8. High Needs Block

8.1 Table 5 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 5 - High Needs Block	Original Budget	Budget Changes	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure	19,776	100	17,669	17,991	323
Support services			127	127	0
DSG grant funding	-19,074		-17,249	-17,514	-265
Net Position	702	100	547	605	58

8.2 There is currently a forecast overspend of £323k against expenditure and an £87k under achievement on the grant allocation which is due to the lower than predicted amount of the import export adjustment.

8.3 An additional £380k of high needs funding has been allocated for 2018-19 in recognition of the cost pressures in the high needs block. This has been included in the forecast figure.

8.4 The main variances against expenditure are as follows:

- £45k – overspend in Applied Behaviour Analysis which represents the number of learners requiring bespoke packages to meet their needs.
- £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.
- £36k - over spend in SEN Commissioned Provision largely as a result of a forecast under achievement in income of £31k due to a place being filled by a WBC pupil. Savings will be realised elsewhere as a result of placing pupils in our own provision. There is also a forecast over spend on the repairs and maintenance budget.
- £128k – under spend in Further Education College Top Ups – as a result of building the budget on the same basis as last year which was found to be incorrect and did have a large under spend at the end of 2017/18.
- £215k – over spend in the PRU top up budgets – this is as a result of more than expected pupils receiving funding as permanently excluded pupils than budgeted.
- £125k – over spend in the EHCP PRU Placement budget – this is funding for pupils attending the PRU where they are on a single roll and the request is agreed by the SEN Assessment Team. Savings may be identified elsewhere as a result of using this provision.

- Other over and under spends within the Top Up funding areas are demand led and can be as a result of pupil movement from one setting to another.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 Over spends in the High Needs Block is significant and the total over spend forecast against this Block is £605k (including budgeted over spend and additional grant allocation, £381k). There needs to be a serious consideration to where spending can be scaled back and savings identified in order to contain the over spend to the initial budget.
- 9.2 Though a transfer could be made from the Schools Block to support the High Needs Block, it would be a one year only transfer and would not address the structural deficit problem.

10. Appendices

Appendix A – DSG 2018-19 Budget Monitoring Report Month 10

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2018-2019 Budget Monitoring Month 10

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	
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	
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 - CLEAPSS	3,170		3,170	3,170	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	133,010	-26,600	Budget incorrectly set to include VAT
90019	Servicing of Schools Forum	43,580		43,580	43,580	0	
90743	School Admissions	244,860		244,860	238,610	-6,250	Reduced costs for Capita IT System
90354	ESG - Education Welfare	201,900		201,900	195,400	-6,500	Reduced costs for Capita IT System
90460	ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	197,540		197,540	191,920	-5,620	Reduced costs for Capita IT System
	Central School Services Block DSG	847,490	0	847,490	802,520	-44,970	

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2018-19	Net Virements Agreed In Year	Amended Budget 2018-19	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90010	Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	876,070		876,070	893,600	17,530	
90037	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	1,269,090		1,269,090	1,188,700	-80,390	
90036	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	6,199,460		6,199,460	6,055,010	-144,450	
90052	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	48,280		48,280	65,730	17,450	
90053	Disability Access Fund	23,370		23,370	17,650	-5,720	
90018	2 year old funding	719,480		719,480	553,550	-165,930	
90017	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	223,300		223,300	219,660	-3,640	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	45,000		45,000	45,000	0	
90238	Early Years Inclusion Fund	75,000		75,000	84,360	9,360	Increased demand
	Early Years Block Total	9,479,050	0	9,479,050	9,123,260	-355,790	
90026	Academy Schools RU Top Ups	854,270		854,270	815,680	-38,590	Slight reduction in FTE compared to budget.
90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	3,300,420		3,300,420	3,362,730	62,310	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	984,610	-113,460	Known movements to other settings including one placement costing in excess of £100k
90575	Non LEA Special School (OofA)	840,100		840,100	803,420	-36,680	Various movements of placements.
90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	2,436,400		2,436,400	2,321,260	-115,140	Various movements of placements.
90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,396,140		1,396,140	1,267,940	-128,200	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	274,240	-18,780	Number of pupils lower than expected at one site
90618	Non WBC Resourced Units - Top Up Funding	107,000		107,000	135,180	28,180	Known costs for placements agreed to date
90621	Mainstream - Top Up Funding maintained	541,560		541,560	650,410	108,850	Increasing numbers of pupils entitled to Funding

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2018-19	Net Virements Agreed In Year	Amended Budget 2018-19	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Acadamies	185,170		185,170	247,080	61,910	Increasing numbers of pupils entitled to Funding
90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	75,000		75,000	83,920	8,920	Known costs for placements agreed to date
90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	542,950		542,950	757,700	214,750	Summer and Autumn Term Actuals. Estimated for Spring Term.
90627	Disproportionate No: of HN Pupils NEW	100,000		100,000	83,610	-16,390	Actual Payments Full Year 2018-19
90628	EHCP PRU Placement			0	126,330	126,330	Estimate based on number of pupils currently attending the PRU with EHCPs
High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total		11,770,100	0	11,770,100	11,914,110	144,010	
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		1,600	1,600	1,600	0	2017/18 Residual C/F budget agreed by SF
90370	Behaviour Programme (Invest to Save)	0	78,400	78,400	78,400	0	
90371	PPEP Care Programme	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	
90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	75,000		75,000	119,570	44,570	Based on current demand
90280	Speci 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	26,190	-1,800	Low take up on Exam Grant
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	Few er than expected places requested therefore recharges lower.

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2018-19	Net Virements Agreed In Year	Amended Budget 2018-19	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	2017/18 C/F budget agreed by SF.
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	456,000		456,000	491,670	35,670	Premises Expenses pressure. Places filled by WB & Other LA pupils .
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	45,000	0	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	2,315,350	178,530	
	High Needs Block Total	17,568,920	100,000	17,668,920	17,991,460	322,540	
	Total Expenditure across funding blocks	92,334,440	490,300	92,824,740	92,746,520	-78,220	
	SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES	444,000		444,000	444,000	0	
	TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE	92,778,440	490,300	93,268,740	93,190,520	-78,220	

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 14

Schools Forum Work Programme 2019/20

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 5	<i>Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman</i>			11/06/19	17/06/19	Decision	
	Schools in Financial Difficulty - Bid for Funding: St Finians	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Scheme for Financing Schools 2018/19	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	School Balances 2018/19	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain Ian Pearson/Amin Hussain
	DSG Outturn 2018/19	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Decision	
	Schools Funding Benchmarking Information	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Information	Amin Hussain
	High Needs Block - Invest to Save Update	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Decision	Jane Seymour
	Vulnerable Children's Fund - Annual Report for 2018/19			11/06/19	17/06/19	Information	Michelle Sancho
Term 6	Trade Union Facilities Time - Annual Report for 2018/19			11/06/19	17/06/19	Information	Gary Upton
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	29/05/19	05/06/19	11/06/19	17/06/19	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	Scheme for Financing Schools 2018/19	25/06/19	02/07/19	09/07/19	15/07/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	School Budgets 2019/20 and Schools in Financial Difficulty	25/06/19	02/07/19	09/07/19	15/07/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	De-delegations 2020/21	25/06/19	02/07/19	09/07/19	15/07/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Schools' Forum Membership and Constitution from September 2019			09/07/19	15/07/19	Decision	Jessica Bailiss
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	25/06/19	02/07/19	09/07/19	15/07/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	DSG Monitoring Month 3			09/07/19	15/07/19	Discussion	Ian Pearson
Term 1	DSG Budget Overview 2020/21	24/09/19	01/10/19	08/10/19	14/10/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	Schools Funding Formula 2020/21	24/09/19	01/10/19	08/10/19	14/10/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Final De-delegations 2020/21	24/09/19	01/10/19	08/10/19	14/10/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Additional Funding Criteria 2020/21	24/09/19	01/10/19	08/10/19	14/10/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	24/09/19	01/10/19	08/10/19	14/10/19	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
Term 2	DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 5			08/10/19	14/10/19	Information	Ian Pearson
	Draft DSG Funding & Budget 2020/21	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	Final School Funding Formula Proposal 2020/21	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Final Additional Funding Criteria 2019/20	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Draft Central Schools Block Budget	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	Draft High Needs Budget 2020/21	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	High Needs Places and Arrangements 2020/21	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Schools Funding Benchmarking Information	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Information	Amin Hussain
	High Needs Block - Resourced Units	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Outline Early Years Forecast 2019/20 and Budget 2020/21	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Avril Allenby
	Update on Schools in Financial Difficulty	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Information	Wendy Howells
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	19/11/19	26/11/19	03/12/19	09/12/19	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
Term 3	DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 7			03/12/19	09/12/19	Information	Ian Pearson
	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2020/21	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Discussion	Amin Hussain
	Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Central Schools Block Budget Proposals 2020/21	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Decision	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2020/21	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Decision	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019/20	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Information	Amin Hussain
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	02/01/20	08/01/20	14/01/20	20/01/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 9			14/01/20	20/01/20	Information	Ian Pearson
Term 4	Work Programme 2020/21	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Jessica Bailiss
	Final DSG Budget 2020/21 - Overview	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Amin Hussain
	Final Central Schools Block Budget 2020/21	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Amin Hussain/Ian Pearson
	Final High Needs Block Budget 2020/21	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho
	Final Early Years Block Budget 2020/21	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Avril Allenby
	Schools: deficit recovery (<i>standing item</i>)	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 10			03/03/20	09/03/20	Information	Ian Pearson

This page is intentionally left blank