

# Notice of Meeting

---

## Schools Forum

**Monday 20th January 2020 at 5.00pm**  
At Shaw House Church Road Newbury  
RG14 2DR

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 14 January 2020

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

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



## **Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 20 January 2020 (continued)**

**Forum Members:** Reverend Mark Bennet, Dominic Boeck, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Jon Hewitt, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, Sheila Loy, Ross Mackinnon, Julia Mortimore, Ian Nichol, Erik Pattenden, Janet Patterson, Derek Peale, Gemma Piper, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Jayne Steele, Bruce Steiner (Chairman), Suzanne Taylor and Charlotte Wilson

# **Agenda**

## **Part I**

		<b>Page No.</b>
1	<b>Apologies</b>	
2	<b>Minutes of previous meeting dated 9th December</b>	1 - 14
3	<b>Actions arising from previous meetings</b>	15 - 16
4	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
5	<b>Membership</b>	17 - 18

## **Items for Decision**

6	<b>De-delegations 2020/21 (Ian Pearson/Melanie Ellis)</b>	19 - 58
7	<b>Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (Melanie Ellis)</b>	59 - 70
8	<b>High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2020/21 (Jane Seymour)</b>	71 - 108
9	<b>Central Schools Block Budget Proposals 2020/21 (Melanie Ellis)</b>	109 - 114

## **Items for Discussion**

10	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2020/21 (Melanie Ellis)</b>	115 - 118
11	<b>Schools: deficit recovery (standing item) (Melanie Ellis)</b>	119 - 122



## Items for Information

- |    |  |           |
|----|--|-----------|
| 12 | <b>DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 9 (Ian Pearson)</b>  | 123 - 132 |
| 13 | <b>Forward Plan</b>  | 133 - 134 |
| 14 | <b>Date of the next meeting</b><br><i>Monday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020, 5pm at Shaw House</i>  |           |
| 15 | <b>Exclusion of Press and Public</b><br>RECOMMENDATION: That members of the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items as it is likely that there would be disclosure of exempt information of the description contained in the paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 specified in brackets in the heading of each item.<br><a href="#">Rule 8.10.4 of the Constitution refers.</a> |           |

## Part II

- |    |  |           |
|----|--|-----------|
| 16 | <b>Schools' Broadband Contract (Thomas Ng)</b><br><i>(Paragraph 3 – information relating to financial/business affairs of particular person) and (Paragraph 6 – information relating to proposed action to be taken by the Local Authority).</i> | 135 - 140 |
|----|--|-----------|

Sarah Clarke  
Head of Legal and Strategic Support

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



This page is intentionally left blank

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

## **SCHOOLS FORUM**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2019**

**Present:** Reverend Mark Bennet, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston, Jacquie Davies, Antony Gallagher, Keith Harvey, Jon Hewitt, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, Ian Nichol, Councillor Erik Pattenden, Janet Patterson, Graham Spellman (Vice-Chairman), Jayne Steele, Bruce Steiner (Chairman) and Charlotte Wilson

**Also Present:** Amerie Bailey (Contracts Manager), Robert Bradfield (Service Manager - Commissioning), Melanie Ellis (Chief Accountant), 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 Dominic Boeck, Sheila Loy, Councillor Ross Mackinnon, Julia Mortimore, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Suzanne Taylor and Gary Upton

#### **PART I**

#### **45 Minutes of previous meeting dated 14th October 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2019 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **46 Actions arising from previous meetings**

The Chairman drew the Schools' Forum's attention to the actions from the last meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2019 Oct19-Ac3, Oct19-Ac4 and Jul19-Ac2 were completed or in hand.

Oct19-Ac1: Melanie Ellis confirmed that finance training was being set up by the School's Team and would form part of the Governor Training, which would take place in January 2020.

*(Post Minute comment from Schools' Accountancy Team: As part of our Service Level Agreement we provide:*

- *Up to two days on site support offered for all new Finance Officers (FOs)/ School Business Managers (SBMs) (additional days may be purchased).*
- *On-site visit to a new Head Teacher. This is to explain the West Berkshire Council financial processes and procedures which are the responsibility of the Head Teacher.*
- *A half day visit is offered in either the summer or autumn term to review/discuss any developments in schools accountancy and ensure current work practices are robust and up to date.*
- *Training on any new systems/procedures e.g. a half day training for every SBM/FO on the new budgeting system in autumn 2018. This is being replicated in January 2020 for anyone newly employed since the last training.*

*Adhoc chargeable training e.g.:*

- *School Finance and the Role of the Governor – provided to school governors in conjunction with the Audit team.)*

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Oct19 – Ac2: Bruce Steiner reported that Jessica Bailiss had followed up the action. The ESFA's Good Practice Guidance did not specify a length of time for Term of Office. The Term of Office could therefore be extended to four years as suggested at the last meeting of the School's Forum. If agreed, any new or re-elected members, from the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2019, would have a Term of Office of four years.

Jonathan Chishick proposed that the Term of Office be extended from three to four years and this was seconded by Catie Colston. At the vote the motion was carried.

Jan19-Ac1: Jessica Bailiss reported that there was still a Secondary Governor vacancy on the Forum. Effort would continue in the New Year to fill the position.

**RESOLVED that** the Term of Office be extended from three to four years and the Constitution be updated accordingly.

### 47 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

### 48 **Membership**

The following points were raised:

- Two of the Academy headteacher positions had been filled by Derek Peale from Park House School and Julia Mortimore from St Bartholomew's School, with Gemma Piper from Kennet School as her substitute.
- In October, Jonathon Chishick was re-elected as Primary Governor Representative for another three year term.
- There were still a number of vacancies on the Forum. These included a maintained primary business manager position, a maintained secondary governor position and one Academy Headteacher position. Effort would continue in the New Year to fill these positions.

### 49 **De-delegations 2020/21 (Ian Pearson)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 6), which set out the details, cost and charges to schools of the services on which maintained school representatives were required to vote whether or not they should be de-delegated.

Services were only de-delegated to mainstream schools however, academies were able to buy back the majority of de-delegated services.

Ian Pearson drew attention to the recommendations under section two of the report which were phased. The recommendation under section 2.1 for primary schools included an additional de-delegated fund which was the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund. It was also highlighted that the recommendation related to funding in 2020/21 and not 2019/21 as stated in the report.

Regarding Health and Safety services, Health and Safety Level One included Option Two services, which was the most basic option of services. Schools wishing to offer a more comprehensive level of service could buy back services included in Option One.

The proposals set out in the report would be included in the consultation with all schools on the proposed school funding arrangements for 2020/21. The recommendations detailed under section two of the report, were those that had been supported by the Heads funding Group at its meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019. Given that the information would be sent out shortly to schools for consultation a final decision would not be sought from the Schools' Forum regarding de-delegated services until its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020, once the consultation period had concluded. At this stage agreement was required regarding the information that should be included within the consultation document.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Jonathon Chishick noted on the table under section three of the report that the 2020/21 Primary Budget for the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund was marked as 'to be confirmed'. Jonathon Chishick noted that the balance of the fund was at £181k and recalled that a threshold had been set for the fund of £250k. He therefore queried if the reserve would need topping up. Ian Pearson referred to paragraph 8.2 of the report, which made the assumption that there would be no further bids to the fund in 2019/20. They had not however, reached the end of the financial year and therefore further bids were possible. The issue was therefore whether they should work on the basis that the shortfall should form the target that needed to be de-delegated. This would be included in the consultation. Keith Harvey queried the threshold that had been agreed and recalled that it was £200k rather than £250k. Ian Pearson confirmed that this point would be checked. *(Post minute comment: this was subsequently checked and confirmed as £200k).*

Ian Nichol referred to the table under section 5.2 regarding the Therapeutic Thinking Service (Previously Behaviour Intervention) and noted that the budget for Primary Schools had risen by only £6k for 2020/21 however, the cost per pupil had risen substantially. Melanie Ellis reported that this was due to there being fewer pupils to spread funding over, due to academy conversion. Ian Nichol commented that it would be helpful to include pupil numbers within the table.

Ian Pearson stated that as part of the process the Schools' Forum could agree what was set out within the report or alternatively that some costs should be reduced. If the latter was decided then the figures sent to schools as part of the consultation would need to be adjusted.

The Chairman asked the Schools' Forum if it agreed in principle with the recommendations set out under section two of the report, which would be included in the consultation with schools. As there were no maintained secondary headteachers present the Forum was unable to consider section 2.2.

Keith Harvey proposed that maintained primary school members support the information set out in section 2.1 of the report, and this was seconded by Antony Gallagher. At the vote the motion was carried.

Jon Hewitt proposed that maintained special, nursery and PRU schools support the information set out in section 2.3 of the report and this was seconded by Jacqueie Davies. At the vote the motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED that**

- The threshold for the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would be checked and confirmed at the next meeting of the Schools' Forum in January.
- Pupil numbers to be included within the table under section 5.2 regarding the Therapeutic Thinking Service, for the next meeting in January 2020.
- The relevant maintained school members supported the recommendations set out in section two of the report that would return to the Schools' Forum on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020 for final decision, once the consultation with schools had concluded.

### **50 Additional Funding Criteria (Melanie Ellis)**

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 7), which aimed to set out the current criteria and budgets for additional funds for review by the Schools Forum to ensure they were still relevant and met their purpose.

The Growth Fund would be calculated by the Department for Education (DfE) and received in December 2019. Melanie Ellis reported that the reserve for the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund was currently at £181k. A decision would need to be made as to whether to de-delegate this service in 2020/21, in order to top up the fund, or whether to

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

leave it at £181k, assuming no further bids were received in 2019/20. This would be included within the consultation with schools.

Details regarding the Additional High Needs Fund was contained under section 4.5 of the report. It was apparent that the number of schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils was continuing to grow and funding needed to be set aside from the High Needs Block at the current level of spend, in order to fund those schools qualifying. It was proposed that this remained at £100k.

A decision was required from the Schools' Forum to agree the proposed criteria for the Growth Fund, Financial Difficulty Fund and Additional High Needs Fund in order for this information to go out to consultation with schools. The budget for each fund also needed to be agreed.

Jonathon Chishick referred to the Additional High Needs Fund and noted that this money was used to fund schools with higher number of pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) than assumed in the formula. He felt that schools with higher numbers of pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) but not EHCPs, should also benefit from the funding. Jonathon Chishick stated that he had raised the matter before however, acknowledged that the area was a challenge because of the way schools self-identified pupils against a set of measures regarding SEN. There were particular primary schools that were more attractive to parents, due to how they catered for certain SEN pupils, and as a result these schools were being placed under increased pressure.

Ian Pearson acknowledged the issue raised by Jonathon Chishick and the potential difficulties due to schools using their own self-identification measures. It would be difficult to include this matter as part of the consultation document for 2020/21 due to timescales however, Ian Pearson suggested that Officers could work on a proposal that could be presented at a future meeting in 2020, including proposals and implications. It was important to note that this could place further pressure on the High Needs Block. Jonathon Chishick was satisfied with the proposed way forward on the issue and timescale. He stated that it seemed to be a growing issue and therefore it needed to be looked at. Jane Seymour agreed but, stated there was a lot of variation between schools regarding how they placed pupils on the SEN register and there was risk that a perverse incentive could be caused.

Catie Colston felt that investigation into the issue was wise seeing as the thresholds for EHCPs had risen. Keith Harvey concurred and supported that the issue needed to be looked at however, also agreed with Jane Seymour's comment that a perverse incentive could be created. It might however be an opportunity to bring the number of EHCPs down.

Hilary Latimer stated that over 4% of the pupils at her school had EHCPs. The school received £24k to meet the needs of these pupils however, this did not adequately cover costs. Hilary Latimer felt that schools under increased pressure from higher numbers of SEN pupils needed support.

Jane Seymour clarified that the threshold for EHCPs had not increased. The number of EHCPs had actually risen by 33% and the matter was that the level of needs were getting higher.

Catie Colston suggested that Officers could investigate what other local authorities were doing on the issue. Ian Pearson noted that members of the Forum were supportive for the issue to be taken to the Heads' Funding Group for further discussion.

The Chairman invited members of the Forum to vote on whether they agreed the proposals included within the report regarding the criteria and budgets for additional funds for 202/21, in order to go out to consultation with schools. Keith Harvey proposed



## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

that the Schools' Forum support the proposals set out in section four of the report and this was seconded by Ian Nichol. At the vote the motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED that**

- A report would be brought to a meeting of the Heads' Funding Group in 2020 including proposals and implications for dealing with schools under increased pressure due to higher numbers of SEN pupils.
- The Schools' Forum agreed the proposals under section four of the report, in order to go out to consultation with schools.

### **51 Resourced Schools (Jane Seymour)**

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 8), which aimed to inform the Schools' Forum of the proposed action in response to concerns expressed by some mainstream schools with resourced units, in that they had a shortfall in funding, and to seek agreement from the Schools' Forum regarding the action proposed within the report.

It was proposed under section five of the report that a survey was sent to all schools with resourced units in December 2019 to identify specific pressure areas and enable a targeted review of resourced school funding to take place. It was also proposed that any potential changes required to the resourced unit banding system were identified and considered by the Heads Funding Group and Schools Forum in March 2020, in the context of the High Needs Block (HNB) shortfall in 2020-21. Jane Seymour stressed that it was important that pressure on the HNB was kept in mind when considering what action should be taken.

The Chairman invited members of the Schools' Forum to consider and vote on the proposals contained within the report. Catie Colston proposed that the Schools' Forum agreed the proposals set out in section five of the report and this was seconded by Jon Hewitt. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the proposals under section five of the report were agreed by the Schools' Forum.

### **52 School Meal Catering and Cleaning Contracts (Robert Bradfield)**

Bruce Steiner welcomed Robert Bradfield and Amerie Bailey to the meeting. A comprehensive report had been circulated (Agenda Item 9), which aimed to update the Schools' Forum on the progress made with the school meal arrangement.

Robert Bradfield reported that consultation with schools regarding a procurement strategy had now come to an end and only 10 schools had opted to remain in the West Berkshire Council (WBC) tendered provision for school meals. The cleaning contract was still an issue as only three schools had opted to remain in a WBC led tender process.

Hilary Latimer stated that her school was one of the schools that had opted into the WBC led contract and were in an impossible situation because it was likely that bids would cause schools meals to be too expensive. This could potentially result in the school losing its kitchen facility and becoming less attractive to potential parents. Hilary Latimer stated that small schools like her own were not able to go out to tender on an individual basis as the contract amount was too expensive. Amerie Bailey stated that this reflected the feedback starting to be received from schools. Those that had left the WBC led scheme were being faced with requests for enormous management fees.

Ian Pearson stated that smaller schools were more vulnerable due to their size and often rural location. There was no further money in the system for WBC to subsidise the cost to schools and therefore schools were having to meet costs from their own delegated budgets. This was particularly hard for small schools.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Catie Colston noted that some of the schools that had opted out of the WBC led process were small schools and queried what they were doing. Robert Bradfield stated that he was unsure what action was being taken on an individual school basis however, smaller schools were beginning to realise that they would not achieve economies of scale. Some schools were working in clusters to obtain contracts.

The Chairman commented that there did not seem to be enough money within education to go around to all schools. He hoped that this would change after the General Election due to take place on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2019.

Catie Colston noted the decision a number of schools had taken to opt out of the WBC led cleaning contract and queried how final this decision was, as many were being faced with a very volatile situation. It was possible that schools had opted out due to the recent situation with the school meals catering contract. Robert Bradfield explained that the timescales for the tendering process were the problem. It was hoped that the process would be launched in January 2020 and then there would need to be six months before the contract could go live.

Brian Jenkins felt that it seemed like action had been taken by the WBC commissioning team without doing a full analysis. Robert Bradfield explained that presentations had been provided to schools to ensure that they could make an informed decision.

The Chairman invited members of the Schools' Forum to consider the proposal set out under section six of the report for a tender for schools to be undertaken on a cross-subsidised model, with no cap on gains. Catie Colston proposed that the Schools' Forum agree the proposal set out in the report and this was seconded by Ian Nichol. At the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED** that the proposal set out under section six of the report was agreed by the Schools' Forum.

### 53 **Draft High Needs Budget (Jane Seymour)**

*(It was decided that item 11 would be discussed prior to item 10)*

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 11) which set out the current financial position of the High Needs Block (HNB) Budget for 2019/20 and the position known so far for 2020/21, including the likely short fall.

Jane Seymour drew attention to section 3.6 of the report, which stated that in 2020/21 the Government had increased the Local Authorities HNB budget. In West Berkshire's case, the HNB budget would increase from £20,070,067 to £21,595,616, which was an increase of £1,525,616 or 7.6%. There would also be an in year import / export adjustment, which was difficult to estimate at this stage.

Section 3.7 of the report highlighted the net shortfall in the 2020/21 HNB, which was £3,158,616. This included a predicted overspend for 2019/20 of £2,050,052. Table One on page 115 of the agenda showed a breakdown of the pressure on the HNB and highlighted the latest estimate of expenditure in the HNB budget for both 2019/20 and 2020/21. Currently an overspend of £1.5m was predicted. Jane Seymour explained that this overspend had been planned as a planned deficit of £1.6m had been set.

The current in year pressure was £1.1m and Appendix A set out the areas where pressures on the HNB could be seen and the reasons for the pressure on the 2020-21 HNB budget.

#### Top Up Funding

The largest area of pressure was Top Up Funding, detailed on page 117 of the report, with a pressure of £540,780 being placed on the HNB. Positively a lot of spend in this area would go in to provision provided by West Berkshire Council. Mainstream

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

maintained and mainstream academies were causing an increased pressure of nearly £170k. The pressure in this area reflected the increase in Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) within mainstream schools. Positively the pressure from Independent Special Schools had reduced by £136k.

### Pupil Referral Units (PRUs)

The next significant pressure on the HNB was PRUs and this was detailed on page 120 of the report. This was because of the increase number of EHCPs. Placements at a PRU were more cost effective than placing pupils at mainstream or special schools.

### Non Statutory Services

The cost in this area would remain however, some invest to save proposals had been added.

Non statutory services had been used to create savings over recent years however, some of these savings had impacted negatively on other areas of the system. For example, charges for Language and Literacy Centres (LALs) were introduced in 2018/19 at 50% of the placement cost. As a result the take up of placements had fallen. It was therefore proposed that the Schools' Forum might wish to consider restoring the LAL budget to its original figure of £116,200 and removing charging.

There was also a proposal included to increase the Vulnerable Children's Grant (VCG), which had been gradually reduced from £120k over the past years. Schools making calls on the fund were often finding it was depleted before year end. It was therefore proposed that £60k was added to the fund in 2020/21 to increase the budget to £110k.

Finally, there was also a proposal included on page 126 of the report to fund a Therapeutic Thinking Officer. Without this post there was a serious risk that the potential of the Therapeutic Thinking to realise savings in the HNB would not be realised.

Jane Seymour reported that all of the proposals for invest to save would be up for discussion by the Heads' Funding Group (HFG) and Schools' Forum. No savings proposals had yet been formed however, savings could only be made to non-statutory services and as seen in the past savings in this area often impacted negatively on statutory services.

Jane Seymour highlighted that a transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the HNB was proposed as part of agenda item 10.

Keith Harvey commented that even if the maximum amount was transferred from the Schools Block to the HNB and all statutory services were cut, the deficit would continue to rise. Ian Pearson commented that a cash injection had been received from the Government however, it had not had the desired impact as the deficit had continued to grow. A proposal was included under agenda item 10 that sought views from schools regarding a transfer of funds from the Schools Block to the HNB. Schools would need to consider if they were willing to contribute to help tackle the issue being faced. In order to tackle strategic issues in a structural way, consideration needed to be given to what should be invested in.

Ian Pearson explained that a second section to the consultation document showed how any budget transfer from schools could be used and that it would not be used to simply reduce the deficit.

Gemma Piper referred to pupil numbers and felt it would be helpful to see the pressures broken down by pupil numbers. Jane Seymour commented that this had been carried out as part of the SEN Strategy. There had been a 33% rise in EHCPs. Until recently this rise had only been amongst the 19-25 age group however increases were also now being seen in younger age groups. More cost effective placements were required for students

and it was about putting funding into schools to help them support the needs of their pupils.

Gemma Piper further queried the figures under Table Four with regards to home tuition. Ian Pearson stated the figure for home tuition was the result of the conflation of two figures due to the service being brought in house. This had reduced the cost by £40k as a savings contribution to the HNB.

Ian Pearson concluded the report was for information at this stage however, further discussion would take place under agenda item 10 regarding the proposal to transfer funding.

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

### 54 School Funding Formula and Consultation (Melanie Ellis)

*(It was decided that item 11 would be discussed prior to item 10)*

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 10), which set out the requirement and changes for setting the primary and secondary school funding formula for 2020/21 and to set out West Berkshire Council's funding proposals to go out to consultation with all schools.

The basic structure of the National Funding Formula (NFF) had not changed for 2020/21. The factors that would be taken into account when calculating the Schools Block Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding through the NFF were shown under section 4.1 of the report.

Appendix One to the report compared schools' allocations to the previous year. A decision would need to be reached on how any shortfalls or surpluses were allocated.

Regarding the High Needs Block (HNB) the report proposed the possibility of a funding transfer and this was included within modelling options. Section 5.6 of the report set out six different options for allocating funding to schools. The Local Authority had modelled a number of scenarios to determine the impact on the options of individual schools' budgets. Options four to six under section 5.6 had not been taken further. Modelling was based on an assumption that the funding available to schools would be reduced by £520k. Melanie Ellis highlighted that some schools would not contribute as they were already at the minimum per pupil funding level.

Melanie Ellis reported that Option Three (a combination of options one and two) had been supported by the Heads' Funding Group. This option protected 17 schools and provided a more even distribution of funding across schools. The information would go out for consultation with schools from 10<sup>th</sup> until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019. Melanie Ellis reported that Appendix B to the report provided a consultation document on the Funding Formula and Appendix C was a document consulting schools on the potential block transfer.

Catie Colston was concerned about the short turnaround time for the consultation. Melanie Ellis reported that councils normally received the allocation information in July however, this had not been received until October 2019. The formula had to be submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) by a statutory deadline of 21<sup>st</sup> January 2020. Keith Harvey felt that some of the language used within the consultation document was difficult to understand and suggested that a summary document be included when the information was sent out to schools.

Jonathon Chishick queried why schools were not listed alphabetically and Melanie Ellis agreed to update this.

Graham Spellman referred to pupil numbers and queried when the October 2019 census data would be available. There was uncertainty when this would be available. Ian

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Pearson reported that a re-balancing of phased numbers might be required and this would need to be looked at.

Ian Pearson referred to Appendix C on page 111 of the report, which set out the consultation proposals regarding a transfer for the Schools Block to the HNB. A sliding scale had been used and was detailed under section 6.3 of the report. The table under section 6.4 of the report showed how this funding could be allocated if schools approved the transfer. The exact detail of how the funding would be used would need to be agreed by the Schools' Forum.

Jonathon Chishick noted the sliding scale that had been applied under section 6.4 however, queried why any increase in funding as a result of the sliding scale was shown under the Vulnerable Children Grant (VCG). He queried, if money was no object, how much this area would require. Ian Pearson reported that this fund had been reduced over time and was being exhausted. Schools using this fund were schools that had a need that could not be met by any other fund. Issues requiring schools to call on the fund were often short term. The VCG was currently being depleted very quickly. Ian Pearson reported that currently areas were not funded based on their level of need and this formed a structural problem in the way local authorities were funded. An attempt was being made to re-balance the costs to schools that currently schools were trying to re-balance on an individual basis.

Michelle Sancho reported on the area of Therapeutic Thinking and that ideally she would fund more Officers to lead the area or work and would fund further training. The VCG was however, currently the largest issue of concern. For example the VCG might be required by a school if it was faced with a child at risk of being permanently excluded that it was unable to retain due to pressures on its budget. The child might not meet the criteria of requiring an EHCP however, was still vulnerable. This was an example of when a call would be made on the VCG.

Jane Seymour commented that if there was more money available for ASD services then she would increase the size of the team. Jane Seymour reported that she had tried to form realistic proposals.

Ian Pearson reported that a transfer of funding had been proposed in 2018/19 however it had not been supported by the Schools' Forum. Ian Nichol queried what view the Heads' Funding Group had given regarding the transfer of funding. Ian Pearson reported that it had been agreed that it should be included in the consultation. Ian Pearson had also attended the Secondary and Primary Headteacher Forums to help schools understand the background to the issue. It was up to individual schools how they should respond on the issue.

Catie Colston referred to page 112 and struggled to see how schools would answer the question regarding the transfer without knowing what they would have to forfeit as a result. Jonathon Chishick felt that there should be another option for schools to choose, which was to transfer no funding. Schools should also be given the opportunity to provide an explanation for their choice.

Jon Hewitt added that 0.5% was not the maximum amount that could be transferred, but anything above this would need to be agreed by the Secretary of State.

The Chairman invited members of the Schools' Forum to consider the proposals under section two of the report. Keith Harvey proposed that the Schools' Forum approve the recommendation that the proposals included in the report should be sent to all schools for consultation before setting the school funding formula for 2020/21. Secondly, due to short timescales, the results of the consultation should be emailed to Schools' Forum members to review and comment ahead of the next meeting in January. Keith Harvey's proposal was seconded by Jonathon Chishick and at the vote the motion was carried.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- A summary document be included with the consultation with schools.
- Schools should be listed alphabetically within the consultation document.
- The recommendations set out in section two of the report were approved by the Schools' Forum.

### **55 Draft Central Schools' Budget (Melanie Ellis)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 12), which set out the budget proposal for services funded from the Central Schools' Services Block (CSSB).

The final allocation of funding for the CSSB for 2020/21 was £951,820. The table on page 86 of the report showed the budget requirement for services that fell within the CSSB for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20.

There had been a shortfall on the block since it was established and section 5.1 of the report set out how this shortfall had been managed. Areas for discussion going forward included the transfer of funding from one of the other blocks. More detailed proposals on this would be brought to the next round of meetings in January 2020.

Ian Pearson referred to page 131 of the report, and stated that there were numerous activities supported by the Central Schools Services Block, including servicing the Schools' Forum which benefitted all schools though the pupil number used to calculate the allocation excluded nursery special and PRU.

Ian Pearson stated that in 2018 there had been a transfer from the Early Years and High Needs Blocks into the CSSB to properly reflect activity. This would be looked at in more detail at the next round of meetings in January 2020.

Jonathon Chishick queried if there was scope for sharing services across smaller local authorities. Ian Pearson reported that this had been explored in the past and some of West Berkshire Council's services were already shared. However, due to a number of factors including economies of scale and decision making, agreement for a shared service had never been reached.

*(Reverend Mark Bennet joined the meeting at 6.23pm)*

Jonathon Chishick referred to Copyright Licensing and felt that this was an area that could potentially be shared. Ian Pearson reported that some areas were negotiated at a national level by the Department for Education (DfE). More detail including the time spent by teams on each area could be found under Appendix A.

Councillor Erik Pattenden referred to section 4.2 and the reduction in staff and asked what impact this reduction was having. Ian Pearson reported that regarding team reductions, the Finance Support Team was under the most pressure with a 29% reduction. Melanie Ellis reported that there had been many changes to the Schools' Finance Team over the past year. Sustainability would need to be evaluated going forward.

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

### **56 High Needs Place Funding (Jane Seymour)**

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 13), which aimed to advise the Schools' Forum of planned places allocated currently to special schools, resourced schools.

The Education Skills and Funding Agency (ESFA) would base 2020/21 planned place funding on the place funding allocated for 2019/20 for schools which received their planned place funding through the Local Authority. There would be no opportunity for

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

local authorities to request additional planned places for these schools, although it was possible to move places between schools.

If agreed, funding for additional places would be top sliced from the HNB. 17 new planned places had been request however, a request had also been made to remove 13 places from Newbury College and therefore there was a net increase of four planned placed.

Jonathon Chishick referred to the table on page 136 of the report and queried why it referred to 'post 16 only'. Jane Seymour confirmed that this combined a number of places including children with EHCPs in resourced units with the post 16 group.

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

### **57 Proposed banding system for funding children with EHCPs attending PRUs (Jane Seymour)**

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 14), which aimed to provide information on the implementation of the banding system for funding children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) who attended PRUs. The banding system was agreed by the Schools' Forum in November 2018 and there were different bands for the different levels of need.

Jane Seymour drew attention to the figures under section 4.7 which set out that the banding system had been applied to children with EHCPs in the PRUs and would cost approximately £502,760 in the 2019-20 financial year. It was estimated that the costs would be approximately £578,230 in the 2020-21 financial year due to increasing numbers of children with EHCPs in PRUs. This represented a pressure of £246,830. However, PRU placements for children with EHCPs were more cost effective than non-maintained and independent special school placements.

Jane Seymour explained that the banding system was applied retrospectively to pupils who had attended the PRUs from April 2018 and since that time 34 pupils with EHCPs had been placed at iCollege (some only on the temporary basis).

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

### **58 DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 7 (Ian Pearson/Melanie Ellis)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 15) which set out the forecasted financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), highlighting any overspends.

There was a deficit recovery requirement of £1.8m for 2019/20 and this represented the difference between the expenditure budgets set across the blocks and actual funding received for 2019/20. £1.6m of the deficit was within the High Needs Block and £0.2m was in the Early Years Block. This was in accordance with the 2019/20 budget agreed by the Schools' Forum at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2019. The month seven forecast position was shown under Table One on page 168 of the report.

Ian Pearson referred to a wider issue regarding the deficit in 2018/19. The deficit amount had fallen just below the threshold that required a deficit recovery plan to be submitted to the DfE. It was more likely that this would be required for 2019/20 and if this became a reality the Schools' Forum would need to take a view on the issue.

Reverend Mark Bennet noted there were figures provided on the overall budget and forecasts however, there were no actual figures provided. Melanie Ellis reported that currently this was how the Local Authority conducted its budgeting and figures were not looked at on a monthly basis.

## SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Jonathon Chishick queried what lobbying had taken place regarding the lack of funding for high needs. Ian Pearson reported that lobbying efforts had been extensive including with the local Member of Parliament and the Local Government Association. Extra money had been received from the Government for high needs as a result of lobbying action that had taken place nationally however, the sums of funding were too small to solve the problems being faced long term.

Brian Jenkins added that lobbying by the early years sector was also taking place.

Hilary Latimer noted that there were some local authorities across the country not facing a deficit in their high needs budget and queried what these authorities were doing differently. Ian Pearson stated that there were only a minority of local authorities not facing a deficit in their high needs budgets. West Berkshire was in a better position than many other local authorities which were facing a deficit.

Jacque Davies queried what would happen next for the local authorities facing a deficit. Ian Pearson stated that some local authorities were submitting deficit recovery plans and others had refused. It was not possible to form a credible plan until it was known what funding was available the following year. Catie Colston stated that the issues being faced were continuously being repeated and cautioned against creating a magic trick to fix the situation. It was important to be truthful about the real issues being faced.

Reverend Mark Bennet referred to the deficit being faced and queried when it would become a practical issue that would mean that bills could no longer be paid. He queried when this point would be reached. Ian Pearson stated that the DSG was owned by colleagues at the DfE and therefore an answer would be needed from them on this question.

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

### 59 **Schools: Deficit Recovery (Melanie Ellis)**

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 16), which provided the details of four schools which had submitted deficit budgets for 2019/20, the two schools which ended the 2018/19 financial year with an unlicensed deficit balance and a summary of the schools that submitted deficit forecasts for 2020/21.

An action from the last Schools' Forum in October 2019 had involved adding a section to the report on the number of schools predicting a deficit in year two. This was included under section five of the report. Melanie Ellis reported that although the summary indicated that the number of schools with a deficit would be high, this was not expected to be the case. Section 5.2 explained that historically schools did not tend to spend a significant amount of time on the two years of forecast (2020/21 and 2021/22) as the funding information available was not robust, the time available to schools to work on forecasts was limited and it had been noted that some schools were no longer preparing three year School Development Plans to support three year budget forecasting.

Year two budgets detailed under section five showed an increase in the number of schools with deficits. Melanie Ellis highlighted that this was only indicative and this number had historically reduced as time progressed.

Antony Gallagher queried if the funding allocations sent to schools as part of the consultation would include the possible 0.5% transfer of funds. He was mindful that the position of some of the schools predicting deficits could worsen if this was agreed. Melanie Ellis responded that the schools included within the report might already be at the minimum funding amount per pupil and therefore would not be impacted upon if the transfer was agreed. The detail on this would be included within the consultation with schools.

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



**SCHOOLS FORUM - 9 DECEMBER 2019 - MINUTES**

**60 Forward Plan**

**RESOLVED that** the Schools' Forum noted the forward plan.

**61 Date of the next meeting**

*Monday 20th of January 2020, 5pm at Shaw House*

*(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 6.47 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

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

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## Actions from previous meeting

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Dec19 - Ac1	9th December 2019	De-delegation proposals 2020/21	The threshold for the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would be checked.		A threshold of £200k was agreed by the Schools' Forum in December 2018.
Dec19 - Ac2	9th December 2019	De-delegation proposals 2020/21	Melanie Ellis to ensure that pupil numbers were included within the next de-delegation report.	Melanie Ellis	An updated report will be included with the agenda for 20th January 2020.
Dec19 - Ac3	9th December 2019	Additional Funding Criteria	A report would be brought to a future meeting of the Heads' Funding Group in 2020 including proposals and implications for schools under increased pressure due to higher numbers of SEN pupils.	Jane Seymour	This will be placed on the Work Programme for July 2020.
Dec19 - Ac4	9th December 2019	Schools Funding Formula and Consultation	A summary document be included with the consultation with schools.	Melanie Ellis	Completed. This was included with the consultation documentation for schools.
Dec19 - Ac5	9th December 2019	Schools Funding Formula and Consultation	Schools should be listed alphabetically within the consultation document.	Melanie Ellis	Completed.

## Ongoing Actions

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Jan19 - Ac1	Ongoing	Membership	An election be conducted for the position of Secondary Governor Representative on the Schools' Forum.	Jessica Bailiss	An election is scheduled to take place at the beginning of the financial year 2020/21.

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Membership Report

---

<b>Report being considered by:</b>	The Schools' Forum		
<b>On:</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> January 2020		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Jessica Bailiss		
<b>Item for:</b>	Information	<b>By:</b>	All Forum Members

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To ensure members of the Schools' Forum are kept informed regarding the membership of the Forum.

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Members of the Schools' Forum note the report.

### 3. Membership information

- 3.1 On the 9th December 2019, the Schools' Forum agreed that the Term of Office for Schools' Forum Members be extended from three to four years. This change will take effect for any new or re-elected members joining the Forum after the 9th December 2019. Those who were members of the Forum prior to the 9th December 2019, will continue on their three year term.
- 3.2 The constitution for the Schools' Forum has been updated accordingly to reflect this change.

### 4. Vacancies

- 4.1 There are currently three vacancies on the Forum including a maintained primary business manager, a maintained secondary school governor and an academy headteacher position.
- 4.2 The necessary action is being taken to try and fill these positions including an election, which will take place in the spring for the maintained secondary governor position.

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## De-delegation Proposals 2020/21

---

<b>Report being considered by:</b>	Schools Forum		
<b>On:</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> January 2020		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Melanie Ellis, Ian Pearson		
<b>Item for:</b>	Decision	<b>By:</b>	All Maintained Schools Representatives

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

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

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That representatives of maintained primary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2020/21 financial year for:

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

- 2.2 That representatives of maintained secondary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2020/21 financial year for:

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

- 2.3 That representatives of maintained special, nursery and PRU heads should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2020/21 financial year for:

- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
  - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools
  - Internal Audit of schools
  - Administration of pensions for school staff
  - Health and Safety (level 1 support)

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

### 3. Summary of Proposals

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>2020/21 Primary Budget £</b>	<b>Proposed by HFG</b>	<b>2020/21 Secondary Budget £</b>	<b>Proposed by HFG</b>	<b>2020/21 Early Years &amp; High Needs Budgets £</b>	<b>Proposed by HFG</b>
Therapeutic Thinking Support	186,716	Yes	51,318	Yes	n/a	n/a
Ethnic Minority Support	232,498	Yes	4,558	Yes	n/a	n/a
Trade Union Representation	40,934	Yes	11,250	Yes	n/a	n/a
Schools In Financial Difficulty	19,000	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CLEAPSS	1,856	Yes	1,215	Yes	n/a	n/a
Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 1	201,677	No	55,429	No	10,272	No
Statutory and Regulatory Duties Option 2	149,265	Yes	41,024	Yes	7,603	Yes

### 4. Background

4.1 The Schools' Forum in October and December 2018 agreed for the following services to be centrally provided to primary and secondary maintained schools in the 2019/20 financial year through the pooling of funding:

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

4.2 The schools funding regulations for 2020/21 have now been published and these confirm that similar arrangements for de-delegation of the cost of these services will apply for 2020/21. Funding arrangements are expected to change in 2021/22, but details of the changes have not yet been announced.

4.3 Primary and secondary school representatives are required to recommend to Schools Forum whether or not funds should be de-delegated in the financial year 2020/21 for:

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support
- Trade Union Representation
- Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary only)
- CLEAPSS



- 4.4 Funds cannot be de-delegated from Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs for these services, but those schools will have the option to buy back these services at a cost based on the same amount per pupil as for primary and secondary schools.
- 4.5 Representatives of all maintained schools (including Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs) are required to recommend to Schools Forum whether or not funds should be de-delegated for the services which make up Statutory and Regulatory Duties.
- 4.6 Academies and other non-maintained schools also may be able to choose to buy into any of the above services subject to service provider agreement.
- 4.7 Appendix A sets out the total cost of each service and the amount to be de-delegated from each school. This is the final amount based on the October 2019 census.

## 5. Therapeutic Thinking Service (previously Behaviour Intervention)

- 5.1 The Therapeutic Thinking Service proposal for 2020/21 is set out in Appendix B.
- 5.2 Table 1 shows the budget and unit charge for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20. The total cost has been divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2019 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school is based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2019 census the cost is £16.09 per pupil.

TABLE 1	2019/20			2020/21		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	12,294	£15.26	£180,808	11,603	£16.09	£186,716
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,127	£15.26	£54,482	3,189	£16.09	£51,318
<b>Total</b>			<b>£235,290</b>			<b>£238,034</b>

## 6. Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service

- 6.1 The detail of the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) is set out in Appendix C.
- 6.2 Table 2 shows the budget and unit charge for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20. The total cost in respect of Primary and Secondary schools has been divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (EAL) in the October 2019 census to determine a unit charge per EAL pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school is based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2019 census the cost is £318.03 per pupil.

TABLE 2	2019/20	2020/21
---------	---------	---------

	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	692	£345.39	£239,167	731	£318.03	£232,498
Maintained Secondary Schools	17	£345.39	£5,880	14	£318.03	£4,558
			<b>£245,047</b>			<b>£237,056</b>

## 7. Trade Union Representation

- 7.1 The detail of the service provided by Trade Union representatives to schools is set out in Appendix D.
- 7.2 Table 3 shows the budget and unit charge for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20. The proposal for 2020/21 is based on the cost of 1FTE supply teacher on UPS3. It is assumed there will also be some buy in from academy schools. The total net cost in respect of primary and secondary schools has been divided by the total number of pupils in the October 2019 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based on. As all schools have access to all representatives (regardless of which school they are based in), the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2019 census the cost is £3.53 per pupil.

	2019/20			2020/21		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	12,294	£3.52	£43,257	11,603	£3.53	£40,934
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,127	£3.52	£11,002	3,189	£3.53	£11,250
			<b>£54,259</b>			<b>£52,184</b>

## 8. Schools in Financial Difficulty

- 8.1 The Schools in Financial Difficulty reserve at the end of financial year 2018/19 is £252,000. This fund is largely used for one off exceptional costs such as those in relation to staffing restructures.
- 8.2 The primary schools in financial difficulty fund had £252k remaining at the end of 2018/19 and it was not topped up in 2019/20. Bids amounting to £71,000 have been approved in 2019/20, leaving the reserve at £181,000. The de-delegation of this service in 2020/21 would require the fund to be topped up to the previously agreed level of £200k.

	2019/20			2020/21		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools				11,603	£1.64	£19,000
Maintained Secondary Schools						n/a
						<b>£19,000</b>

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

- 9.1 The detail of the service provided by this subscription is set out in Appendix E.
- 9.2 As the actual pricing from CLEAPSS will not be available until after the schools budget has been set, an assumption has been made on the 2020/21 fee. Any over or under spend will be recovered the following year, as in all de-delegated services. Table 5 shows the budget and unit charge for the service for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20. The unit charge includes the administration fee. Note that secondary schools will need to pay the fee relating to sixth form pupils separately as de-delegation is based on pre 16 pupils only.

TABLE 5	2019/20				2020/21			
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Charge per school	Budget	Number of pupils	Est Unit Charge per pupil	Est Charge per school	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	12,294	£0.16		£2,034	11,603	£0.16		£1,856
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,127	£0.16	£225	£1,288	3,189	£0.16	£235	£1,215
				<b>£3,322</b>				<b>£3,072</b>

## 10. Statutory and Regulatory Duties

- 10.1 Statutory regulatory duties consist of the statutory responsibilities held by the local authority in respect of maintained schools. These consist of Accountancy, Internal Audit, Pension scheme administration and Health and Safety. The Accountancy, audit and pension administration services are described in appendix F.
- 10.2 In 2019/20 funds to provide level 1 Health and Safety support were de-delegated but individual schools were given the choice whether or not to buy back level 2 support. The Health and Safety service is proposing two alternative options for de-delegation, as set out in appendix G. Option 1 is to de-delegate funds to provide level 1 and 2 support for all maintained primary and secondary schools. Option 2 is the same arrangement as for 2019/20.
- 10.3 Table 6 shows the budget and estimated unit charges for these services in 2020/21 compared to 2019/20. The total cost will be divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2019 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. The same unit charges will apply to both primary and secondary schools. The unit charges shown are based on the October 2019 census.

TABLE 6	2019/20			2020/21					
	Number of pupils	Charge per Pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Total Budget	Primary Budget	Secondary Budget	budget for Other *
Accountancy	16,092	£3.03	£48,715	15,881	£3.11	£47,857	£36,097	£9,921	£1,839
Audit	16,092	£2.87	£46,154	15,881	£2.97	£45,700	£34,470	£9,474	£1,756
Pension Scheme Administration	16,092	£2.23	£35,948	15,881	£2.39	£36,729	£27,704	£7,614	£1,411
Health and Safety Option 1 (level 1 & 2)				15,881	£8.91	£137,093	£103,406	£28,420	£5,267
Health and Safety Option 2 (level 1)	16,092	£4.04	£64,959	15,881	£4.39	£67,606	£50,993	£14,015	£2,597
Total Option 1					<b>£17.38</b>	<b>£267,379</b>	<b>£201,677</b>	<b>£55,429</b>	<b>£10,272</b>
Total Option 2		<b>£12.17</b>	<b>£195,776</b>		<b>£12.86</b>	<b>£197,892</b>	<b>£149,265</b>	<b>£41,024</b>	<b>£7,603</b>

NOTE:

2019/20 Health and Safety Option 1 proposal was £8.04 per pupil to include Level 1 & 2 support

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

## 11. Consultation and Engagement

11.1 The proposals set out in this report were included in the consultation with all schools on the proposed school funding arrangements for 2020/21. Of the 17 schools that responded, all supported the proposals, with three comments made on the Schools in Financial Difficulty fund as shown below:

- (1) We agree with the majority of the proposed services being de-delegated, but would question how/why the amount for schools in difficulty needs to be topped up to £250k if it has not been required this year. Is this based on prior knowledge or a huge increase in schools in difficulty? (Note: top up level confirmed at £200k).
- (2) We do not agree with the de-delegation relating to Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty. There is no such financial 'safety net' for Secondary Schools and the existence of the Primary fund does not encourage sound financial decision making. (comment made by a Secondary School).
- (3) Our school faces a deficit budget due to reduced NOR over this period and should be eligible for a Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund. This fund held £181k in reserve at the end of 2019/20. De-delegating the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would require this fund to be maintained to previously agreed minimum £250k. (Note: top up level confirmed at £200k).

## 12. Appendices

Appendix A – De-delegations per school for 2020/21

Appendix B – Therapeutic Thinking Support Service

Appendix C – Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service

Appendix D – Trade Union Representation Service

Appendix E – CLEAPSS Service

Appendix F – Accountancy, Audit and Pension Administration

Appendix G - Health and Safety

Appendix H – Health and Safety Service Level Provision

Appendix I – Health and Safety Legal Duty Holders



## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2020/21

#### Therapeutic Thinking Support Team

#### Outline of Proposed Service 2020/21

The Therapeutic Thinking Support Team (TTST) formerly the Behaviour Intervention Team (BIT) offers evidence-based advice and support to schools. The type of involvement includes whole school support, staff training, staff support, class or year group support as well as individual support.

#### Key Features

These themes stem from the behaviour review:

1. Quick and flexible response to challenging cases in schools.
2. Different levels of response within the team (whole school, group, individual).
3. Advice and support using newly developed SEMH Range Guidance and Behaviour Action Guidance.
4. Support and advice in relation to Therapeutic Thinking; developing therapeutic plans, anxiety mapping, conscious and subconscious checklists

#### Team Members

1. The Team –
  - Beth Cartwright (TTST Manager & Senior EP)
  - Amy Bushell (TTST EP)
  - Gerry Heaton (Primary TTST Advisor)
  - Sue Keepax (Secondary TTST Advisor)
  - Rachel Wallace (TTST Worker)
  - Kayleigh Chocian (TTST Worker)
  - Jessica Durham (TTST Worker)
  - Roslyn Arthur (Exclusions Officer)
  - Piyush Bharania (Admin Assistant)

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

The service has changed name to represent an increased emphasis on a therapeutic way of working that recognises adverse childhood experiences and trauma. An increased offer has been maintained with a range of professionals and

expertise in the team. This will be delivered without a significant increase in the cost of the service. This is due to a more efficient deployment of resources.

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

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

1. Screening and signposting for identified mental health difficulties.
2. Having identified a child or young person's need, a TTST worker will offer an intervention to develop the unmet need, e.g. Social skills through Lego Therapy, reading and social emotional skills through Storylinks
3. Immediate write up and actions as well as agreed review of cases where appropriate.
4. Links with other support services and help in securing necessary actions
5. More direct support with very complex cases involving a wide range of services.
6. Access to support for challenging whole school situations through advisors with senior level management experience and experienced educational psychologists.
7. Direct links into PPP (Pupil Placement Panel & Fair Access process), VCF (Vulnerable Children's Fund) and other relevant systems/services
8. Support from workers where appropriate to help implement/model strategies in school.



9. Clear information of key personnel and agencies within West Berkshire –regularly updated.
10. Suggestions and links regarding potential training needs
11. Access to circle of adults meetings facilitated by an educational psychologist and a TTST worker for pupils at risk of permanent exclusion.

### Feedback from 2018/19 delivery

#### Comments from Primary Schools:

*‘Improved understanding of children’s perspective for teacher providing ability to build change with them and give them positive power in their classroom’.*

*‘We have had BIT team support for a number of pupils and to support staff working with SEMH children. Staff confidence has improved and in most children there has been an improvement in behaviour and staff approaches to that behaviour’*

*‘Staff engaged well with the process as it was non-judgemental, collaborative and supportive. The strategies given were well thought out, specific to the class and realistic in their expectation. Staff were willing to try them immediately and continue using them as they found they were effective.’*

#### Comments from Secondary Schools:

*‘The Secondary BIT worker and BIT EP are both exceptional in their flexibility, creativity and approach with staff in school. We always feel like our needs are addressed – often when we haven’t realised what our needs were.’*

*‘Objective views on whole school behaviour have become an important part of our quality assurance.’*

*‘The supervision is fantastic for those of our staff with a strongly therapeutic role.’*

*‘...more of the same!’*

### Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2020/21

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2020/21. It is based on employing the team members outlined above.

	2018/19 £	2019/20 £	2020/21 Proposed £	% increase
Staffing Costs	203,230	207,750	210,245	
Other Costs	6,150	6,150	6,150	
Support Service Recharges	20,940	21,390	21,639	
Total Cost	230,320	235,290	238,034	1.17%
Less Surplus Brought Forward	-12,690			
<b>Amount to be De-Delegated</b>	<b>217,630</b>	<b>235,290</b>	<b>238,034</b>	<b>1.17%</b>

The overall cost of delivering the service has increased by 1.17% which takes into account the expected April 2020 pay award and salary increments. As the underspend in 2018/19 has been requested to be added to 2019/20 budgets there is no carry forward from previous years.

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

### Method of charging in 2020/21

The total net cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2019 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2019 census data, this would equate to £16.09 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the total amount per school.

Other Options which *may* be considered

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

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

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

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

### Context

EMTAS has been funded through a de-delegation process as agreed with the Heads Funding Group. All of the support for Black Minority Ethnic, English as an additional language (EAL) pupils and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) pupils is provided by the West Berkshire EMTAS Service.

### Current Structure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

supported with attendance, admissions, transition, access to extra-curricular activities and engagement with learning.

## Benefits of Service

### EAL assessments

Referrals from schools for EAL assessments increased slightly from 101 to 106 in the academic year 2018/19.

In 2018/19 English assessments were carried out in 21 primary schools and 4 secondary schools. The autumn term has continued to have the highest number of referrals for new arrivals than in other terms.

EAL assessments, including guidance and reports, have been completed in the following schools in 2018/19

Birch Copse	John Rankin Infants
Calcot Infant	St.Paul's Catholic
Falkland	Thatcham Park
Inkpen	Spurcroft
Long Lane	Kennet Valley
Mortimer St. John's Infant	Theale
Parsons Down Infant	St. Nicolas Junior
St. John the Evangelist Infant	Mrs Bland's Infant
St. Joseph's Catholic	Robert Sandilands
Shaw cum Donnington	The Willows
Westwood Farm Infant School	
St. Bartholomew's (Academy)	The Downs
Park House (Academy)	Denefield (Academy)

### Pupil Support Officer (Romanian)

Bilingual support has been provided in the following schools in 2018/19:

The Castle	Kennet Valley
Thatcham Park	Hungerford

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

### Pupil Support Officer (Polish)

Polish bilingual support and/or translation has been provided in the following schools in 2018/19:

Theale Primary	Inkpen
Thatcham Park	Kennet Valley
Yattendon	Robert Sandilands
Parsons Down Infants	Birch Copse
St John the Evangelist	The Willows
St. Joseph's Catholic	Brookfields
Westwood Farm Infant	The Castle
Denefield (Academy)	Little Heath
Park House (Academy)	The Downs

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

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

### **Pupil Support Officer (Portuguese/Italian/Spanish)**

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

St.Joseph's Catholic	Thatcham Park
Robert Sandilands	Shaw cum Donnington
Theale Primary	
Little Heath	Park House (Academy)

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

EMTAS delivered the GCSE Portuguese in secondary schools as requested.

### **Pupil Support Officer (Urdu)**

Bilingual support and/or translation has been provided in the following schools in 2018/19:

Westwood Farm Juniors	Spurcroft
Denefield	

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

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

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

### **Teaching Assistant funding**

EMTAS provides funding for Teaching Assistants within schools to support specific ethnic minority pupils. EMTAS increased the hourly rate to £10.43 per hour in September 2018 to be more in line with current Teaching Assistant pay.

Number of TA funded hours given to schools:

2018/19
990 hours (EAL)
150 hours (GRT)
Total £10,571.30

**Schools in receipt of GReaT 1 to 1 project funding during 2018/19** to provide targeted intervention for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. (hours included in the figures above):

Mrs Bland's	Aldermaston
Garland Junior	Hampstead Norreys
Yattendon	

#### **Training provided (both general and school specific)**

2018/19
'Meeting the needs of New Arrivals with English as an additional language' to teachers
EAL Co-ordinator's Network meeting
'Every Child a Talker' to Early Years Practitioners
EAL training for Teaching Assistants
GRT training for one to one support: Yattendon Primary School Aldermaston Primary School

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

West Berkshire has 122 children who are ascribed as Gypsy, Roma or Traveller.  
36 West Berkshire schools have Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils on roll.

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

#### **Number of schools supported with GRT pupils**

The following schools have received support from EMTAS for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. EMTAS Pupil Support Officer for GRT pupils has been involved in 368 sessions/meetings in 2018/19 in support of children and families from GRT backgrounds.

Aldermaston	Yattendon
Beenham	Kintbury St. Mary's
Garland Junior	John Rankin Juniors
Hermitage	I-College
Fir Tree (Academy)	Mrs Bland's Infants
Hampstead Norreys	Hungerford Primary
The Willink	Kennet (Academy)
The Downs	John O'Gaunt (Academy)
Trinity (Academy)	Park House (Academy)
Theale Green (Academy)	

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

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

EMTAS run a 'school' for the children travelling with the Michaelmas Fair. 23 pupils attended over the three days ranging in age from 4 to 13 years. They took part in lessons which focused on the

## De-delegation Proposals 2020/21

core curriculum areas of literacy and numeracy. Feedback from parents and Northcroft Leisure Centre staff was 100% positive.

### Number of outreach sessions on Traveller Site

8 outreach sessions have been delivered from September 2018 to July 2019 on the 'Bus of Hope'. These have taken place monthly at Paices Hill Traveller site and have provided Parent and Toddler activities for families. These sessions have been supported by the Family Hub staff. Children have attended sessions at different times over the course of the year; some of these families were travelling and staying temporarily on the transit part of the site.

### Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2020/21

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2020/21 in comparison with 2019/20 and 2018/19.

	2018/19 £	2019/20 £	2020/21 Proposed £	% increase
Staffing Costs	185,480	196,920	198,640	
Other Costs	31,720	26,020	26,020	
Support Service Recharges	21,720	22,294	22,466	
Total Cost	238,920	245,234	247,126	0.77%
Less Surplus Brought Forward	-38,300	-35,170	-10,070	
	200,620	210,064	237,056	12.8%
Less income from Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs	-27,143	0	0	
<b>Amount to be De-Delegated</b>	<b>173,477</b>	<b>210,064</b>	<b>237,056</b>	<b>12.8%</b>

The overall cost of delivering the service has increased by 0.77% which takes into account the expected April 2020 pay award and salary increments. The underspend from 18/19 is used to off-set the cost of service for 20/21. Unfortunately this underspend is lower than previous years, therefore increasing the overall cost of de-delegation by 12.8%.

### Method of charging in 2019/20

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (for up to 3 years after they enter the statutory school system) in the October 2019 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Based on October 2019 census data, this equates to £318.03 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the total amount per school.

### Other Options which *may* be considered

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

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

An EAL assessment and report

£500-£600

## De-delegation Proposals 2020/21

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



## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2020-21

#### Trade Union Representation Service

## Outline of Proposed Service 2020/21

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

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

### What union officers do

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

#### Individual casework issues

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

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

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

### Collective Issues

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

This school year has seen an increase in the number of school restructurings accompanied by the risk of redundancy, as school budgets come under increasing pressure. The redundancy procedure is complex and often involves multiple meetings. The threat of redundancy can quickly undermine morale in a school and often the role of union officers is to reassure and support employees as well as ensuring that correct procedures are followed.

## Benefits of Service

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Notes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2020/21

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2020/21, compared to 2019/20. It is based on engaging a representative from each of the unions:

Union	2019/20	Proposed 2020/21
NASUWT	£15,950	£15,786
NUT	£15,900	£15,736
ATL	£13,665	£13,524
NAHT	£3,530	£3,494
ASCL	£2,425	£2,400
Support Service Recharges	£5,150	£5,094
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£56,620</b>	<b>£56,034</b>
Income from Academies	£1,730	£1,765
<b>Cost to Maintained Schools</b>	<b>£54,890</b>	<b>£54,269</b>
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	£2,286	£2,418
<b>Cost to Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>£52,604</b>	<b>£51,851</b>

The proposed budget for 2020/21 is based on:

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

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

## Method of charging in 2020/21

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2019 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2019 census data, this would equate to £3.53 per primary and secondary pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the total amount per school. Academies and other schools may choose to buy into the service at the same per pupil rate (this would provide funding for additional hours).

## Other Options which *may* be considered

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

Currently some academies are using their allocation for trade union facilities time to set up school based consultative arrangements, rather than 'buying in' to local authority arrangements. This might be the preferred model for all secondary schools in the future with de-delegation and funding of release time for representatives to undertake union duties in another WBC school to be confined to the Primary sector.

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

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2020-21

#### CLEAPSS Service

## Outline of Proposed Service 2020/21

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

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

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

The CLEAPSS service also requires the provision of a Radiation Protection Officer (RPO) and the Radiation Protection Adviser (RPA) for secondary schools and academies who will require some radiation sources on site as part of the national curriculum.

## Benefits of Service

CLEAPSS covers:

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

CLEAPSS provides:

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

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

## Costs and Method of charging for 2020/21

CLEAPSS set the pricing each year in January/February for the financial year April to March ahead. In 2019/20 the charge to schools was 15 pence per pupil including administration costs. For secondary schools who require the service of a Radiation Protection Officer (delivered by WBC Health & Safety Team) and a Radiation Protection Adviser (delivered by CLEAPSS) there are additional costs of £185 per annum for the Radiation Protection Officer and £50 per annum for the Radiation Protection Adviser totalling £235 for the RPA and RPO services.

The proposal for 2020/21 is to set a rate per pupil of 16 pence per pupil which we hope will cover any increase in the CLEAPSS fee and the cost of administration. As the de-delegation covers pre-16 pupils only, maintained secondary schools will need to pay the 6<sup>th</sup> form element of the fee as a separate sum. Any shortfall or surplus will be carried forward to the following year.

The charges for the RPA and RPO service will be maintained as above.

### Other Options which *may* be considered

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

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

School	Cost through local authority per pupil	Cost directly per pupil (min 200 pupils/ 350 secondary)	Radiation Protection Advisor	Radiation Protection Officer
Nursery	16p	30p	N/A	N/A
Primary	16p	30p	N/A	N/A
Secondary	16p	30p	£50	£185
Special	16p	30p	N/A	N/A
PRU	16p	30p	N/A	N/A
Primary Academy	16p	30p	N/A	N/A
Secondary Academy	16p	30p	£50	£185
Incorporated Colleges	16p	30p	£50	£185

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2020-21

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

Accountancy (Statutory Functions)
<p><b>Description of Duties:</b>            Consolidation of school accounts into Council's year end statement of accounts.</p> <p>Overview of school budget submissions &amp; budget monitoring reports.</p> <p>Monitoring of schools in financial difficulty/deficit.</p> <p>Monitoring adherence to Scheme for Financing Schools.</p> <p>Returns to Central Government – CFR, CFO grants return.</p> <p>Administration of grants &amp; other funding to maintained schools eg. PPG, budget allocations &amp; adjustments.</p> <p>Budgeting and accounting functions relating to maintained schools (Sch 2, 74)</p>
Cost: £47,857
0.31 FTE Accountants; 0.43 FTE Senior Accountant; 0.1 FTE Finance Manager <b>Total FTE 0.84</b>

Pension Scheme Administration
<p><b>Description of Duties:</b>            Administration of Teachers and Local Government pension schemes in relation to staff working in maintained schools:</p> <p>Amending and updating employee records in relation to pensions</p> <p>Responding to queries from employees in relation to pensions</p> <p>Completion of statutory monthly returns to Teachers Pensions and Local Government pension scheme, including service and pay calculations.</p>
Cost: £36,729
1.0 FTE Pensions Assistant

## Internal Audit of Schools – Statutory Requirements

### Description of Duties:

Annual internal audit of maintained schools according to level of risk - circa 10 schools are audited per year. Each audit takes on average 7 days. The audit covers Governance; financial planning and management; financial policy, processes and records; benchmarking and value for money; school fund, SFVS.

We also carry out follow-up reviews for those schools that have a weak or very weak audit report opinion.

There is provision for adhoc advice to schools/issuing the Anti Fraud Advisory Bulletins and the investigation of any financial irregularities. We also monitor compliance with submitting the SFVS returns.

We have also included an element of time for the planning and monitoring of the school visit programme, and liaising with Accountancy /governor support etc on queries when they arise.

Cost: £45,700

0.65 FTE Senior Auditor; 0.09 FTE Audit Manager

**West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools****Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2020-21****Statutory and Regulatory Duties – Health and Safety****1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Council has an established, professional and well regarded Health and Safety Team that already supports West Berkshire schools, currently through two service level options, Level One and Two.

**2. Background and Legislative Context**

- 2.1 The principal legislation in the United Kingdom for health and safety is the Health and Safety at Work Etc Act 1974. There is also a considerable amount of health and safety legislation under the Health and Safety at Work Etc Act 1974 including the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations etc.
- 2.2 The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations set out that every employer shall appoint one or more competent persons to assist him in undertaking the measures s/he needs to take to comply with the requirements imposed by the relevant statutory provisions.
- 2.3 The regulations state that the employer shall ensure that the number of competent persons appointed, the time available for them to fulfil their functions and the means at their disposal are adequate having regard to the size of the undertaking, the risks to which employees are exposed and the distribution of those risks throughout the organisation. It should be noted that the regulations do not suggest any limit or scope to the competent advice or how it should be delivered practically.
- 2.4 The regulations also state that where there is a competent person in the employer's employment, that person shall be appointed in preference to a competent person not in his employment.
- 2.5 The duties imposed by the health and safety at work Act 1974 and associated regulations apply to the Council as an employer and it would also apply to the Council in relation to Local Authority maintained schools as the Council is the employer.
- 2.6 In the case of Foundation and Voluntary Aided schools the Governors are the employer. In independent schools and Academies the Governors or the Academy Trust are the employers.
- 2.7 The Council also has the general "duty to educate", even where the Governors or an Academy Trust are the employer, there could be some limited involvement for the Council if a serious incident were to occur. See Appendix I for further information on the legal duty holders.



### 3. The Councils Health & Safety Support Service to Schools

- 3.1 The Council offers a health and safety support services to West Berkshire schools through two service level options, Level One and Two.
- 3.2 The Level One service suggests compliance with the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations in terms of access to competent advice for health and safety. The Level One service includes for a health and safety needs assessment of schools but all other services are remote and delivered by email and/or telephone contact. All other services set out in Level Two are not included and require additional payment from schools.
- 3.3 Schools health and safety needs assessments are completed less frequently for Level One schools and there is no additional support to improve on the areas identified in the needs assessment report. The schools are expected to make the improvements themselves. The issues discussed at 3.2 and 3.3 are not necessarily compatible with 2.3 above.
- 3.4 The Level Two service is a comprehensive health and safety support service and covers all aspects of health and safety management and support including necessary health and safety training.
- 3.5 Two members of the health and safety team provide the Level Two service to the schools that opt to purchase the service. The Health and Safety Team provide a compliance, advice and training role for schools. However, the work of the team relies on the buy-back which thus far has been reasonably stable but does not fully cover the cost of the two posts.
- 3.6 This brings with it difficulty in future planning and the risk that if there is a drop off in buy-back that one of the posts could be vulnerable. This in turn would make the service unviable as it would not be possible to maintain the service with one post/person.
- 3.7 As the Council is the employer and therefore the principal legal duty holder (notwithstanding any delegated responsibilities to a schools and its Head Teachers and Governors) in relation to health and safety, it makes sense to ensure an adequate, effective and efficient health and safety service is provided to Local Authority maintained schools and then a buy-back option offered to non-maintained schools.
- 3.8 Other options that could be considered would be to try to staff the team to match income levels e.g. reduce hours for remaining posts, look at alternative contracts such as term time only etc. These are not likely to be practical and may lead to the loss of quality staff that historically have been hard to attract to West Berkshire.
- 3.9 The Council could also remove the buy-back service completely and operate within the scope and resources of the Level 1 service. This would mean removing both Schools Senior Health and Safety Adviser posts and retaining the currently vacant Schools Health and Safety Adviser post (some adjustment to person specification / job description / grade and pay would likely be necessary).
- 3.10 The Council would also need to review the scope of the service but it is likely that we would remove or drastically reduce health and safety training available to schools.

- 3.11 The service would likely comprise of access to competent advice (mostly remote via email and phone), accident/incident investigation via Crest and schools needs assessments but on a less frequent basis.
- 3.12 No services would be offered to schools other than those that are Council maintained.

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

- 4.1 An options paper setting out a number of alternative ways that the schools health and safety service could be funded into the future was taken to the Schools Funding Forum in 2019/20.
- 4.2 There were options to move to a uniform service level delivered to all maintained schools and funded by all maintained schools paying an equal share based on pupil numbers. The other option was to remain with the part funded and part buy-back service as we are. Head Teachers voted to remain as we are with a Level 1 core service (funded by all schools) and the Level 2 buy-back support service.
- 4.3 Head Teachers accepted that if the Level 2 buy-back drops off then this would jeopardise the future provision of the service and requested that a further report be brought for their consideration if that was to happen.
- 4.4 As was somewhat expected at this time last year the overall buy-back of the service by schools did reduce slightly with around five schools dropping out due to budget constraints.
- 4.5 Buy back of Level 2 for the year 2019/20 is around £107,558 with staffing costs around £140,000 including overheads, leaving a shortfall of around £33,000. These figures allow for the saving on the vacant post.
- 4.6 Funding for the Level 1 post (Approx £37k), which is held vacant still offsets this but we need to establish the structure and funding for the Schools H&S Team going forward as the current system is unlikely to be viable in the longer term.
- 4.7 We were successful in retaining work for health and safety support service to the Excalibur Academies Trust for approximately £18,000 per annum. We have also been successful in gaining work and income of just over £7000 from Park House Academy and St Gabriel's independent school. This is included in the £107,558

#### 5. Proposals

##### Option 1

- 5.1 In order to meet the requirements of the employer under the Health and Safety at Work Etc. Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations and other related health and safety legislation the Council considers that the schools health and safety service should be provided to all Council maintained schools, thus removing the differing levels of service.
- 5.2 To delete one (currently vacant) of the three posts currently supporting schools to reduce costs but to maintain a viable service including the provision of training etc.
- 5.3 The two posts will provide a health and safety service to all maintained schools. Some site visits and needs assessments would need to be more evenly distributed

to accommodate the extra schools and spread the workload over a longer period with 2.2 FTE posts.

- 5.4 We could, for example move schools health and safety needs assessments to a results and risk based approach similar to Ofsted inspections. See Appendix H for further details of the service level provision.
- 5.5 All Council maintained schools would equitably share the cost of funding the two post via the DSG or other system in future.
- 5.6 A buy-back option would be offered to non-maintained schools where the Council is not the employer and therefore is not the main duty holder in relation to health and safety. Any income generated from the buy-back service would be offset to reduce costs for the Local Authority maintained schools.

<b>Option 1 – Level 1 and Level 2</b>	<b>Proposed 2020/21 £</b>
Staffing Costs 0.2 FTE H&S Manager 2.0 FTE Senior H&S Officer	119,630
Other Costs – IT System	5,000
Support Service Recharges	12,463
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>137,093</b>
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	-6,109
<b>Cost to Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>130,984</b>
Estimated cost per pupil	£8.78

## Option 2

- 5.7 Maintain the current split in the service levels and funding, with a Level 1 service funded through the DSG with those schools equally and equitably sharing the costs of the provision of the Level 1 service.
- 5.8 Those schools that decide to purchase the Level Two schools health and safety service will then be provided the Level 2 health and safety service.
- 5.9 It is likely that we would need to change the service offer in the near future as the service is already operating at a deficit of around £30,000 that is only being offset by not appointing to the vacant post but this has a knock on effect on staff and service delivery and arguably risk.

<b>Option 2 – Level 1 only</b>	<b>Proposed 2020/21 £</b>
Staffing Costs 0.2 FTE H&S Manager 1.0 FTE H&S Officer (vacant)	56,460
Other Costs – IT System	5,000
Support Service Recharges	6,146
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>67,606</b>
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	-3,013
<b>Cost to Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools</b>	<b>64,593</b>
Estimated cost per pupil	£4.33

## 6. Recommendation

- 6.1 Schools consider the options set out above and choose the best option that suits their needs, resources and meets legal requirements for financial year 2020/21.
- 6.2 Schools consider the issue discussed in paragraphs 3.9 to 3.12 and indicate if they wish this option to be explored further and possibly presented as an alternative option in future.

## 7. Conclusion

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

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Health and Safety Service 2020/21

#### Overview of Service

West Berkshire Council has a professional and dedicated Schools Health and Safety Team who provide support and advice to schools on all aspects of health and safety including policy development and effective implementation, user friendly guidance and information, support in completing risk assessments, a complete range of health and safety training, a regularly updated website, SLA online, safety alerts and health and safety newsletters.

#### Schools Health & Safety Needs Assessment

Schools Health & Safety Needs Assessment are designed to measure levels of compliance with legislation and best practice. The associated action plan will help you prioritise your improvements.

The assessment is conducted using a process of objective evidence gathering including a review of safety documentation, discussions with relevant managers and staff and a tour/inspection of the site.

We have operated the current system of needs assessments for four years now and have seen schools develop their health and safety management system but continued improvement is still required.

In order to free resource time that could be better utilised helping schools improve on the areas identified in the needs assessments, we propose to continue with the needs assessments with an amended schedule and to develop topic based assessments that will enable greater depth and time to be devoted to specific topics.

We propose that we would move the needs assessment process onto re-inspection frequencies similar to Ofsted.

Schools achieving a score of 91% and above on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 5 years. For those schools purchasing the Level Two Health and Safety Service, support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed, where required.

Schools achieving a score of 80% to 90% on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 4 years. For those schools purchasing the Level Two Health and Safety Service, support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed, where required.

Schools achieving a score of 60% to 79% on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 3 years. For those schools purchasing the Level Two Health and Safety Service, support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed, where required.

Schools achieving a score of 59% and below on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 1 year. For those schools purchasing the Level Two Health and Safety Service, support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed, where required.

Those schools purchasing the Level 2 Health and Safety Service will be able to request a new needs assessment at any time, which will be booked at the earliest mutually convenient opportunity at no additional cost to the school.

There are 20 questions in the Schools Needs Assessment, each carrying a maximum of 4 marks giving a total maximum possible score of 80. Any question marked not applicable will reduce the total maximum score possible accordingly. Terminology has been taken from Ofsted, which should make it more familiar to schools and the scoring system has been influenced by British Safety Council and RoSPA health and safety audit systems. The frequency of needs assessments discussed above has been included in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**

Benchmark	Overall Score	Description	Score Range Achieved	Frequency between needs assessments
Outstanding	91%+	Schools judged as 'outstanding' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 5 years. Support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	91% and above	Up to 5 years
Good	80% to 90%	(1) Schools judged as 'good' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment	80% to 90%	Up to 4 years

		completed in up to 4 years. Support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.		
Requires Improvement	55% to 79%	(2) Schools judged as 'requires improvement' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 2 years. Support will be provided in intervening year on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	60% to 79%	Up to 3 years
Inadequate	Up to 54%	(3) Schools judged as 'inadequate' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 1 year. Support will be	59% and below	Up to 1 year

	<p>provided in intervening months on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.</p>		
--	---	--	--

## West Berkshire Council Health and Safety

**Table 2**

<b>Level 1 Service (All West Berkshire Council schools)</b>	
<p><b>Summary</b> The core elements (accident/incident reporting, advice and health and safety needs assessments) of the Level 1 Health and Safety Service are provided to all WBC schools.</p> <p>Health and Safety Training can be purchased at good value on a cost per person per course basis or schools can request a quotation via SLA Online for bespoke or onsite health and safety training.</p>	
<b>Service Provided</b>	<b>Service Standard</b>
<b>1) Advice</b>	This is a 'REMOTE' service i.e. no 'in depth' support on site. Services will generally only be provided via email or telephone.
<b>2) Training</b>	The Health and Safety Team run school specific health and safety courses, which are accessible to Level 1 schools and Academies for a fee. Further details of courses available and costs can be obtained from CYP Training
<b>3) Health and Safety Needs Assessment</b>	<p>Schools will receive a health and safety needs assessment designed to assess and measure levels of compliance with health and safety legislation and best practice. The associated action plan will help you prioritise your improvement plan.</p> <p>Health and Safety Needs Assessments will be completed for Level 1 school on a 5 yearly risk based cycle. Where the overall score of the previous needs assessment recommends a needs assessment in less than 5 years the school will be required to purchase the 'additional' needs assessment.</p> <p>This will be recorded on the completed report from the needs assessment and left to the discretion of the school.</p>
<b>4) Accident Reporting &amp; Recording System</b>	The Crest system is provided to all schools as it is a requirement that all schools must use the system. Failure to use the Crest system appropriately could affect a schools insurance cover.



Table 2

<b>Health and Safety Level Two Service and the Proposed Combined Service</b>	
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The aim of this service is to provide schools with a named, dedicated and professional Health and Safety Adviser to provide 'on site support and advice' to the school, guiding and prioritising the integration of an effective and efficient safety management system and documentation in support of the School's Health and Safety Policy.</p> <p>The schools dedicated Health and Safety Adviser will begin by arranging and completing a Health and Safety Audit (Needs Assessment) of the school that will help to identify the strengths and areas for improvement in the schools existing arrangements. The Schools dedicated Health and Safety Adviser will then continue to work closely with the school to help plan, develop and implement your health and safety policy and the areas for improvement you need.</p> <p>The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations require you to appoint someone competent to help you meet your health and safety duties. A competent person is someone with the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to manage health and safety.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council, Schools Health and Safety Team will be your competent person and help ensure you meet your health and safety duties. Details of the Health and Safety service are listed below in further detail.</p>	
<b>Service Provided</b>	<b>Service Standard</b>
<b>1) Advice</b>	Advice and support will be provided to the school on specific questions/issues. If required the schools dedicated Health and Safety Adviser will arrange to visit the school and meet with relevant persons to ensure the enquiry is resolved.
<b>2) Health and Safety Needs Assessment</b>	<p>Schools will receive a health and safety needs assessment designed to assess and measure levels of compliance with health and safety legislation and best practice. The associated action plan will help you prioritise your improvement plan.</p> <p>Your dedicated Health and Safety Adviser will then arrange to assist and support the school in progressing the recommendations to ensure continual improvement.</p> <p>Health and Safety Needs Assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service on a cycle subject to the outcome of the previous needs assessment as per Table 1 above.</p> <p>Schools will be able to request a new needs assessment at any time, which will be booked at the earliest mutually convenient opportunity at no additional cost to the school.</p>
<b>3) School Safety Policy:</b>	<p>Review existing against a model H&amp;S Policy that is school specific, in line with the LA Safety Policy, and conforms to appropriate local and legislative requirements.</p> <p>Ensure the Policy identifies key commitments with current signature.</p> <p>Ensure that the Policy, Organisation and arrangements are carried out and accurately reflect practice.</p>
<b>4) Safety Organisation:</b>	Review and provide documentation that identifies how health and safety is/shall become 'embedded' in daily operations at the school. Identify and/or nominate key staff tasked with

	health and safety responsibilities.
<b>5) Planning and implementing:</b>	<p>Review the existing arrangements; ensure the school adequately documents the standards and procedures required for a safe place of work.</p> <p>Following written review and prioritisation of issues, help the school to progress the areas for improvement by providing support and guidance. Improvement will be achieved with the schools full commitment and involvement.</p>
<b>6) Health and Safety Risk Assessment:</b>	<p>Provide the school with initial or refresher training to nominated persons regarding completion of <i>local</i> Risk Assessments.</p> <p>Provide on-site review of the schools risk assessments, to support their completion.</p> <p>Provide basic refresher training to nominated groups of key staff. Ensure a practical understanding of the training by jointly completing several specific health and safety risk assessments required by the school.</p> <p>Provide support and guidance in terms of prioritising risk assessments to be completed or reviewed etc.</p>
<b>7) Telephone/Incident response:</b>	<p>Provide general telephone health and safety advice as required.</p> <p>Please note that where the topic is of a specific nature, additional time may be required for a detailed response following the initial call.</p> <p>Whilst every endeavour is made to provide an immediate answer to health and safety queries via telephone/email, requests may require additional research time. Therefore, where it is not possible to provide an answer of sufficient depth at the time of the call, or the same day, every endeavour shall be made to provide a follow-up call the next working day.</p> <p>Should the associated risk to safety or health warrant a school visit, this shall be arranged by the Health and Safety Team.</p>
<b>8) Health and Safety Training</b>	<p>The Health and Safety Team run school specific health and safety courses. All health and safety training is included FOR all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.</p> <p>Further details of courses available and costs can be obtained from CYP Training</p> <p>On-site training such as twilight or inset days etc. can also be arranged at no additional cost.</p>
<b>9) Fire Management</b>	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a review of the schools Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>Your advisor will also:          Complete a site inspection to verify recommendations have been implemented.          Discuss any issues outstanding and how to address these.</p>

	<p>Your advisor will help schools to complete an assessment to ensure you have adequate numbers of appropriately trained staff to deal with fire safety issues.</p> <p>Your advisor can also provide Fire Awareness training to school staff at an agreed time and date on site.</p>
<b>10) Asbestos Management</b>	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a condition check of ACM (asbestos containing materials) with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>Your advisor will also review: The Asbestos Management Plan The Asbestos Register The Asbestos Survey</p> <p>Additionally any asbestos related risk assessment you may have in place will be reviewed to ensure it is correct and relevant.</p> <p>Your advisor can also provide tool box talks to your staff to allay any fears they may have regarding retained ACMs and also to highlight their responsibilities in respect of Health and Safety regarding asbestos.</p>
<b>11) Legionella Management</b>	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a review of the legionella risk assessment with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>The advisor will also check that the school are working within the written scheme suggested and in line with the recommendations of the risk assessment.</p>
<b>12) Playground Equipment</b>	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a playground equipment inspection with their Health and Safety Advisor. This will be a guided check to ensure staff are confident with what should be checked, what should be recorded and what action to take.</p> <p>We will also review the playground equipment risk assessment with the school to ensure it is suitable and sufficient.</p> <p>This will give a specific opportunity for any concerns to be discussed and queries answered.</p> <p>We can also provide on-site training and support to staff if required.</p>
<b>13) First Aid</b>	<p>Schools will receive support and assistance to ensure the school's first aid needs assessments are in place and up to date and an appropriate number of staff are identified and trained to deliver first aid.</p>
<b>14) Accident / Incident investigation and enforcement action</b>	<p>Schools will receive full on-site support and advice from your named and dedicated Health and Safety Adviser during an accident investigation for a serious accident or enforcement action by an enforcing authority such as the Health and Safety Executive.</p>
<b>15) Accident Reporting &amp; Recording System</b>	<p>The Councils Accident Reporting &amp; Recording System is provided to all schools to allow them to record and monitor accidents/incidents. Schools must use the Councils Accident Reporting &amp; Recording System as failure to do so could</p>

	invalidate insurance cover.
<b>16) CHAS</b>	<p>Assessing health and safety competence can be a lengthy and time consuming process. CHAS assesses applicants: health and safety policy, their organisation for health and safety and their specific health and safety arrangements to a standard acceptable to our buyers and others. In essence, CHAS completes the initial health and safety application process for you.</p> <p>Using CHAS will help you select a competent contractor or supplier but you still need to check they are competent to carry out your project by checking they have appropriate experience and take references etc.</p>
<b>17) Safety Schemes In Partnership (SSIP)</b>	<p>An important feature of the SSIP Forum is the HSE's message that a buyer can be confident a supplier who is registered or accredited as compliant or approved with an SSIP member has been assessed to the Core Criteria standard.</p> <p>There are numerous pre-qualification health and safety schemes including CHAS, EXOR, SAFEcontractor etc. SSIP brings most of the pre-qualification schemes together under one umbrella via a 'deem to satisfy' agreement.</p> <p>This means that buyers using the SSIP database will have access to thousands of contractors who are accredited as compliant to the HSE's Core Criteria (stage one) standard. Using SSIP will help you select a competent contractor or supplier but you still need to check they are competent to carry out your project by checking they have appropriate experience and take references etc.</p> <p>Access to SSIP is included for Level 2 schools.</p>

### School responsibilities

Whilst the duty to comply with statutory requirements cannot be delegated and remains with Schools and in some cases the Local Authority, the tasks involved with the effective implementation of health and safety management in schools is delegated to Head Teachers. For this approach to be successful, each school must do all that is reasonably practicable to ensure the health, safety and welfare of their staff, pupils and non-employees.

The operation of an effective health and safety management system at the school is central to achieving the above, with key areas being:

- The school Health and Safety Policy
- Organising for health and safety
- Planning and implementing safety controls
- Monitoring school health and safety performance
- Auditing and reviewing health and safety compliance and best practice.

Schools must also use the Council's Crest system to record accidents and incidents relating to the health and safety of their staff, pupils or visitors.

### **West Berkshire Council Schools Health and Safety Team**

The Schools Health and Safety Team is made up of two Senior Schools Health and Safety Advisors and a Health and Safety Manager who also manages Corporate Health and Safety.

**Mike Lindburn - Health & Safety Manager**

Mike has a wide range of experience in both the public and private sectors for over twenty years, providing strategic direction and operational management on health and safety. Applying initiative and practical, cost-effective solutions whenever possible. He is professional and hard working with good leadership, management and influencing skills.

Mike is a Chartered Member of the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (CMIOSH), has a Level 5 Institute of Leadership & Management certificate in Leadership, is an Associate Member of Institute of Environmental Management and Audit (AIEMA), has achieved BIOH Asbestos Specialist, BOHS P901 Legionella and completed RoSPA Operational playground inspection course.

**Wendy Manning - Senior Health & Safety Advisor (Schools)**

Wendy is a Chartered Member of IOSH (CMIOSH) and has over 13 year's post-qualification experience in health and safety in the public sector working in various roles. Wendy has since completed schools related training for RoSPA Operational Playground Inspection, CLEAPSS Radiation Protection Officer & Auditing Science.

Wendy has worked with multi-disciplinary teams often working in very high risk and dynamic environments where resources are limited and priorities constantly changing. Wendy has strong negotiation and influencing skills and is able to adapt and respond quickly to changing demands. Her health and safety advice always aims to be cost effective, flexible and realistic for the environment they are implemented in, achievable, jargon-free and simple to follow especially for those with little or no health and safety experience.

**Alice Pye - Senior Health & Safety Advisor (Schools)**

Alice has over 15 years' experience as an Environmental Health officer. As well as health and safety enforcement she has worked in many other disciplines of Environmental Health so has a wide range of knowledge to bring to the team.

Alice has excellent organisational and communication skills and will work well with schools by building positive relationships. Much of her previous role involved working with partners to find practical solutions to issues as well as providing guidance and advice to help achieve the best possible outcome often in difficult situations.

Working with businesses to achieve health and safety compliance means she has a good working knowledge of the legislative requirements and their practical implications as well as experience in accident investigation.

To discuss any aspect of the Health & Safety Service please contact:

[schoolshealthandsafety@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:schoolshealthandsafety@westberks.gov.uk)

**Key contacts:**

- Mike Lindburn – Health & Safety Manager  
Tel: (01635 519204)  
Email: [mike.lindburn@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:mike.lindburn@westberks.gov.uk)
  
- Alice Pye – Senior Health & Safety Advisor  
Tel: (01635 519630)  
Email: [alice.pye1@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:alice.pye1@westberks.gov.uk)
  
- Wendy Manning Senior Health & Safety Advisor  
Tel: (01635 519303)  
Email: [wendy.manning@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:wendy.manning@westberks.gov.uk)

## West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

### Legal Duty Holders for Health and Safety

England and Wales	
School type	Employer
Community schools	The local authority
Community special schools	
Voluntary controlled schools	
Maintained nursery schools	
Pupil referral units	
Foundation schools	The governing body
Foundation special schools	
Voluntary aided schools	
Independent schools	The governing body or proprietor
England	
Academies and free schools	The Academy Trust

---

## Schools Funding Formula 2020/21

---

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020  
**Report Author:** Melanie Ellis  
**Item for:** Decision      **By:** All Forum Members

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the results from the consultation with all schools on the proposed primary and secondary school funding formula for 2020/21 and to make a final decision.

### 2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 Agree the following for setting the school funding formula for 2020/21:
- (1) To mirror the DfE's National Funding Formula to calculate the funding allocations
  - (2) To introduce the mobility factor into the local formula
  - (3) To address any surplus or shortfall in funding by a combination of reduced AWPU rates and a cap on gains
  - (4) To agree the criteria for additional funds as per the consultation
  - (5) To agree the de-delegations and to top up the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty fund to £250k
  - (6) Apply a top slice of 0.25% to the schools' funding, in order to support High Needs.

- 2.2 The above proposals are going to Executive on 16 January 2020. The Executive decision will be presented at the Schools Forum of 21 January 2020.

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

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 The Government announced in August that funding for schools and high needs will rise by £2.6 billion for 2020/21. The West Berkshire schools' block allocation for 2020/21 is £104.5m excluding the growth fund, which is an increase of £5.1m from 2019/20.
- 3.2 2020/21 is the third year of the National Funding Formula (NFF). The government has confirmed its intention to move to a single 'hard' NFF to determine every school's budget, and will work closely with local authorities and other stakeholders in making this transition in the future.

- 3.3 In 2020/21, as in previous years, each LA will continue to have discretion over their schools funding formulae, in consultation with local schools. The LA is responsible for making the final decisions on the formula. Political ratification by the Council's Executive must be obtained before the 21 January 2020 deadline.
- 3.4 Provisional 2020/21 NFF allocations were published at a local authority level by the Department for Education (DfE) in October 2019, including notional school level allocations. Funding levels and allocations were announced later than in previous years, giving LA's less time for modelling and consultation.

#### 4. Consultation responses

- 4.1 A consultation was held in December 2019, covering the six areas below. Appendix A contains the responses to the consultation. 17 responses were received.

- (1) Do you agree that, subject to final affordability, West Berkshire should mirror the DfE's 2020/21 NFF and that this formula should be used to calculate funding allocations?

17 responses, 16 agree, 1 disagree

- (2) Do you agree that West Berkshire should introduce the mobility factor into the local formula in order to mirror the NFF?

17 responses, 17 agree

- (3) Do you agree that any shortfall in funding is addressed by using Option 3, using a combination of reduced AWPU values and applying a cap on gains?

17 responses, 14 agree, 3 disagree

- (4) If you have any comments/suggestions on the additional funds proposal or the criteria set to access the other additional funds please provide details.

4 responses, 4 agree

- (5) If you do not agree with any of the proposed services being de-delegated, please let us know with your reasons why

8 responses, 7 agree

- (6) Which of the following options would you support regarding a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for 2020/21?

a) 0% b) 0.125% c) 0.25% d) 0.5%

17 responses, a) 8, b) 0, c) 4, d) 3 plus 2 responders supporting a transfer but not saying which percentage.

Overall supporting a transfer 9, against a transfer 8.



## 5. Conclusion

- 5.1 Based on the consultation responses, the Authority's recommendations are set out in section 2. These proposals were supported by the Heads Funding Group at their meeting of 8 January 2020.
- 5.2 The final formula will be allocated according to the principles above and the Council's Executive will make the final decision in January 2020, with the formula to be submitted to ESFA by 21 January 2020.

## 6. Appendices

Appendix A): consultation responses and comments

Appendix B): illustrative funding per school based on the recommendations

This page is intentionally left blank

# Appendix A - Consultation Summary 2020/21

## 1. Question 1

1. Do you agree that, subject to final affordability, West Berkshire should mirror the DfE's 2020/21 NFF and that this formula should be used to calculate funding allocations? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

16 responses, 15 agree, 1 disagree, comments below:

- 1.1 I agree with this. Although my school does not come out as favourably as others, this seems to be the fairest way to work and is likely to mirror funding moving forward as well, so will not have any future surprises.
- 1.2 Yes, we agree West Berkshire should mirror the DfE's 2020/21 NFF.
- 1.3 Yes we agree – there is no effect on schools and meets the needs of mobile children
- 1.4 We absolutely agree that subject to affordability pre any block transfers West Berkshire should mirror the DfE's NFF. This is the most sensible and logical path given the DfE's commitment to a hard NFF.
- 1.5 Our school is in an area with a relatively high IDACO score, correlating with higher numbers of GRT pupils, who tend to require higher levels of support in early years with regard to behaviour and literacy. This is inadequately represented by WBC's SFF deprivation factor.

## 2. Question 2

2. Do you agree that West Berkshire should introduce the mobility factor in the local formula in order to mirror the NFF? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

16 responses, 16 agree, comments below:

- 2.1 I agree that West Berkshire should introduce the mobility factor. Again, although as a school we would not be positively impacted by this, it seems a fair way of moving forward.
- 2.2 Yes, we agree that the mobility factor should be introduced.
- 2.3 We agree to this technical change which introduces a mobility factor driven by census data to mirror the NFF.
- 2.4 The rural nature of WB means that many pupils live more than 2 miles from the nearest school. Many pupils in our school catchment travel out of the LA area to their nearest school, while some pupils travel from out of LA area to our

school. This conforms to proposal 1 that SFF should mirror NFF, which includes mobility factor from 2020/21.

### 3. Question 3

3. Do you agree that any shortfall in funding is addressed by using Option 3, using a combination of reduced AWPU values and applying a cap on gains? If not, please let us know with your reasons why.

16 responses, 13 agree, 3 disagree, comments below:

- 3.1 I agree that this is the fairest way of splitting any shortfall in funding and am happy to move forward in this way.
- 3.2 Yes, we agree that any shortfall in should be addressed by using option 3.
- 3.3 Yes, although applying a cap on gains means our school loses funding which is disappointing as we have invested so much in marketing to increase pupil numbers only to have funding removed because of the cap.
- 3.4 No we do not agree – because some schools cannot afford a reduction in AWPU.
- 3.5 Thank you for sending out the consultation documentation, which looks comprehensive and easy to follow. I would like to express my support for Heads' Funding Forum colleagues' view that Option 3 is the more equitable approach and agree with all the proposals as detailed in the document. I am sure that this has been a challenging piece of work and would like to thank you and your team's efforts in presenting indicative figures in a timely and positive manner.
- 3.6 No, we believe that Option 1 should be chosen. In 2019/20 West Berkshire's locally determined NFF proposed limiting the gains cap to 2% when the DfE's 2019/20 NFF had proposed a gains cap of 6.09% (a further 3% gain on top of the 3% in 2018/19 which West Berkshire did mirror and implement). The reality for West Berkshire Schools in 2019-20 was that after all the updates and corrections to the modelling the gains cap was limited to 0.22% and not the 2% initially proposed, due to affordability. For too long now West Berkshire schools that have previously been underfunded against the NFF, have been held back from the path of receiving the full gains a DfE NFF would give, due to affordability. The fair and equitable basis for any adjustment for affordability given the steps taken in setting the 2019-20 formula is Option 1.
- 3.7 Agree, if this is the most equitable, but moving away from the NFF AWPU rates seems to be a step in the wrong direction.
- 3.8 There will be no NFF gains cap, so that all schools attract their full allocations under the formula. This contradicts proposal 1 that SFF should mirror NFF. Our school is currently undersubscribed therefore a gains cap will punish efforts to grow NOR.
- 3.9 Yes for the good of schools overall, however any reduction would be detrimental to us.

#### 4. Question 4

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

4 responses, 4 agree, comments below:

- 4.1 I agree that we should have the current additional funds. I do not agree with the suggestion that was made in schools forum regarding schools with a high proportion of SEN support children, as I believe that this gives a perverse incentive to increase numbers in this area and it is not as robustly checked/decided as EHCP Plans.
- 4.2 We are in favour of options 3 and 4.
- 4.3 Comment: re: (f) (2) our school reduced the number of classes at the start of 2019/20 due to falling rolls. In 2018/19 WBC Schools Forum agreed to cease the Falling Rolls Fund as only one school qualified for payment in the past four years. NOR fell largely due to reduced district-wide fertility, but this was compounded at our School due to diseconomies of scale.
- 4.4 Re: (f) (3) our school faces a deficit budget due to reduced NOR over this period and should be eligible for a Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund. This fund held £181k in reserve at the end of 2019/20.

#### 5. Question 5

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

8 responses, 7 agree, comments below:

- 5.1 I agree with all of the services that are suggested for de-delegation.
- 5.2 We are happy with the services being de-delegated.
- 5.3 We agree with the majority of the proposed services being de-delegated, but would question how/why the amount for schools in difficulty needs to be topped up to £250k if it has not been required this year. Is this based on prior knowledge or a huge increase in schools in difficulty?
- 5.4 We do not agree with the de-delegation relating to Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty. There is no such financial 'safety net' for Secondary Schools and the existence of the Primary fund does not encourage sound financial decision making. (comment made by a Secondary School).
- 5.5 De-delegating the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund would require this fund to be maintained to previously agreed minimum £250k.

#### 6. Question 6

6. Which of the following options would you support regarding a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for 2020/21?  
0% b) 0.125% c) 0.25% d) 0.5% a)

16 responses, a) 7, b) 0, c) 4, d) 3 plus 2 responders supporting a transfer but not saying which percentage.

Overall against a transfer 7, supporting a transfer 9. Comments below:

- 6.1 I am happy to support transfer of funds from the schools block to the high needs block, if there is a specific aim for the money to be used to 'invest to save'. My concern with the 0.5% transfer is that the use of the money has not been fully thought through. I think that if 0.5% were to be transferred, rather than it being used to top up vulnerable child funding, it would be more useful to increase the amounts spent on ASD/Therapeutic thinking resource across the authority, as this would be likely to reduce the number of permanent exclusions and thus ease the pressure on the high needs budget. However, it could also, perversely, increase the number of EHCPs, as it provides additional reports that could be used for evidence for EHCPs, so this would need to be thought through very carefully.
- 6.2 We would support 0.5% being transferred from the schools block to the High Needs Block for 2020/21.
- 6.3 0%. We believe that the shortfall is due to a lack of central government funding whereby funding levels do not match pupil need. Attempting to paper over such issues by moving cash, which would largely only come from medium sized schools, is short sighted. It is also the case that this would in no way remove the deficit in this budget and would also likely have numerous other opportunities costs for all pupils. Urgent government action is needed to fully fund SEND education. Only by refusing to 'rob peter to pay paul' will we move closer to the necessary awareness of the urgency of the situation.
- 6.4 We agree that the LAL centre should be fully funded however feel that the use of funds for the other services would be better given directly to schools to be used as required rather than having to go through lengthy application processes to access funds or services.
- 6.5 0%. My choice is based on the fact that SEN should be funded appropriately by the DfE. By taking funding direct from school budgets then I feel it is just hiding the problem and putting an even greater burden on schools.
- 6.6 0% because the government needs to realise that they must invest – we can't keep bailing it out.
- 6.7 High Needs provision and sustainability has been an on-going concern for many years. Any top slice in the face of the additional high needs funding announcement and the prospect of a £3mn deficit on the High Needs Block at the end of 2020-21 is of concern, both from the perspective of financial discipline and strategic development of efficient, effective and affordable provision.

Whilst West Berkshire is a small authority and it will be providing the DfE with a deficit recovery plan in 2020, there is no escaping from the fact that the deficit forecast at the end of 2020-21 at £3.1m will be 15% of High Needs Block Funding which has increased by some £1.6mn and that despite this increase the in-year deficit for 2020-21 is £1.1m.

The DfE are clear that all LAs are expected to keep their local offer of special provision under review and to plan ahead strategically to ensure good quality provision can be developed and sustained in line with available resources.

The DfE in The Schools Operational Guide 2020-21 states that any proposal to transfer should be presented along with a range of evidence and gives expectations on what that evidence should include. In terms of evidence:

There is no detail provided of previous movements between the blocks and why those transfers together with the increased high needs funding for 2020-21 are not adequate.

There is no breakdown of the changes in demand for special provision over the last three years which we would have liked to see split between 3-11, 11-16 and 16-19 and 19-25, as well as by provision type. There is a reference to an increase in EHCPs of 33% but this is from 2014 to date and so includes the period of SEN 19-25 and Raising Participation Age changes too.

There is no strategic financial plan setting out how the LA intends to bring High Needs expenditure to levels that can be sustained within anticipated future High Needs funding levels.

We are not clear that an increase of £350k to the vulnerable child grant, the significant majority of £520k top slice, is or has been shown to be the best way to spend that sum on securing good quality special provision.

We are cautious and reluctant to allow the High Needs Block any further discretion on spending funded by schools through a transfer from the Schools Block. This position has been taken because of the above and has been further compounded by the fact that back in 2017-18 schools were told that the PRU Strategic Review's purpose would be to secure savings in the High Needs Block deliverable from 2018-19.

### 3. Introduction/Background

3.1 One of the purposes of the PRU Strategic Review was to secure savings in the High Needs Block. By reducing the number of places from 84 to 66, there are savings simply from a reduced number of places needing to be funded. Place funding alone has reduced the budget requirement by £180,000.

The following table from the High Needs 2020-21 budget shows that the savings have not been secured and that the PRU Strategic Review has resulted in some unintended and very expensive consequences.

Against 2018-19 budget spend PRU top ups to the end of 2020-21 will create over £2m pressure on the High Needs Block.

The High Needs Block deficit of £521k from 2018/19 (which back in October 2017 was predicted to be a surplus of £131k) is predicted to grow to £2.050m 2019/20 and then to £3.159m at end 2020/21.

There is no accompanying analysis of PRU places and demand both historic trend forecast and no detail of any options or outcomes or review of the PRU

Strategic Review that was implemented to address, limit and reverse the unintended consequences. The gulf between the planned for savings and actual costs appears to be widening and unchecked.

### 3. PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS (PRU) – STATUTORY

3.1 Table 3 shows the budgets for PRU top ups.

TABLE 3 PRU Budgets	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
PRU Top Up Funding (90625)	542,950	800,225	757,700	847,980	90,280	818,400	+60,700
PRU EHCP SEMH Placements (90628)	0	223,699	331,400	502,760	171,360	578,230	+246,830
Non WBC PRU Top Up Funding (90626)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>542,950</b>	<b>1,023,924</b>	<b>1,089,100</b>	<b>1,350,740</b>	<b>261,640</b>	<b>1,396,630</b>	<b>+307,530</b>

- 6.8 0.25%, but any transfer of funding needs to be linked to better information on how schools can access vcg funding, as well as access to asd advisory services and access to the proposed new specialist TAs. 0.5% of dsq is too large a deduction when there is no guarantee that it won't just get eaten up by the already increasing HN overspend. £259k seems a reasonable compromise. We would also like to have seen more funding going into increasing HN top-up rates which have not kept pace with staff cost increases for several years now. Was this option considered at all?
- 6.9 We are generally not supportive of any transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block as it would result in a reduction in per-pupil funding. However, our school was one of the schools who couldn't access vulnerable children's funding during the current year because it had run out - there was no other source of external funding available for the additional emergency support a child required. We would therefore support option (c) a 0.25% transfer



APPENDIX B): illustrative formula allocations 2020/21		2019/20 ALLOCATION			2020/21 FINAL FUNDING ALLOCATION			YEAR ON YEAR CHANGE			
School Name	Phase	2019/20 pupil count	2019/20 Formula allocated	2019/20 per pupil funding	2020/21 pupil count	Funding allocation with 0.25% High Needs Block transfer	2020/21 per pupil funding	2020/21 change in pupil count	2020/21 change in total cash	2020/21 change in per pupil total funding	% change in per pupil funding
Aldermaston C.E. Primary School	Primary	168	£686,199	£4,085	148	£645,892	£4,364	-20	£-40,306	£280	7%
Basildon C.E. Primary School	Primary	144	£596,458	£4,142	153	£637,462	£4,166	9	£41,004	£24	1%
Beedon C.E. (Controlled) Primary	Primary	45	£281,616	£6,258	49	£306,572	£6,257	4	£24,956	£-2	0%
Beenham Primary School	Primary	71	£363,433	£5,119	56	£322,114	£5,752	-15	£-41,318	£633	12%
Birch Copse Primary School	Primary	423	£1,505,116	£3,558	421	£1,603,634	£3,809	-2	£98,518	£251	7%
Bradfield C.E. Primary School	Primary	164	£650,311	£3,965	159	£650,845	£4,093	-5	£534	£128	3%
Brightwalton C.E. Aided Primary S	Primary	100	£449,823	£4,498	88	£430,235	£4,889	-12	£-19,588	£391	9%
Brimpton C.E. Primary School	Primary	56	£324,915	£5,802	52	£314,852	£6,055	-4	£-10,063	£253	4%
Bucklebury C.E. Primary School	Primary	112	£484,772	£4,328	118	£530,361	£4,495	6	£45,589	£166	4%
Burghfield St Mary's C.E. Primary S	Primary	213	£805,400	£3,781	209	£820,786	£3,927	-4	£15,386	£146	4%
Calcot Infant School and Nursery	Primary	204	£836,636	£4,101	198	£857,581	£4,331	-6	£20,945	£230	6%
Calcot Junior School	Primary	288	£1,166,633	£4,051	279	£1,153,506	£4,134	-9	£-13,128	£84	2%
Chaddleworth St Andrew's C.E. Pri	Primary	24	£209,926	£8,747	30	£234,519	£7,817	6	£24,592	£-930	-11%
Chieveley Primary School	Primary	202	£769,619	£3,810	201	£788,005	£3,920	-1	£18,386	£110	3%
Cold Ash St Mark's C.E. School	Primary	180	£688,741	£3,826	183	£716,918	£3,918	3	£28,176	£91	2%
Compton C.E. Primary School	Primary	183	£712,987	£3,896	194	£794,950	£4,098	11	£81,963	£202	5%
Curridge Primary School	Primary	99	£435,038	£4,394	102	£450,807	£4,420	3	£15,769	£25	1%
Denefield School	Secondary	961	£4,811,739	£5,007	973	£4,957,510	£5,095	12	£145,771	£88	2%
Downsway Primary School	Primary	214	£828,421	£3,871	214	£858,139	£4,010	0	£29,718	£139	4%
Enborne C.E. Primary School	Primary	66	£337,373	£5,112	70	£355,120	£5,073	4	£17,747	£-39	-1%
Englefield C.E. Primary School	Primary	107	£457,848	£4,279	97	£436,424	£4,499	-10	£-21,425	£220	5%
Falkland Primary School	Primary	450	£1,600,197	£3,556	453	£1,727,799	£3,814	3	£127,602	£258	7%
Fir Tree Primary School and Nurse	Primary	176	£757,650	£4,305	177	£789,068	£4,458	1	£31,418	£153	4%
Francis Bailly Primary School	Primary	568	£2,026,944	£3,569	581	£2,186,515	£3,763	13	£159,571	£195	5%
Garland Junior School	Primary	213	£853,178	£4,006	221	£915,935	£4,145	8	£62,757	£139	3%
Hampstead Norreys C.E. Primary S	Primary	87	£405,791	£4,664	89	£432,073	£4,855	2	£26,281	£190	4%
Hermitage Primary School	Primary	187	£737,622	£3,945	181	£732,987	£4,050	-6	£-4,635	£105	3%
Highwood Copse Primary School	Primary				18	£128,013	£7,315		£-128,013	£7,315	
Hungerford Primary School	Primary	389	£1,447,144	£3,720	357	£1,381,260	£3,869	-32	£-65,884	£149	4%
Inkpen Primary School	Primary	70	£346,290	£4,947	66	£343,139	£5,199	-4	£-3,151	£252	5%
John O'gaunt School	Secondary	363	£2,005,915	£5,526	381	£2,193,069	£5,756	18	£187,155	£230	4%
John Rankin Infant and Nursery Sc	Primary	254	£958,011	£3,772	254	£983,078	£3,870	0	£25,067	£99	3%
John Rankin Junior School	Primary	348	£1,281,567	£3,683	351	£1,343,154	£3,827	3	£61,587	£144	4%
Kennet School	Secondary	1451	£7,127,939	£4,912	1484	£7,502,709	£5,056	33	£374,770	£143	3%
Kennet Valley Primary School	Primary	189	£788,559	£4,172	197	£866,685	£4,399	8	£78,126	£227	5%
Kintbury St Mary's C.E. Primary Sch	Primary	164	£679,154	£4,141	159	£681,077	£4,284	-5	£1,923	£142	3%
Lambourn CofE Primary School	Primary	182	£771,751	£4,240	177	£773,146	£4,368	-5	£1,394	£128	3%
Little Heath School	Secondary	1287	£6,326,028	£4,915	1282	£6,564,380	£5,120	-5	£238,352	£205	4%
Long Lane Primary School	Primary	214	£821,105	£3,837	214	£857,971	£4,009	0	£36,866	£172	4%
Mortimer St John's C.E. Infant Sch	Primary	171	£680,738	£3,981	170	£702,643	£4,133	-1	£21,905	£152	4%
Mortimer St Mary's C.E. Junior Sch	Primary	220	£824,265	£3,747	212	£828,791	£3,909	-8	£4,525	£163	4%
Mrs Bland's Infant School	Primary	165	£695,225	£4,213	174	£760,534	£4,371	9	£65,309	£157	4%
Pangbourne Primary School	Primary	199	£791,961	£3,980	196	£806,010	£4,112	-3	£14,049	£133	3%
Park House School	Secondary	867	£4,336,048	£5,001	905	£4,627,987	£5,114	38	£291,939	£113	2%
Parsons Down Infant School	Primary	167	£678,802	£4,065	135	£606,637	£4,494	-32	£-72,165	£429	11%
Parsons Down Junior School	Primary	292	£1,112,275	£3,809	268	£1,059,734	£3,954	-24	£-52,541	£145	4%
Purley CofE Primary School	Primary	112	£498,531	£4,451	103	£481,999	£4,680	-9	£-16,532	£228	5%
Robert Sandilands Primary School	Primary	242	£975,185	£4,030	238	£1,011,898	£4,252	-4	£36,713	£222	6%
Shaw-cum-Donnington C.E. Prima	Primary	88	£453,544	£5,154	80	£430,611	£5,386	-8	£-22,633	£232	5%
Shefford C.E. Primary School	Primary	50	£311,401	£6,228	44	£303,915	£6,907	-6	£-47,487	£679	11%
Speenhamland School	Primary	294	£1,138,874	£3,843	311	£1,272,760	£4,092	17	£133,886	£219	6%
Springfield Primary School	Primary	301	£1,104,200	£3,668	300	£1,150,779	£3,836	-1	£46,579	£167	5%
Spurcoth Primary School	Primary	444	£1,634,569	£3,681	446	£1,736,503	£3,894	2	£101,934	£212	6%
St Bartholomew's School	Secondary	1313	£6,379,484	£4,859	1332	£6,720,699	£5,046	19	£341,216	£187	4%
St Finian's Catholic Primary School	Primary	178	£695,905	£3,910	186	£747,768	£4,020	8	£51,863	£111	3%
St John the Evangelist C.E. Nursery	Primary	180	£691,698	£3,843	180	£732,554	£4,070	0	£40,856	£227	6%
St Joseph's Catholic Primary Schoo	Primary	201	£797,321	£3,967	211	£884,671	£4,193	10	£87,349	£226	6%
St Nicolas C.E. Junior School	Primary	255	£940,903	£3,690	256	£973,888	£3,804	1	£32,985	£114	3%
St Paul's Catholic Primary School	Primary	327	£1,185,257	£3,625	311	£1,183,211	£3,805	-16	£-2,045	£180	5%
Stockcross C.E. School	Primary	100	£429,164	£4,292	103	£456,670	£4,434	3	£27,506	£142	3%
Streatley C.E. Voluntary Controlle	Primary	94	£429,608	£4,570	99	£453,237	£4,578	5	£23,629	£8	0%
Sulhamstead and Ufton Nervet Sc	Primary	106	£454,098	£4,284	101	£454,813	£4,503	-5	£715	£219	5%
Thatcham Park CofE Primary	Primary	363	£1,355,186	£3,733	349	£1,383,105	£3,963	-14	£27,919	£230	6%
The Downs School	Secondary	922	£4,452,658	£4,829	954	£4,797,446	£5,029	32	£344,787	£199	4%
The Hilsleys Primary School	Primary	63	£326,403	£5,181	67	£354,914	£5,297	4	£28,510	£116	2%
The Willink School	Secondary	918	£4,515,350	£4,919	951	£4,862,677	£5,113	33	£347,327	£195	4%
The Willows Primary School	Primary	359	£1,484,936	£4,136	364	£1,597,566	£4,389	5	£112,630	£253	6%
The Winchcombe School	Primary	437	£1,768,005	£4,046	438	£1,801,824	£4,114	1	£33,820	£68	2%
Theale C.E. Primary School	Primary	306	£1,115,408	£3,645	312	£1,197,351	£3,838	6	£81,943	£193	5%
Theale Green School	Secondary	400	£2,108,827	£5,272	439	£2,376,198	£5,413	39	£267,371	£141	3%
Trinity School	Secondary	873	£4,507,329	£5,163	923	£4,911,911	£5,322	50	£404,582	£159	3%
Welford and Wickham C.E. Primar	Primary	97	£440,499	£4,541	98	£468,364	£4,779	1	£27,865	£238	5%
Westwood Farm Infant School	Primary	177	£710,451	£4,014	177	£744,298	£4,205	0	£33,846	£191	5%
Westwood Farm Junior School	Primary	232	£884,898	£3,814	238	£957,249	£4,022	6	£72,351	£208	5%
Whitelands Park Primary School	Primary	347	£1,300,138	£3,747	341	£1,320,379	£3,872	-6	£20,242	£125	3%
Woolhampton C.E. Primary School	Primary	89	£405,328	£4,554	93	£423,975	£4,559	4	£18,647	£5	0%
Yattendon C.E. Primary School	Primary	83	£392,850	£4,733	91	£437,639	£4,809	8	£44,789	£76	2%
<b>Primary Total</b>			<b>£52,773,857</b>			<b>£54,777,210</b>			<b>£2,003,353</b>		
<b>Secondary Total</b>			<b>£46,571,317</b>			<b>£49,514,587</b>			<b>£2,943,270</b>		
<b>Total all Schools</b>		<b>22,648</b>	<b>£99,345,173</b>		<b>22,832</b>	<b>£104,291,796</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>£4,946,623</b>		

This page is intentionally left blank

High Needs Block Budget 2020/21			
Report being considered by:	Schools Forum on 20 <sup>th</sup> January 2020		
Report Author:	Ian Pearson, Jane Seymour, Michelle Sancho, Linda Curtis		
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 2019/20 and the position known so far for 2020/21, including the likely shortfall. It also sets out some savings options (together with an assessment of impact and risks) and some invest to save proposals.

### 2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the predicted shortfall and take a view on savings options and invest to save proposals shown in Appendix B, including the proposed transfer of 0.25% of the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. The final decision will be taken at the March meeting.

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. The budget set for 2019/20 included a planned overspend of £1.6M.

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 2020-21 costs exceed 2019-20 budgets.

3.6 In 2020-21, the Government has increased in Local Authorities' HNB budgets. In West Berkshire's case, the HNB budget will increase from £20,070,067 to £21,667,304, an increase of £1,597,237 or 8%. There will also be an in year import / export adjustment which is difficult to estimate at this stage. The current year import / export adjustment was £30,000.

3.7 If the Schools Block transfer is agreed, the net shortfall in the 2020-21 HNB budget, is **£3,374,029**. This includes a predicted 19/20 overspend of **£2,209,793**.

3.8 The increase can be explained as follows:

- Overspend of £521,000 in 2018-19, carried forward
- Deficit budget of £1.6M set in 2019-20, due to increased pressure in a range of areas including maintained special schools, non maintained special schools, resourced units, EHCPs in mainstream schools, FE College placements, PRUs and children with EHCPs in PRUs.
- Additional pressures in 20-21, over and above the deficit budget set in 2019-20, which relate to mainly to top up funding for children with EHCPs in a variety of settings. See Appendix A sections 2 and 3 below for more detail.

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 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 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 2019/20 and 2020/21 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 services continuing at current staffing levels (with the exception of some invest to save proposals which are detailed in Section 6 of Appendix A). The figures assume 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 2019 census, and import/export adjustments based on the January 2020 census and February 2020 ILR.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>2019/20 Budget £</b>	<b>2019/20 Forecast £</b>	<b>2020/21 Estimate £</b>
Place Funding	6,016,000	6,016,000	6,055,000
Top Up Funding	12,119,960	11,997,039	12,865,755
PRU Funding (top ups only)	1,089,100	1,345,495	1,375,915
Other Statutory Services	1,501,180	1,517,340	1,541,650
Non Statutory Services	801,470	785,700	1,076,200
Support Service Recharges	127,286	127,286	180,020
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>21,654,996</b>	<b>21,788,860</b>	<b>23,090,540</b>

HNB DSG Allocation	-20,070,067	-20,100,067	-21,667,304
0.25% SB Transfer			-263,000
In year overspend	1,584,929	1,688,793	1,164,236
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	521,000	521,000	2,209,793
<b>Total cumulative deficit</b>	<b>2,105,929</b>	<b>2,209,793</b>	<b>3,374,029</b>

4.3 There is a forecast shortfall of **£1,164,236** in the 2020/21 HNB which may change as the budgets continue to be finalised.

4.4 Proposals for savings, together with proposals for invest to save projects, are included in this report.

4.5 A consultation has taken place with schools on a proposal to transfer a percentage of the Schools Block to the HNB in order to fund a range of invest to save projects, with the aim of reducing expenditure in the long term. Schools were asked to select their preference from a transfer of 0.5%, 0.25%, 0.125% and 0%.

4.6 16 schools responded to the consultation. 9 voted for a transfer of funds and 7 voted for no transfer of funds. Of the 9 who supported a transfer of funds, 3 voted for 0.5%, 4 voted for 0.25% and 2 supported a transfer but did not say which option they preferred.

4.7 On this basis it is proposed that a 0.25% transfer from Schools Block is made to the HNB, to fund the invest to save proposals set out in Section 6 of Appendix A.

Appendix A sets out the detail of the budgets included within the High Needs Block, and the reasons for the pressure on the 2020-21 HNB budget.

## 5. Appendices

Appendix A – High Needs Budget detail and Invest to Save options

Appendix B – Savings Options

Appendix C – Evaluation and Impact Data

## Appendix A

### High Needs Budget Detail

#### 1. PLACE FUNDING – STATUTORY

- 1.1 Place funding is agreed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and has to be passed on to the institution, forming their base budget. Academy and FE 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 FE colleges, a request can be made to the ESFA. However, any additional places agreed would be top sliced from West Berkshire's HNB allocation in 2020-21; no additional funding is made available.
- 1.3 Requests have been made for an increase of 17 places in academies and FE, but this is offset by a reduction of 13 FE places, so the net increase is 4. Further detail is given in a separate report on planned places.
- 1.4 It is not possible to increase planned places in maintained schools unless there are surplus planned places available for reallocation, which is not the case. The shortfall in planned places for children with EHCPs attending West Berkshire maintained special schools or PRUs, so this funding is taken from the maintained special school and PRU EHCP top up budgets, creating additional pressure in those areas.

TABLE 1 - Place Funding Budget	2019/20 Budget			2020/21 Budget		
	No. of Places	£	Current No. of Pupils	Proposed No. of Places	£	Difference in number
Special Schools pre 16 (90540) –	286	2,860,000	405	286	2,860,000	0
Special Schools post 16 (90546) –	79	527,000		79	790,000	0
Special Schools –post 16 (DSG top slice)		263,000				
Resource Units Maintained – pre 16 (90584)	35	234,000	30	25	230,000	0
Resource Units Academies – pre 16 (DSG top slice)	94	628,000	88	112	664,000	8
Mainstream Maintained – post 16	5	16,000	7	5	30,000	0
Mainstream Academies – post 16 (DSG top slice)	14	82,000	14	16	96,000	2
Further Education	139	746,000	135	133	725,000	-6
PRU Place Funding (90320)	66	660,000	72	66	660,000	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>6,016,000</b>		<b>722</b>	<b>6,055,000</b>	<b>4</b>

## 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 2019/20 and the estimate for 2020/21.

TABLE 2 Top Up Budgets	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 8)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Special Schools Maintained (90539)	3,300,420	3,383,249	3,463,450	3,758,740	295,290	3,986,360	+522,910
Non WBC special schools (90548)	1,098,070	1,009,156	1,065,960	992,664	-73,296	1,194,295	+128,335
Resource Units Maintained (90617)	293,020	274,236	270,350	310,156	39,806	313,650	+43,300
Resource Units Academies (90026)	854,270	822,634	946,530	809,871	-136,659	948,280	+1,750
Resource Units Non WBC (90618)	107,000	126,702	143,580	154,248	10,668	130,600	-12,980
Mainstream Maintained (90621)	541,560	658,073	667,330	803,593	136,263	779,450	+112,120
Mainstream Academies (90622)	185,170	247,075	267,460	349,970	82,510	389,600	+122,140
Mainstream Non WBC (90624)	75,000	78,343	73,030	94,658	21,628	70,590	-2,440
Non Maintained Special Schools (90575)	840,100	747,940	1,030,380	1,019,300	-11,080	1,068,200	+37,820
Independent Special Schools (90579)	2,436,400	2,218,567	2,683,020	2,405,841	-277,179	2,797,000	+113,980
Further Education (90580)	1,396,140	1,270,010	1,408,870	1,197,998	-210,872	1,087,730	-321,140
Disproportionate HN Pupils (90627)	100,000	83,609	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,227,150</b>	<b>10,919,594</b>	<b>12,119,960</b>	<b>11,997,039</b>	<b>-122,921</b>	<b>12,865,755</b>	<b>+745,795</b>

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

- West Berkshire maintained special schools
- Mainstream top ups (academies)
- Non maintained special schools



- Resourced units in maintained schools
- Mainstream top ups (maintained)
- Non West Berkshire special schools

2.3 However, there are also significant savings on three of the top up cost centres:

- Further Education
- Independent special schools
- Resourced units in Non West Berkshire schools

2.4 The predictions of cost for 2020-21 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 2020/21. The figures assume a middle ground between the best case scenario and the worst case scenario (financially) in terms of Tribunal outcomes.

**2.5 West Berkshire maintained special schools**

This pressure reflects increasing numbers in our special schools, the need to compensate for inadequate planned place funding through the top up budget and some very high needs pupils needing additional support to maintain their placements.

**2.6 Mainstream top ups (academies)**

There is pressure on the budgets for EHCPs in mainstream schools (both maintained and academies). This relates to an increase in the average cost of an EHCP in a mainstream school, together with an increase in overall numbers of EHCPs. There was a significant increase in the number of EHCPs issued in the 2018-19 academic year. There are robust systems in place to manage demand, and criteria for EHC assessments have not changed, so the increase suggests an increase in the numbers of children with significant needs.

The total numbers of EHCPs has increased as shown below since implementation of SEND Reforms in 2014. This represents an increase of 33% in just under 6 years.

Jan 2014	770
Jan 2015	751
Jan 2016	822
Jan 2017	897
Jan 2018	892
Jan 2019	912
Nov 2019	1026

**2.7 Non maintained special schools**

This increase in this budget is predominately due to a very ill child who has returned to the area and will need a specialist placement.

The majority of placements made in non maintained special schools continue to be for children with SEMH and ASD, plus a smaller number of HI placements.

## 2.8 Resourced units in maintained schools

This pressure relates to some pupils in resourced units requiring higher funding bands due to the complexity of their needs.

## 2.9 Mainstream top ups (maintained)

There is pressure on the budgets for EHCPs in mainstream schools (both maintained and academies). See 2.6 above. There has been a notable increase in the number of children with EHCPs who are of nursery age.

## 2.10 Non West Berkshire special schools

There is a current underspend in this budget due to pupils moving out of Northern House School to join I-College and 2 pupils predicted to go to Thames Valley School who have now been placed at The Pod (New I-College provision).

There will however be a pressure on this budget for next year due to 3 pupils requiring places at Holybrook School (SEMH) from September 2020, 4 other pupils in mainstream moving to SEMH provision and 1 to TVS. The cost of these additional placements is offset by leavers but there is still a net increase.

## 2.11 Further Education

There is a predicted underspend on this budget in the current financial year. The budget for 2019-20 was based on the number of students with EHCPs attending FE Colleges in 2018-19, but numbers in 2019-20 are down on the previous academic year. It is not entirely clear why this is the case, but appears to be partly due to more young people moving in to employment. In addition, one student left an Independent Specialist College placement (ISP) after 2 years of a 3 years course, generating a significant saving. One student will be leaving an ISP early at Christmas who was expected to stay until the end of the academic year.

The predicted costs for 20/21 are based on current numbers and represent a significant reduction in predicted expenditure.

It should be noted, however, that this budget is volatile as it covers young adults who have the right to leave education should they wish, sometimes unexpectedly.

Students with high level needs can also opt to re-enter education at any time up to the age of 25 years. In addition, a change to the ESFA funding guidance means that the host Local Authority is responsible financially for place funding for students over and above the agreed number of planned places who are placed by other Local Authorities. It is not possible to predict what the impact of this will be in 2020-21. Any additional costs are reimbursed through the import / export adjustment but not until the following financial year.

## 2.12 Independent special schools (ISS)

There is a predicted underspend in this budget caused by a number of factors including delays in sourcing suitable placements in some cases, placements being made at Engaging Potential rather than independent special schools, one pupil moving to Elected Home Education, some negotiated reductions in fees and some children moving out of area.

It is anticipated that costs in 2020-21 will also be lower than the 2019-20 budget, although the discrepancy will not be as great as the current underspend. Provision needs to be made for 2 pupils with ASD potentially moving into private schools (one is a Tribunal case), 1 pupil with ASD seeking an independent SPLD special school placement via Tribunal, 2 pupils with ASD moving in to ISS placements and 2 pupils with ASD in LA special schools potentially moving in to residential ISS (one case is via Tribunal).

### 2.13 Resourced units in Non West Berkshire schools

Taking in to account existing placements and proposed new placements, costs in 2020-21 will be lower than the 2019-20 budget due to some pupils changing placement.

## 3. PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS (PRU) – STATUTORY

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

TABLE 3 PRU Budgets	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 8)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
PRU Top Up Funding (90625)	542,950	800,225	757,700	847,980	90,280	818,400	+60,700
PRU EHCP SEMH Placements (90628)	0	223,699	331,400	497,515	166,115	557,515	+226,115
Non WBC PRU Top Up Funding (90626)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>542,950</b>	<b>1,023,924</b>	<b>1,089,100</b>	<b>1,345,495</b>	<b>256,395</b>	<b>1,375,915</b>	<b>+286,815</b>

3.2 The current year budget was based on the previous year's forecast. Schools Forum agreed to pilot a 50% contribution from schools for pupils that they placed. Further details can be found in a separate report. 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 20/21 PRU Top Up Funding is based on the profile of pupils at I-College in the summer term. A more up to date figure may be available after the autumn term figures are known.

3.3 The number of pupils with EHCPs being placed in PRUs is increasing as this can be an appropriate and cost effective provision for some young people. A new provision for pupils with EHCPs was set up in autumn 2019, The Pod. The top up and place costs have been allowed for in the 2020-21 estimate as new planned places for maintained provision cannot be made available. These placements are usually more cost effective than independent and non-maintained special school placements.

## 4. OTHER STATUTORY SERVICES

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

TABLE 4 Other Statutory Services	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 8)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Applied Behaviour Analysis (90240)	75,000	116,192	119,120	181,718	62,598	136,580	+17,460
Sensory Impairment (90290)	175,750	241,928	236,000	231,320	-4,680	227,590	-8,410
SEN Commissioned Provision (90577)	456,000	487,772	527,150	527,150	0	567,650	+40,500
Equipment for SEN Pupils (90565)	10,000	11,954	15,000	7,000	-8,000	15,000	0
Therapy Services (90295)	240,760	276,331	261,470	261,470	0	261,470	0
Elective home Education Monitoring (90288)	27,990	22,801	28,240	25,240	-3,000	28,240	0
Home Tuition Service (90315)	245,000	230,567	102,080	102,080	0	0	-17,000
Medical Home Tuition (90282)	0	0	119,920	119,920	0	205,000	
Hospital Tuition (90610)	45,000	37,390	36,000	36,000	0	39,060	+3,060
SEND Strategy (DSG) (90281)	0	0	56,200	25,442	-30,758	61,060	+4,860
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,275,500</b>	<b>1,424,935</b>	<b>1,501,180</b>	<b>1,517,340</b>	<b>16,160</b>	<b>1,541,650</b>	<b>40,470</b>

## 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 through Personal Budgets.

4.2.4 The predicted cost for 2020-21 is slightly lower than the current budget, in spite of the overspend in 2019-20, because two particularly large packages of support have recently ceased.

## 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 The budget requirement will be slightly lower next year due to a small increase in numbers of children requiring support.

#### **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 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 2020-21 relates to reduced income for young people placed by other Local Authorities and an increase in premises costs.

#### **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 budget of £10,000 would be made available to meet these needs. In 2019-20 it was agreed that the budget should be increased again to £15,000 as demand for equipment for children in nurseries and resourced schools was increasing. The budget is not fully spent this year but there are likely to be more equipment requests in the final 4 to 5 months of the financial so it is recommended that the budget stays the same for 2020-21.

#### **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 It is anticipated that there will be a small percentage increase in this budget in 2020-21 to reflect staff pay increases, but this information has not yet been made available by the service provider.

#### **4.7 Elective Home Education Monitoring**

4.7.1 The Elective Home Education monitoring sits within the Education Welfare and Safeguarding Service. There is a statutory duty to monitor arrangements for EHE made by parents. Elective Home Education numbers are growing, both locally and nationally. In August 2019 the part time teacher who was in post resigned, which gave the opportunity to evaluate the post and consequently advertise for an EHE Officer to work for three rather than two days. The current year forecast is a £3,000 saving, due to the change of staff terms and conditions.

## 4.8 Medical Tuition Service

4.8.1 The Medical Tuition Service (previously Home Tuition Service) is a statutory service providing home tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full-time school. This service was moved from I-College to the Local Authority with effect from September 2019 with savings and next year's budget already agreed by Schools' Forum. £23K saving has already been taken in this financial year and there will be a £17K saving in 2020-21 as a result of transferring this service in house.

## 4.9 Hospital Tuition

4.9.1 The Local Authority is 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. As numbers and costs are impossible to predict, it is proposed that the 2020-21 budget remains the same as 2019-20.

## 4.10 SEND Strategy Officer

4.10.1 In 2019-20 the Schools Forum agreed to fund a SEND Strategy Officer for three years initially to support implementation of the SEND Strategy 2018-23.

## 5 NON STATUTORY Services

5.1 Table 5 details the non-statutory service budgets for 2018-19, 2019-20, and estimates for 2020-21. 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 2020/21 assuming that the services continue and there are no changes to staffing levels.

5.3 Table 5 also includes four proposals for invest to save initiatives; an increase in the Vulnerable Children Grant, investment in the Therapeutic Thinking initiative in order to ensure it is sustainable, removal of LAL charges and expansion of the ASD Advisory Service.

TABLE 5 Non Statutory Services	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 8)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Language and Literacy Centres LALs (90555)	82,400	93,800	98,400	98,400	0	116,200	+17,800
Specialist Inclusion Support Service (90585)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	0
PRU Outreach Service (90582)	61,200	61,200	61,200	61,200	0	61,200	0

TABLE 5 Non Statutory Services	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 8)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Early Years Inclusion Fund (90238) moved to EY Block	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Needs Support Team (90280)	319,170	309,706	325,660	307,400	-18,260	333,010	+7,350
ASD Advisory Service (90830)	141,550	140,063	146,210	148,700	2,490	208,390	+62,180
Vulnerable Children (90961)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	179,400	+129,400
Early Development and Inclusion Team (90287)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	40,000	0
Dingley's Promise (90581)	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	0
Therapeutic Thinking	0	0	0	0	0	58,000	+58,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>774,320</b>	<b>774,769</b>	<b>801,470</b>	<b>785,700</b>	<b>-15,770</b>	<b>1,076,200</b>	<b>+274,730</b>

#### 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 The budget was reduced in 2018-19 when charging for LAL places, at 50% of the real cost of the place, was introduced. Since charging was introduced, take up of places fell from 48 to 33 in 2018-19 and 26 in 2019-20.

5.4.3 A number of schools have stated that they would like to purchase LAL places but cannot afford to do so. Children who do not access LAL places due to cost maybe more likely to require an EHCP, with associated costs, and are likely to present at secondary school with very low literacy levels.

5.4.4 It is recommended that the LAL budget is restored to its original figure of £116,200 and charging is removed. This proposal is set out in more detail in section 6 below.

#### 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.

5.9.3 It is recommended that this service is expanded in order to provide more assistance to schools to meet the needs of children with ASD. This proposal is set out in more detail in section 6 below.

## **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. This is a well used resource that helps schools support vulnerable pupils with complex needs.



5.10.3 The budget has been used up for this financial year which impacts on the Local Authority's ability to support schools to meet the needs of pupils with Social, Emotional and Mental Health Difficulties.

5.10.4 It is recommended that this budget is increased in order to provide more assistance to schools to meet the needs of children with SEMH. This proposal is set out in more detail in section 6 below.

### **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.

### **5.11 Dingley's Promise**

5.11.1 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.

5.11.2 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. 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.

## **6 Invest to Save Proposals**

It is proposed that a transfer of 0.25% of the Schools Block is made to the HNB in order to fund the following initiatives, with the aim of achieving savings in the longer term:

### **6.1 Proposal to fund Therapeutic Thinking Officer**

6.1.1 Over 120 school staff and West Berkshire employees have attended engagement days which helped them to understand how to support children and young people

in schools in a trauma informed way. In addition, over 70 school staff and LA employees attended three day train the trainer training in order to upskill themselves to deliver training in therapeutic thinking in their own settings. Other local authorities that have adopted a similar approach have seen impressive outcomes. For example, one local authority found that in schools where head teachers were trained as trainers there was a 60% reduction in fixed term exclusions, an 89.5% reduction in exclusion days and no permanent exclusions. This was achieved within a year.

6.1.2 Both the engagement day training and the 3 day training have been evaluated positively. The evaluation is outlined below.

6.1.3 The Therapeutic Thinking Invest to Save Project has had a significant impact on staff skills and reported practice. In order to sustain change across West Berkshire it is recommended that a 3 year fixed term post of Therapeutic Thinking Officer is funded to lead network meetings for school leads, develop policy and practice within West Berkshire and in schools and to continue to deliver the engagement and train the trainer courses.

6.1.4 Some work has been done to start implementation of Therapeutic Thinking but progress has been severely limited by having no dedicated capacity to embed this approach.

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

6.1.6 The post is likely to be a Band K post which equates to a salary range from £36,876 to £44,632. Assuming an appointment at the mid-point of the scale, and taking on costs and start-up equipment purchase into account, the estimated annual cost of the post would be £58K.

6.1.7 Without this post there is a serious risk that the potential of the Therapeutic Thinking 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.

6.1.8 A reduction in permanent exclusions by 25% maintained for three years would equate to approximately 17 less permanent exclusions in that time period which would result in a saving of £340K. Some students from this group go on to be placed in schools which cost an average of £62,000 per place per year, therefore there is the potential to save £428K over 3 years if for example 2 of the 17 students spend one year in such provision.

## **6.2 Proposal to increase Vulnerable Children Grant**

6.2.1 This is a small budget of £50,000 held by the Local Authority to support vulnerable pupils with complex needs. It can be used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short term basis.

- 6.2.1 The budget is well used and has helped to maintain children in their mainstream schools and avoid exclusions. Schools have appreciated being able to access funds relatively quickly for their most vulnerable pupils. However, the grant is in high demand and has already run out for the current financial year, meaning no further children can be supported.
- 6.2.2 If this budget were to be increased, it would allow more support to be given to schools to help them meet the needs of vulnerable children, including those with social, emotional and mental health needs.
- 6.2.3 Increasing this budget by £125,400 to £175,400 would allow the Local Authority to:
- Provide VCG funding for more children and / or for longer periods
  - Provide funding to schools when they admit a child who has been permanently excluded from another school
  - Support schools with implementation of Therapeutic Thinking approaches, eg. funding to support implementation of personalised therapeutic plans

### **6.3 Proposal to remove charging for LAL places**

- 6.3.1 In September 2018, charges were introduced for placements at the Language and Literacy Centres at Theale and Winchcombe schools. Charges are based on 50% of the real cost of the place. These charges were introduced in order to alleviate pressure on the High Needs Block.
- 6.3.1 The LALs can provide 48 places per year for Year 5 students who have persistent difficulties with literacy and need an intensive programme delivered by a teacher qualified in specific literacy difficulties. Outcomes data for pupils who have attended the LALs shows that they make very significant progress prior to returning to Year 6 and then transitioning to secondary school.
- 6.3.2 Prior to the introduction of charging, all 48 LAL places were taken up every year. Since charging was introduced, the number of children accessing the LALs reduced to 33 in 2018 and 26 in 2019 and could fall further again in 2020 given the significant financial pressure on schools.
- 6.3.3 A survey of primary school headteachers has clearly demonstrated that a large number of primary schools would like to refer pupils to LAL but cannot afford to do so. 77% of schools who responded said that they had referred children to LAL in the three years prior to charging being introduced, but only 36% had made referrals since charging was introduced. A number of schools commented that they would like to refer to LAL but the charge was prohibitively expensive, especially for small schools.
- 6.3.4 There is some emerging evidence that the reduction in children being able to access LAL is linked to an increase in requests for EHCPs and an increase in potential appeals to the SEND Tribunal for places in specialist schools for children with dyslexia, with associated costs.
- 6.3.5 It is also possible that secondary schools will begin to see an impact of the reduction in children accessing LAL in terms of literacy levels of Year 7 cohorts and the numbers of children needing intensive support for literacy.

6.3.6 It is proposed that the charges for LAL places are removed so that all children who need this provision can access it and in order to avoid pressure for EHCPs and specialist placements for children with literacy difficulties.

6.3.7 The LAL budget is already subsidising places by 50% of the cost and fully funding the vacant places, so the cost of removing charging altogether would be relatively low at £17,800.

#### **6.4 Proposal to expand the ASD Advisory Team to include Specialist Higher Level Teaching Assistants for deployment in schools**

6.4.1 The number of children diagnosed with ASD has increased very dramatically over the last 10 years and continues to increase. Schools have developed good skills in meeting the needs of children with ASD and have access to support and training from the ASD Advisory Team. However, children with ASD can be challenging for schools to support and manage. We are seeing an increase in exclusions of children with ASD as well as an increase in specialist placements for children with ASD.

6.4.2 The West Berkshire SEND Strategy 2018-23, which was coproduced with parents, schools and other stakeholders, includes a proposal to recruit two Higher Level Teaching Assistants to the ASD Advisory Team, subject to identification of resources. There are currently two teachers in the team and one Autism Adviser who works with families. Service evaluations show that the support of the team is highly rated by schools, but team members are very thinly spread across the 1,152 children with ASD in our mainstream schools. The addition of HLTAs to the team would be a cost effective way of increasing capacity.

6.4.3 The objective of this additional resource would be to build capacity and expertise in schools, help schools to meet need effectively, maintain children in mainstream wherever possible and to support joint working between home and school, working alongside the Autism Adviser for Families

6.4.4 The HLTAs would work with individuals or groups of pupils in order to model strategies suggested by Advisory Teachers in class and support in producing and using resources. They could also run workshops for TAs in school and other staff. Work would have to be time limited but could help to avoid situations reaching crisis point.

6.4.5 The posts would be graded E to F. Assuming appointments at the mid point of the scale the cost would be £57,800.

## Savings Options

### Option 1 – Specialist Inclusion Support Service

This service supports children with learning difficulties and associated needs in mainstream schools. The budget for this service was reduced from £70,000 to £50,000 in 2017-18. Like other SEN support services, this service receives consistently positive ratings in evaluations. See Appendix C.

Consideration could be given to removing or reducing this service further.

Removal of the service would generate a saving of **£50,000**.

Reducing the service by half would generate a saving of **£25,000**.

Implications / Risks:

- (1) Possibility of schools / parents seeking more special school placements, with associated costs.
- (2) Children / staff in mainstream schools unable to access suitable support.
- (3) Additional pressure on other SEN services such as CALT and the ASD Service.

### Option 2 – PRU Outreach

A cut of £80k was made to this budget in 2015/16, with a further cut of £40,000 in 2017/18 and £15,800 in 2018-19. The budget is now £61,200.

Consideration could be given to removing or reducing this service further.

Removal of the service would generate a saving of **£61,200**.

Reducing the service by half would generate a saving of **£30,600**.

Implications/Risks

- (1) Increase in the number of permanent exclusions
- (2) Less support to schools in reintegrating young people who have been permanently excluded from another school
- (3) Greater demand for iCollege places

### Option 3 – Cognition and Learning Team (CALT)

CALT has been working to an income target since April 2015 which has achieved a saving in the HNB. Evaluations of the service are consistently very positive, but some schools report they cannot afford to buy the service or to buy as much support as they would like. See Appendix C for impact and evaluation data.

Staffing has been reduced to bring the expenditure in the trading budget in line with the likely income to be generated by the team.

It is unlikely to be realistic that an increased income target could be met. Savings could therefore only be made by reducing the size of the service. Reducing by 0.5 of a post would make a saving in the region of **£27,500**. Reducing by a full time post would make a saving in the region of **£55,000**.

Implications / Risks:

- (1) The core service provided free to all schools who do not buy in would be reduced or removed
- (2) Reduced support for children and impact on levels of SEN expertise and training of staff in schools. Reduced support for SENCOs.
- (3) Reduced capacity to address concerns about some mainstream schools' SEN provision raised by parents in the 2017 and 2019 Parent SEN Surveys and in the 2018 Local Area SEND Inspection.
- (4) Increase in EHC requests, with associated costs. This is considered to be a high risk as parental requests for EHCPs often arise from dissatisfaction with the school's provision.
- (5) Increased pressure on the capacity of specialist support services

## Heads Funding Group Recommendations:

Heads Funding Group has indicated its reluctance to further reductions from non-statutory services.

## Evaluation and Impact Data

### Cognition and Learning Team (CALT)

The Cognition and Learning Team sends out an evaluation survey to schools every other year. The last one was done in summer 2019 and the next one is due in summer 2021. Ratings from schools in the 2019 survey were as follows (37 schools responded):

Overall rating of the service	100% scored good or excellent
Quality of reports	94% scored good or excellent
In school training	100% scored good or excellent
Timeliness of response	97% scored good or excellent

The survey also asked whether the team had had an impact on staff and pupils. The responses were as follows:

	Yes	No	N/A
Improved staff confidence	89%	3%	8%
Improved provision for pupils with SEN	94%	0%	6%
Improved outcomes for pupils	81%	0%	19%

It is notable that a high percentage of respondents felt there had been an impact on staff and pupils, including pupil outcomes. Where respondents did not answer yes it was generally because they felt the question was not applicable in relation to the type of support they had received, rather than that there had not been a positive impact. The comments from survey respondents are set out in Appendix C (i)

The CALT team supported some schools to deliver the SNAP intervention programme. Children were on the programme for an average of 16 weeks.

Average progress made was as follows:

Word Accuracy - 4.5 months gain for every one month on the programme

Reading Comprehension – 3.3 months gain for every one month on the programme

### Specialist Inclusion Support Service (SISS)

The SISS Service evaluation survey was last sent to schools in summer 2017. Ratings from schools in the 2017 survey were as follows (15 schools responded):

Overall rating of the service	84% scored good or excellent
Quality of reports	84% scored good or excellent
Recommendations	100% scored good or excellent
In school training	100% scored good or excellent

The survey also asked whether the team had had an impact on pupils, staff and parents. Respondents were asked to rate the level of impact on a scale of 0 (no impact) to 5 (high impact). The responses were as follows:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	%

							score 3 or above
Pupils	8%	0%	0%	23%	62%	8%	93%
Staff	8%	0%	0%	8%	54%	31%	93%
Parents	8%	8%	0%	31%	38%	8%	77%

When considering impact, respondents were asked to consider:

Pupils: Progress, self- esteem, inclusion

Staff: Confidence, knowledge & skills, attitudes

Parents: Partnership with parents

93% of respondents felt that there had been a positive impact on pupils and on staff. A summary of comments from survey respondents is attached at Appendix C (ii).

### ASD Advisory Service

The ASD Advisory Service sends out an evaluation survey to schools every other year.

The last one was done in summer 2018 and the next one is due in summer 2020.

Ratings from schools in the 2018 survey were as follows (21 schools responded):

Overall rating of the service	76% scored good or excellent
Quality of reports	67% scored good or excellent
Recommendations	81% scored good or excellent
In school training	90% scored good or excellent

The survey also asked whether the team had had an impact on pupils and staff.

When considering impact, respondents were asked to consider:

Pupils: Progress, self- esteem

Staff: Confidence and resilience

This question was not scored; comments are included in Appendix C(iii).

Respondents were also asked:

Does the ASD Advisory Service meet your needs as a school?

12 of 21 respondents said yes. Where schools felt the service was not meeting their needs, this appears to relate mainly to the limited capacity of the service (1.95FTE teachers to a caseload of approximately 700 children in mainstream schools), for example, some schools wanted more frequent visits.

Are there any other needs you have that are not being met?

8 out of 21 respondents said no. Respondents who said yes wanted a level of service which would be difficult to provide from existing resources.

A summary of comments from survey respondents is attached at Appendix C(iii).

### Language and Literacy Centres (LALs)

The Language and Literacy Centres collect data annually on the average progress, in months, of children who have attended the centre, at the end of a 7 month intervention.

The table below shows the data for the 2018-19 academic year.



Test	Salford Reading	WRAT Reading	HAST Spelling
Average gain in months	15.7	12.5	15.2
Average gain in Standardised Score points	3.7	6.0	8.9

A summary of comments from parents and schools is attached at Appendix C (iv)

## Appendix C (i)

### CALT Evaluation Survey Comments 2019

#### 1. How would you rate the reports, advice and recommendations provided by the service?

- a. It's all very sound, based on evidence of what works. There is often quite a lot of recommendation and I wonder if it should be made more overt to parents that it may not be possible to put all the recommendations in at the same time.
- b. xxx will always go above and beyond. In what has been a challenging year she has been a force of calm for children, parents and staff.
- c. Feedback is also given to parents where it was deemed to be helpful and supportive.
- d. xxx will always go above and beyond. In what has been a challenging year she has been a force of calm for children, parents and staff.
- e. Clear reports detailing difficulties and strategies on how to support in class as well as interventions. As usual it can be difficult with lowering numbers of TAs to implement one to one interventions, so the class strategies are very useful.
- f. xxx has produced very thorough reports which details the needs of the children.
- g. "Reports are extremely useful and parents appreciate the level of detail provided.
- h. Reports contain a variety of suggestions that we can work through and try with the children.
- i. "
- j. "Support and guidance is always well explained and provisions/interventions suggests can usually be applied with minimal cost. As with all things, staffing to deliver can be an issue, but obviously this is not a fault of CALT!
- k. xxx is always happy to guide and support me, especially over the last few months when things have been tricky for me personally."
- l. the reports are clear and to the point without lots of jargon. We use the reports as working documents using the recommendations and resources.
- m. "Reports are prompt and informative.
- n. Pupils needs are clearly identified, discussed and advice /support materials provided."
- o. Reports are very detailed and thorough.

- p. Reports are clear and easy to navigate. The advice provided for the provision and next steps for the pupils is supportive and relevant.
- q. Brilliant service - always really helpful and can answer any questions SEN related! Reports are completed quickly so that we can implement the advice soon after a child has been seen.
- r. Very thorough reports and the recommendations are achievable and realistic to be implemented.
- s. The programmes devised have shown impact for reading and spelling.
- t. "Highly efficient and accurate
- u. Really helpful and friendly "
- v. Reports are very clear and easy to read, making them useable for staff and parents.
- w. Not used the service directly
- x. "The support is invaluable to us as a school, widens my knowledge and enables me to support our more complex children. The provision advised has been useful and enabled me to look at free alternatives that I was not aware of.
- y. Reports are always comprehensive and enable me to have really useful conversations with parents. In some cases with parents the report validates what we offer as a school is good practise. "

**2. How would you rate the usefulness of the pupil reports?**

- a. The team produce easy-to-read, easily understandable reports that are highly informative and very accurate in their precise support.
- b. Not only do they give a clear picture of strengths and difficulties but they are also used as working documents with strategies and recommendations for classroom practice and individual support.
- c. It gives a detailed view of the children's needs and provides important evidence for future assessments needed. It also helps us to plan the interventions the child requires and how to help them reach their potential.
- d. Some of the report recommendations can be very similar even though the children can present differently in class.
- e. See previous response!
- f. Can be used to support writing of SAPs and as a discussion focus for parents. One report helped child get the correct referral to paediatrics following a physical assessment.
- g. "Very useful for informing SAP targets and provision.
- h. Used to support access to other services e.g. recommendations for SISS involvement.
- i. Always interesting to read the pupil voice when they are talking to someone less well known to them.
- j. "
- k. CALT speak to the school about what capacity they have to provide intervention and tailor it to our school. There are specific interventions that pupils can be supported individually as well as in small groups which makes planning the provision easier. They provide good evidence to support onward referrals or EHCP request for assessment.
- l. Gives clear advice for what we should do next and the specific difficulties/gaps a child has.
- m. They are clear and explain the needs of the pupil found through assessments. They give teachers some guidance and parents a clearer picture of their child's needs.
- n. Provision recommendations and accompanying resources have resulted in children making rapid progress.

- o. Very accurate and bespoke and full of suggestions
  - p. Not used the service directly
  - q. With a lack of support staff it can be difficult to complete 1:1 interventions, class based interventions where the teacher can be trained to deliver are useful
  - r. The reports are very comprehensive and are used to inform differentiation in the classroom, SAPS, and any further external professional involvement. They provide an outline for a productive meeting with parents to move forward with the support needed in school and helpful to guide parents to support at home.
- 3. Did the team respond to queries from you in a timely manner?**
- a. Emails and calls are always responded to promptly.
- 4. Were reports received within 2 weeks of assessment?**
- a. Sometimes the same day & when just the data was required for a meeting it was returned very quickly
  - b. Always -often sooner
- 5. How would you rate the in-school training provided by the team?**
- a. N/A
  - b. xxx provided training during an Inset day and for an upcoming staff meeting around SAP's and their quality due to new members of staff and as an outside voice.
  - c. xxx has met with all teachers and provided each one of them with recommendations, sharing her expertise and knowledge.
  - d. We have not used this service this year
  - e. Not applicable
  - f. Tailored to meet the needs of pupils and teaching assistants.
  - g. None received this year
  - h. The team continues to respond to our needs when requested to provide in-school training, ensuring that the training matches our setting.
  - i. Not used this year but in previous years has been excellent.
  - j. The staff are very informative and are able to adapt their style of training to the audience.
  - k. We have had several intervention refreshers which have been very useful.
  - l. The training is bespoke and because our CALT teacher knows our setting and the children, she can include this in training to explain how/why a particular child would benefit from an intervention.
  - m. Highly skilled
  - n. When we have received this service it has been okay and staff have been able to implement it.
  - o. Training delivered by two CALT employees for Precision Teaching intervention to be led by Teaching Assistants. They took on board some of the staffing difficulties I had come across to ensure some elements of the training were emphasised. Good resources were supplied to staff as part of the training.
- 6. How would you rate the service overall?**
- a. Just fantastic, xxx always replies to emails, calls and my regular flapping.
  - b. xxx is always prompt in responding to queries, she sees children quickly and helps us to improve our provision for these children. She is always willing to support the SENCo and is very understanding of the financial boundaries of the school, as well as the practical and logistical constraints we are under to fulfil the needs of the children. xxx is knowledgeable on a wide range of SEN needs and has never been unable to answer a question. She always has practical and achievable suggestions to

make and is very approachable. She is well respected by all staff in school and everyone enjoys working alongside her.

- c. Really informative -I feel like I can always ask questions however daft they might seem. Great sounding board at meetings to talk about what we are trying with some pupils.
- d. All aspects of the service - staff, admin, training, service, advice etc are provided at the point of need. communication is quick and effective - emails answered very promptly.
- e. "Always answer any queries no matter how small.
- f. Case load meetings are really useful and give helpful pointers of both a longer term view as well as how to support children in the short term. "
- g. Sue Whiting is brilliant at supporting me as a SENCo. Her knowledge and experience within her role is useful and she keeps us informed of all relevant updates following research updates. The assessments are completed in a calm and supportive manner - all pupils are happy to work with Sue and other CALT teachers. The reports are comprehensive and there is a consistency in the standard of training they deliver.
- h. A really valuable service that I have found incredibly useful. It's been good to know that support and advice is at the end of an email.
- i. Instant responses to queries, programmes of intervention that have resulted in rapid progress, problem solving approach to identifying barriers and how to overcome them, assessments and reports completed in a timely manner.
- j. For all the reasons stated so far
- k. xxx is so professional and so helpful - it is a pleasure to work with her and I do hope that she remains as our CALT team link next year so we can continue to benefit from her support
- l. I have found this service invaluable as a SENDCo and knowing you are there when I have a query is a very useful.

**7. Has the involvement of the Cognition and Learning Team had an impact on pupils and staff?**

- a. We have had little contact with CALT this year apart from the LAL assessments
- b. Due to this year and the changes and challenges we have not yet reviewed the intervention data.
- c. xxx met with each teacher across the Partnership, with the SENCo and discussed the children on the SEDN register and other 'concern' children. She provided suggestions and shared her knowledge and expertise with staff, which provided them with a lot of confidence and skills. She has also worked alongside ESAs on improving the quality of interventions. xxx shares knowledge with the SENCO who then is able to adjust provision for individuals accordingly. She has also worked with the SENCO on assessment across the school which is having an impact on outcomes, tracking and staff awareness of the needs of children. xxx is always happy to suggest appropriate provision and provide ideas if it isn't having the impact expected.
- d. If you can identify a barrier and support the difficulties attached to it the above can happen!
- e. It has helped to give direction about where the interventions may be directed. It may be helpful to direct staff with which gap in knowledge should be worked on first. This is because some children have many gaps and it would be helpful for NQTs and parents to have an order on to what to work on first.

- f. "To be reassured that what you believe a child's issue is and that you now have support, if needed, to assist the child with their learning.
- g. To help establish the barriers to a child's learning and have strategies to support that individual child's needs rather than a generic intervention."
- h. advice and resources continue to have an impact on pupils learning - especially spelling. This year support staff have had refresher training for several interventions enabling them to deliver quality support.
- i. Support and provision is more targeted.
- j. Staff always feel well supported and always welcome advice and recommendations from CALT. Pupils are reviewed regularly to ensure that they are on the correct provision and are making expected progress. CALT teacher is able to recommend alternatives if interventions are not working.
- k. Children making, for example, at least 6 mths progress in 3 mths following intervention. Teachers report that they are confident in leading an intervention that is being delivered by a TA.
- l. We have seen an increase in the confidence of staff delivering the recommendations and those targeted children have progressed.
- m. Over the year the team have supported with two more complex children where parents have benefitted from the reports, school have been able to put in individualised interventions and outcomes have been really positive for the learner. Progress data for these children has been good for the school.

**8. Please add any further comments you wish to make.**

- a. Just an incredible service from xxx, to share her knowledge and expertise. This year her positive outlook has been a real ray of sunshine and really valued.
- b. I have learned so much from Cxxx over the last 3 years and it is privilege to work with her. She is approachable, supportive and knowledgable. xxx is a huge asset to the school and the pupils within it. She has enabled us to provide our SEND pupils with provision that allows them to fulfil their potential and gain in confidence.
- c. I would like to say a big thank you to xxx for all her support this year in the children she has seen, the reports she has written and how she has supported me and my colleagues. Thank you :-)
- d. "Thank you!
- e. Network meetings are useful too and important to those who cannot afford the level of service they might like to choose - so thank you for keeping those open to all.
- f. Always appreciative of xxx's useful advice and willingness to support when resources are stretched. "
- g. Looking at the validity of the Salford test because it is very deceiving when being used as an assessment tool by itself. This is because I have had experience of children being diagnosed with dyslexia or significant Literacy difficulties but not meeting threshold for LAL because of the Salford test.
- h. Every year I continue to find the Cognition and Learning team are a must for a busy SENDCo they are friendly, professional and experienced offering practical and workable advice and solutions, I find the planning meeting at the beginning of an academic year particularly useful.
- i. Thank you for all the support this year!
- j. CALT is an invaluable service for our school. The training and updates at SENCO network meetings keep us up to date. The reports and support for the pupils and teachers is fantastic and tailored to the individuals that CALT are supporting. The

availability of the CALT teacher via email is a great support and all reports are sent within the 2 weeks.

- k. You are one of the best services I work with - thank you.
- l. Fantastic service - so efficient and always happy to help.
- m. Thank you for all the support you provide!
- n. I would not be able to do my role confidently without the support of the C&L advisor.
- o. If we had the money we would definitely make use of the team.
- p. Brilliant service! We love CALT!

## Appendix C (ii)

### SISS Evaluation 2016-17 Comments

<b>Have you made referrals to SISS for any children/young people?</b>		
Yes	No	Don't know
14	0	0

**Comments (Yes):**

- 2015 &16
- 2016 & 17
- 2015-16
- Each year
- 3 Foundation Stage children
- 2016
- 2016
- 2017
- Every year
- Year 6 & 5
- 2015-16
- Every year
- Academic year 2016-17
- 2017
- 2014-15

**Comments (No):**

- N/A

<b>Were the referrals accepted?</b>		
Yes	No	Don't know
13	1	1

**1. Use of service “Other” comments:**

- Staff were able to look around Brookfields school and talk to staff. We were also given useful resources that might help the children and given practical solutions to problems. We were also given resources for staff to look at to help with planning and assessment.
- Didn't use the service at this school this year.
- Borrowing of equipment  
We have used all of the above plus advice sheets/book recommendations and one member of staff has visited Brookfields to talk with the maths dept. Re. Individual maths curriculum being put into place.

## **2. Rating the service comments:**

- Staff have always been responsive and have always sought further advice from colleagues if they could not help on the day.
- We have continued to find this service very useful in helping us to support 3 pupils within our school. K has again been very useful and knowledgeable, providing us with information, advice, support, resources and strategies that we have found much harder to locate/create ourselves. It does feel as though the service is being stretched unfortunately, as the staff appear to have less and less time for each child.
- S was very helpful when sharing ideas and resources for us to use and follow at school. S sought advice from her colleagues before providing us with information to ensure it was accurate and suitable for our purposes. Communication was very good.
- I have always found the SISS service to be excellent. Staff respond promptly to queries and have a wealth of knowledge and are very generous in sharing this both practically and through discussion.
- Gave realistic ideas to manage behaviour and how to improve her language skills e.g. 'now' and 'next' language.
- Any queries are dealt with fully and swiftly. Good contact is maintained throughout the school year. Excellent resources are shared.
- S came to meet the pupil first so he was more familiar with her. She was thorough in her work and adapted resources so he was able to show his skills in the way he communicates.
- SISS has been extremely supportive in assessing one of our pupils and in providing advice and training for staff. I always get a fast response when I contact them. The pupil's mum has valued their input and their honest assessment of what sort of school would be suitable for her son for his secondary education.
- K is very supportive for both staff and pupils when she comes in.
- I was very disappointed that the most recent referral did not include any support as a follow up, not even any recommendations on how to support the child. Previously we have received assessment, recommendations and additional visits, I understand that it was only the assessment referral that was accepted and I was not aware that the same level of support would be forthcoming.
- We referred a child in the summer term of 2016, several meetings were planned in the summer term, including our teacher going to x School to meet with SISS but this never happened. At the beginning of the autumn term, somebody from SISS met with the class teacher and discussed brief action plan and I was to get back in touch with SISS when actions had taken place and attendance of pupil had improved. Following the advice from the EP, we sought support from the ASD team rather than SISS, not both. After a lot of emails, advice led us to seeking support from SISS again and an assessment was done after a few months. We are nearly a year since the first referral was made and only one small assessment has been done on the child, with no further communication from SISS, despite R telling us that they would be in touch again this summer term.

## **3a. Reports, advice and recommendations comments (Quality):**

- Reports are thorough and clear, very useful for staff.
- All of S's recommendations could be used or adapted for our purposes.
- Reports are received promptly and are clear.
- Unable to comment – no report received as yet.
- Advice always appropriate.

- A report was received which gave us accurate information and was ready for the pupil's annual review.
- I have not received any reports following visits this year.
- A report was received which gave us accurate information and was ready for the pupil's annual review.
- Very limited report stating an assessment on the P scales, covering approximately 12 points.
- The advice given has been very useful. The reports have limited use and don't reflect the advice and support we have received.

**3b. Reports, advice and recommendations comments (Recommendations):**

- 4- recommendations for one child, 1- recommendation or lack of for another child
- Recommendations that we have been suggested and given have been useful.
- A report was received which gave us accurate information and was ready for the pupil's annual review.
- Verbal recommendations helpful at meeting.
- Recommendations have been very useful. It was great being able to visit the school and see the advice in action.
- Recommendations are clear, manageable and practical.
- All of S's recommendations could be used or adapted for our purposes.
- Again, very thorough and clear, with some resources provided to support their implementation

**4(a) Did the service respond in a timely manner?**

- YES
- Yes, very efficient
- Yes
- Yes
- We sent the referral in January and received the outcome for our referrals in March. The initial visit was then at the end of March. It basically took 3 months from our referral to receive help. This was too long – basically a whole term!
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Appropriate
- Yes it was very quick and worked around the time frame we had for annual review contributions.
- Yes
- It all happened within this timescale
- Yes
- Yes
- Still waiting to hear the outcome
- Results of referral within a short time. The initial visit was made within approximately 6 term time weeks

**4 (b) Was written advice received within 2 weeks?**

- Yes
- Haven't got that far yet
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- No – we have not received any written reports
- Yes – report emailed within 2 weeks
- Yes
- Yes



- Don't know
- Yes
- Yes
- Just over but S contacted me to tell me she was seeking more advice for the report hence the minor delay.
- Mostly, Follow up emails/advice were always quickly sent out but reports occasionally took longer
- All but one occasion when I knew it would take a few more days

#### 5. Training comments:

- We have not had staff training as such but information received has always been very useful (4) and the visit to Brookfields particularly so. (4)
- The type of language to be used with the pupil.
- Specifically in relation to Down Syndrome.

#### 6. Impact comments:

- Staff have been able to explore some different behavioural strategies and talk through difficult behaviours – in some cases this was reassuring for the school to know we are “on the right track!” In one case in particular it has enabled access to a maths curriculum that the pupil can engage with and a little progress has been seen, which is “good” as the syndrome she has makes long term progress challenging. Staff are more confident in following what is right for the child and the child is having more success.
- The involvement of SISS has very much helped out staff with supporting children with levels of SEN that need a higher and more differentiated level of support. The support from SISS has helped with the inclusion of these pupils within their classes and has improved staff knowledge and confidence when working with these children.
- Staff are able to implement strategies which promote inclusion and progression in learning through curriculum differentiation and assessment advice.
- Staff are more knowledgeable in how they can work with children and this has impacted on their skills and initiative. This has also helped other children in the class.
- Gave staff ideas to be able to improve the pupil's outcomes.
- Promotes pupil progress, improves partnership with parents.
- Unable to comment as involvement very recent!
- Information, resources and support have been useful especially in dealing with parents.
- The assessment helped us to moderate our own judgements, and will help the school to plan for next learning steps.
- Improved staff confidence – K has given good advice to staff about how they can support the children. Improved staff knowledge and skills – as above. Attitudes towards pupils with SEN – n/a. Improved inclusion of pupils with SEN – n/a. Promoting pupil progress – through assessment it has been clear the progress children have made and what they need to work on further. However we usually receive a booklet and a report outlining what children need to be working on and this year we have not. Supporting pupil self esteem – K was very supportive when one of our pupils was attempting transition and although it was not successful she visited the child in class and reassured him. Improved partnership with parents – n/a.
- Involvement focused the teacher's attention more on the needs of this particular pupil. It took a long time for his EHC plan to come through and for the SLT to recruit a TA to work with the child so the teacher had a tough job juggling the needs of this child with the needs of the rest of the class. There has been greater impact from the advice and support from SISS since there has been an additional adult in class to help implement it. Mum has been very receptive to reports and advice given. She valued the very honest appraisal of her son's ability level and advice on suitable secondary placement. She specifically requested that SISS should be represented at her son's annual review because she values their input.
- Change of staffing has impacted on quality of advice but maybe this is to be expected with a time to gain experience.
- Excellent support on puberty education for an SEN child.

- No involvement yet.
- None as yet.

**Further comments:**

- K has visited the 2 children we receive the Outreach for twice this year and has carried out PACE assessments in March – however we have not received any reports from these visits for staff to follow up and work from. I know that everyone is extremely busy and we really value the support that K has given to the staff and the children when she has been in to school – but we really need a written report to follow up on. On another note I visited Brookfields with another one of our parents earlier this year and we were able to share how supportive we had found the outreach service and how the parents had felt supported too – Thank you.
- Thank you – it was really helpful and very well organised ☺
- New SENCO has been in place since the beginning of the summer term.
- I really value the support and advice that SISS are able to offer regarding specific children. They are frequently able to give immediate ideas and strategies when they visit school but when this is not possible they respond quickly by email or phone once they have found out further information.
- S was very helpful. She came in to see me to go through the report and the recommendations. She also acknowledged that had our pupil received 1:1 support she would have been able to offer more suggestions.
- Thank you!

**Appendix C (iii)**

**ASD Advisory Service Evaluation  
for the Academic Year 2017-18**

Number of responses: 21

***Please tick to indicate type of school:***

**Primary 18                      Secondary 2**

**1. Use of service**

Which of the following tasks have been undertaken in your school by the Advisory Service in the past academic year?

Observations of pupil	20
Training for TAs	7
Training for teachers	8
Support for SENCOs	8
Meetings with Staff	12
Meetings with Staff/Parents	15
Other	3

Please specify:

- Phone calls with parents
- Meeting with Year 5 child, rather than observation for a Year 5 discussion.

## 2. Rating the service – *please rate and comment*

On a scale of 1 – 4 how would you rate the service overall?

1 poor	1
2 satisfactory	4
3 good	8
4 excellent	8

- Conversations with ASD service and CT are useful to discuss child/difficulties/tasks to develop child.
- Efficient responses to questions and queries. Good training and support for all staff.
- The conversations with parents were useful to give an insight into individuals within a school setting. Discussion of possible strategies was beneficial and written reports were mostly useful.
- When support is available it is good, it is a shame that it is limited due to high demand.
- We had a very difficult child. There were no quick fixes but support was on hand & frequent (which is what we needed).
- Service is good. A fantastic service that provides valuable support to schools, families and most importantly the pupils. Just wish that there was more than 1 person covering all Primary Schools.
- I would rate the service as a 4 as our ASD support this year has been amazing. We have really appreciated the consistent support and guidance.
- Sensible and “do-able” advice.
- For such a stretched service, the team do an excellent job. They offer so much between them and I know they are there if I need them at any time.
- Highly valued service for staff, parents and pupils.
- Support for both staff and parents useful and relevant. However, sometimes expectations of support to be provided within the classroom can be challenging especially in a large class with high SEN needs. It would be useful to have support categorised into order of importance.
- Visits are usually timely, reports are completed in good time and delivered efficiently.
- Our reason for giving a 2 is due to the repetitiveness of the advice given after a quick conversation with staff members. On occasion, observations of no more than 10 minutes occur which doesn't always give a true reflection of the challenges or difficulties a pupil is having. Conversations with staff are not enough to give the staff an insight as to the reasons behind the behaviour they are struggling to manage.
- Support is provided quickly and feedback given promptly compared to most other services. Meeting every newly diagnosed pupil meet the adviser is often unhelpful and in fact can be detrimental.
- Some of the observations of pupils have been very short due to the support teacher arriving late to the school.

## 3. Reports, advice and recommendations – *please rate and comment*

Please rate on a scale of 1 – 4  
(1 poor, 2 satisfactory, 3 good, 4 excellent)

### a) Reports

1 poor	0
2 satisfactory	7
3 good	7
4 excellent	7

- Picture of child accurate, written observation of what child doing accurate.
- Very quick turnaround of reports after observation!
- Some felt brief/not personal to individual pupils.
- These are usually sent promptly and are sensitivity written.
- Always received promptly.
- I would rate this as a 3 as the advice and recommendations have been invaluable to both staff and parents this year. It has helped us to move particular things forward more quickly and with more success. Reports have been received quickly and with detailed recommendations that can be clearly understood by all adults.
- Swift return so recommendations are in place that term.
- Detailed.
- Promptly received and clear to read.
- Always clear and thorough.
- Reports arrive quickly.
- Little information given that isn't known but reports are written quickly.

b) Advice/Recommendations

1 poor	0
2 satisfactory	3
3 good	6
4 excellent	7

- Good advice – accurate to the children including asking.
- Useful and relevant. Parents may benefit from meeting to discuss the report with the person writing it.
- A range of recommendations made.
- It is always clear and possible to implement.
- Very clear advice and recommendations which have usually been discussed with staff.
- Recommendations discussed so we can use them – i.e. not something on a report that we cannot manage.
- Easy to follow.
- There were no recommendations beyond what was being done already.
- Occasionally some advice seems a bit generic.
- Advice is repetitive for multiple children and previous reports, often advice given are strategies the teachers are already implementing.
- Pupil comments are often reported as in fact; some strategies cannot be implemented in a mainstream school. Advice given without discussion with pastoral team so often support has been put in but the pupil does not report this to the service, reports then sound like school is not acting on information. Strategies suggested are usually commonly known and used in school, we would like new strategies. Advice given directly to parents about what school can offer – this can be misleading, things are offered that we cannot provide without prior discussion with the school.

**4. Training – *please rate and comment***

Please indicate type(s) of training received by staff:

Specific pupil related	4
General ASD	6
Specific ASD related subject (eg Sensory, Behaviour, etc)	6

Other 1

Please rate on a scale of 1 – 4

1 poor	0
2 satisfactory	1
3 good	7
4 excellent	3

- Not in school this year.
- Staff require more training on helping general ASD and it needs to be delivered in a powerful way.
- Clear calm manner delivering sound & solid advice when needed the most.
- It was a great overview of ASD/ADHD behaviours. Maybe in the future more pupil specific whole school training would be great.
- Staff all really enjoyed the training session and was keen to implement the strategies recommended. I think all adults appreciated the 'well-being' aspect too!
- Not used this year.
- The academic access training was very helpful and relevant. Staff were given lots of practical ideas.
- TA training well received and up to date research interested staff who have been in the job a long time. The workshops are more discussion based rather than actively providing strategies.

## 5. Impact

Has the involvement of the **ASD Advisory Service** had an impact on pupils and staff?

*Comment on:*

- a) Building staff confidence
- b) Building staff resilience
- c) Promoting pupil progress
- d) Supporting pupil self esteem

- Yes to all, several children this year.
- Staff have been using breathing techniques shown themselves and with children (where appropriate).
- (a)
- Staff confidence & awareness of strategies to use has improved.
- Staff are more confident in understanding the needs of children with ASD.
- Staff have become more aware of how to meet the needs on a basic level, this now needs strengthening, along with their resilience. Pupils (with ASD) have made good progress.
- Staff confidence & resilience – a big impact. Able to calm staff and offer realistic advice when needed. Pupil progress & self-esteem – limited.
- It ticks a box.
- Supports onward referrals for the pupils. Provides staff with clear recommendations to support pupils' progress in areas of concern. Supports teachers/TAs ability to feel confident about supporting an ASD child which has an impact on their relationships with the ASD pupil.
- I think the ASD Service has helped us with all of the above and more this year.
- It is always good to talk through and adapt approaches if needed. It is good to know what you are doing is good practice. This builds staff confidence and resilience. This in turn supports the pupils. It is really important as a teacher/SENCo that at the point you are

running out of ideas someone can offer something new to try – it can give the bit of hope to keep trying in hard circumstances.

- I feel the staff are more confident due to all the recommendations given, which in turn has built resilience although this has only been seen in staff who have fully taken A's advice on board. Pupil progress and increased self-esteem, is variable but this is inevitable for children with Autism.
- The training sessions for teaching staff on ASD and staff well-being was done as part of our INSET. It was helpful to staff in making them aware of their own needs. It was not intended to train staff for our ASD pupils beyond providing a general information session.
- Building staff confidence by confirming that strategies used in the classroom are good.
- The service has helped build rapport between families, students and staff and enabled us as a school to implement suitable support strategies and resolve problems before they become major ones.
- It always useful to have opportunities to discuss any concerns or achievements with those who are more skilled in this area. It is good to have reassurance that what we are doing is right or advise on what we could do to improve and make things easier for all involved.
- Support from the ASD Advisory Service makes us feel that we are able to get advice from someone quickly and easily who knows the school and the constraints we are under as well as knowing the child.
- No impact since as a result of advice and recommendations from the ASD team.
- Provides the pupils with an outlet and someone impartial to speak to. Useful for parents, however it can be unhelpful when parents contact directly without consultation with the school.
- Support reassures staff that they supporting pupils well. We do not learn anything new from the report that we have not already put into place.

**6. Does the Advisory Service meet your needs as a school?**

- Yes x 12
- Mostly. Staff need further training about teaching to ASD needs within a while class.
- No
- Yes – although I wish visits were more frequent and not reactive to some situations.
- Yes, I find A very accommodating.
- One of the challenges we are facing is that the parents have very high expectations of what the school can offer their children with ASD. In several cases this means that they expect all their desires to be met, these are not always in keeping with what the child wants or what is best for the child. The written reports do not always say what the school is doing towards these issues or support the school if parental requests are not the best option. We sometimes find that the Advisory Service suggestions conflict with those made by other organisations such as the Emotional Health Academy.
- Unfortunately not.
- It does offer support to some but would benefit from some more bespoke programmes.

**7. Are there any other needs you have that are not being met?**

- No x 8
- More contact/meetings with parents and staff, not just staff. Parents like to hear advice from an expert. ASD team can help support staff when parents don't always agree/accept point of view.
- Undiagnosed – little support.
- Staff training may be beneficial in the future.
- Parents have requested drop in sessions, in groups, with an ASD specialist.
- Yes
- Further discussion with pupils 1-1 would be of benefit to some pupils and hearing their thoughts.
- No, our needs are being met.

- Not that I can think of.
- Drop in sessions for parents to discuss on a regular basis. Drop in sessions for staff especially TA's who are working with the children on a daily basis. Longer observations of pupils to help support staff in identifying triggers and environmental changes they can make to support pupils.
- It would be more beneficial if the service could provide social skill groups. Meet with individuals, based on need, not just because they have a diagnosis. Work with individuals over a few sessions to support with a particular issue e.g. school reusing.

**8. Please add any further comments you wish to make.**

- Thank you for advice and support.
- A recent transition meeting was useful to try and ensure appropriate provision & support was in place.
- I am eternally grateful for A's continued support and professional approach and M's help this year to support parents.
- Reports are repetitive and offer few real options to use day to day.
- Parents appreciate a dedicated ASD advisory service. Parents always feel listened to and supported well by the teachers.
- Very valuable service – Thank you. With budgets as they are, it is good to be able to have a service to support a very vulnerable group of pupils that is “free” to access. I am sure this service supports children become more happy and secure and therefore successful learners. In an ideal world, an extension of the service might be to support schools who have children on the pathway as this is often the time support before diagnosis – this means potentially more “trial and error” which is stressful for staff and the child. If the team could come in they might be able to narrow down strategies/offer support that might support the individual child at an earlier point.
- Thank you for all your help and support this academic year.
- The staff who provide this service are all very friendly and approachable. They are brilliant with our young people and have helped to unpick some tricky situations. They are also hugely supportive of both staff and parents and working together as we do has really helped to settle some students and allow them to flourish.
- Thank you to A for all your help and support this year.

## Appendix C (iv)

### Comments from Schools, Parents and Children about LAL Provision

#### *Schools*

- (1) Can I also say thanks for all the hard work and effort you have put into supporting our LAL children over the last couple of years. They have made so much progress both academically and personally. I am so disappointed that we cannot afford to continue sending our children to LAL as it is such a super resource for children.
- (2) One of my Year 6s had LAL in Year 5 and then got a place in the ACE unit. The transition from LAL to ACE was managed superbly by your team. Our pupil was privileged enough to receive regular visits from \* in preparation to moving into Year 7. This helped her

enormously in building confidence and familiarity with what would be expected of her. The pupil struggled right through primary, but showed us that, with support, she could progress and succeed. As a Head, I am delighted and confident that she will continue to thrive at secondary.

### *Parents*

- (1) Having benefitted from it so much we feel it would be wonderful if the programme to even more children in West Berkshire. A huge thank you to Mrs \*\*! It has been a wonderful programme for \*\*.
- (2) LAL is an excellent programme and just what my child needed so I would not change anything about LAL. I just think that it should be for the child in Year 5 and 6. Every school would benefit from Mrs\*\* and her knowledge for the kids that don't learn the same as others. (its not one size fits all)...Lal has definitely worked for ....., the difference in his school work is amazing. ... he's grown in confidence and that his reading is getting really good!
- (3) He has thoroughly enjoyed attending LAL and knows he will miss his weekly LAL visits with you. He has gained so many skills, whilst I know he can struggle with taking direction, he has applied himself to learning. This is mainly down to your ability to make and provide an ideal environment and techniques that work. I am so pleased we embarked on this journey and we will continue your good work.
- (4) Thank you for all your support and help you have given to \*\* and to both my husband and myself. I can finally sit and listen to \*\* read with confidence and hopefully this will be the start of a love of books.

### *Children*

- (1) I've loved it! I think it's helped me because when we went to this place there was this sign and Dad would ask me to read it. I could never read it – now I can. 'Do not climb on this tree because it is ancient.'
- (2) We don't go too fast.. you stop and wait so I can get it.. at school people help me but it's busy so people can't always explain.'
- (3) I think it's helped because I remember when you first came in I wasn't that good at reading and spelling and now I'm more confident. I'm curious about what books I can read next.



---

## Central Schools' Services Block Budget 2020/21

---

**Report being considered by:** The Schools' Forum  
**On:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020  
**Report Author:** Melanie Ellis/Ian Pearson  
**Item for:** Decision      **By:** All Forum Members

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the budget proposal for services funded from the Central Schools' Services (CSSB) block of the DSG and to propose measures to enable the budget for this block to be balanced.

### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To agree to the 2020/21 budget for the Central Schools Services Block.

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

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1 The Schools Funding Regulations for 2018/19 introduced a new Central Schools' Services Block within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This block consists of centrally retained services:
- (1) Admissions, licences and servicing of Schools' Forum, which were previously funded from the Schools Block, and
  - (2) Education welfare, asset management, and statutory & regulatory duties, which were previously funded from the Education Services grant which was withdrawn in 2017/18.
- 3.2 The CSSB covers funding allocated to Local Authorities (LAs) to carry out central functions on behalf of pupils in state-funded maintained schools and academies in England. All the services funded by this block are statutory and have to be carried out.
- 3.3 The final allocation of funding for the Central Schools Services Block for 2020/21 is £958,730.

### 4. Budget Requirement for the Central Schools Services Block

- 4.1 The following table shows the budget requirement for the services that fall within the Central Schools Services Block for 2020/21 compared to 2019/20.

	Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)	2019/20 Budget	2020/21 Budget Requirement	Increase/ Decrease	Change
		£	£	£	%
	<b>Budget Requirement:</b>				
1	School Admissions	243,601	213,016	-30,585	-13%
2	National Copyright Licences	136,330	140,190	3,860	3%
3	Servicing of Schools Forum	48,729	51,290	2,561	5%
4	Education Welfare	235,981	214,892	-21,089	-9%
5	Statutory & Regulatory Duties :				
a	Provision of Education Data	210,724	207,510	-3,214	-2%
b	Finance Support for the Education Service	118,291	84,061	-34,230	-29%
c	Strategic Planning of the Education Service	114,374	96,770	-17,604	-15%
	<b>Total Budget Requirement</b>	<b>1,108,030</b>	<b>1,007,729</b>	<b>-100,301</b>	<b>-9%</b>

4.2 For 2020/21, costs have been reduced by 9% or £100k. There have been staff reductions in Finance support, some staff time has been reallocated to other areas from Admissions and Education Welfare. Further savings have been found from the reallocation of Support Service Recharges.

4.3 The cost of copyright license for schools is determined by the relevant national agencies. Details of all the other services included in the Central Schools Services Block (including a breakdown of costs) is given in Appendix A.

## 5. Funding

5.1 There has been a funding shortfall in the block since it was established due to the pupil number formula used.

- (1) In 2018/19, the shortfall was £251k and was balanced by transfers from Early Years and High Needs blocks and one off Council funding.
- (2) For 2019/20, costs were brought down by £135k, mainly from staffing reductions, and the block was balanced using under spends and some remaining ESG funding.
- (3) The 2020/21 grant funding for the CSSB has reduced by £18k to £959k. A review of supplies and services budgets identified £9k unutilised budget within the Education Welfare and Admissions. Further savings have been found by reallocating staff time to other areas.

5.2 The table below shows how the block has been balanced.

Central Schools' Services Block Budget 2020/21

Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)	2018/19 Budget	2019/20 Budget	2020/21 Budget Requirement	Increase/Decrease from 19/20	Change
	£	£	£	£	%
<b>Total Budget Requirement</b>	<b>1,243,463</b>	<b>1,108,030</b>	<b>1,007,729</b>	<b>- 100,301</b>	<b>-9%</b>
<b>Funding:</b>					
Central Schools Services Block DSG	-992,560	-976,226	-958,729	- 17,497	-2%
Early Years Block transfer	-27,053				
High Needs Block transfer	-32,850				
One off Council funding	-191,000				
Copyright underspend 18/19 & 17/18 carried forward		-53,155			
Capita 1 underspend 18/19		-15,000			
Release of ESG unutilised grant		-63,649	-49,000		
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>-1,243,463</b>	<b>-1,108,030</b>	<b>-1,007,729</b>		
<b>Balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

## Details and Costs of Central Schools' Services

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>School Admissions</b>			
<b><u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u></b>			
Administration of admissions process for maintained schools and academies			
<b><u>Staffing Structure</u></b>			
Service Manager	1.00	10%	
Admissions and Transport Manager	1.00	80%	
Admissions Officers	2.50	80%	
<b><u>Breakdown of Costs</u></b>			
Staff salary costs			129,650
Employee Expenses			18,700
Supplies and Services			5,850
Capita One recharge			22,065
Support Service Recharges			36,751
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR ADMISSIONS</b>			<b>213,016</b>

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>Servicing the Schools Forum</b>			
<b><u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u></b>			
Setting agendas, minute taking, co-ordination and distribution of papers for Schools Forum and its sub groups			
<b><u>Staffing Structure</u></b>			
Head of Education	1.00	10.00%	
Schools Finance Team	2.46	5% to 10%	
Schools Forum Clerk			
<b><u>Breakdown of Costs</u></b>			
Staff salary costs			42,330
Room hire, consumables and members expenses			1,610
Support Service Recharges			7,350
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR SERVICING THE SCHOOLS FORUM</b>			<b>51,290</b>

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>Education Welfare</b>			
<b><u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u></b>			
Tracking of children who can be legally removed from the school roll.			
Monitoring of elective home education.			
Issuing and monitoring of child work permits and performance licences.			
Attendance at core group meetings for specific pupils			
Advice on keeping registers			
Progress cases to court where appropriate. Maintain up to date knowledge of legal processes and			
<b><u>Staffing Structure</u></b>			
Principal Education Welfare and Safeguarding Officer	1.00	65%	
Senior Education Welfare Officer	0.40	90%	
Education Welfare Officers	4.30	35%	
Assistant Education Welfare Officer	1.00	100%	
Administrative Assistant	0.40	100%	
<b><u>Breakdown of Costs</u></b>			
Staff salary costs			162,023
Employee expenses/car allowances			5,290
Other non staffing costs			4,420
Income from fines			-10,750
Capita One Recharges			9,808
Support Service Recharges			44,101
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR EDUCATION WELFARE</b>			<b>214,892</b>

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>Provision of Education Data</b>			
<b><u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u></b>			
Statutory returns to DfE			
Data analysis and reporting e.g. Exam results, performance			
School census administration and reports			
<b><u>Staffing Structure</u></b>			
Staffing	2.00	100%	
<b><u>Breakdown of Costs</u></b>			
Staff salary costs			92,400
Capita One recharge			100,410
Support Service Recharges			14,700
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR PROVISION OF EDUCATION DATA</b>			<b>207,510</b>

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>Finance Support for the Education Service</b>			
<u><b>Description of Statutory Duties covered</b></u>			
DSG services budget preparation, monitoring, and year end			
Education services budget preparation, monitoring, and year end			
School funding formula and early years funding formula			
Administration of funding allocations to all schools for early years and high needs			
Statutory returns e.g. APT, S251, CFO deployment of DSG			
<u><b>Staffing Structure</b></u>			
DSG Accountant	0.65	5%	
Accountant - Education	0.50	95%	
Senior Accountant - Education	1.00	50%	
Education Finance Manager	0.81	25%	
Chief Accountant	1.00	5%	
<u><b>Breakdown of Costs</b></u>			
Staff salary costs			62,010
Support Service Recharges			22,051
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR FINANCE SUPPORT</b>			<b>84,061</b>

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2020/21 £
<b>Strategic Planning of the Education Service</b>			
<u><b>Description of Statutory Duties covered</b></u>			
Strategic planning and management of the Education service as a whole			
<u><b>Staffing Structure</b></u>			
Head of Education	1.00	70%	
Other staffing	1.00	42%	
<u><b>Breakdown of Costs</b></u>			
Staff salary costs			93,970
Other staff costs			2,800
Support Service Recharges			0
<b>TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR PLANNING OF EDUCATION SERVICE</b>			<b>96,770</b>

---

## Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 20/21 - Overview

---

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum

**On:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020

**Report Author:** Melanie Ellis

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

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To set out the overall amount of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and the funding settlement 2020/21.

### 2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the funding allocation for the 2020/21 budgets.

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

### 3. Introduction

3.1 The National Funding Formula (NFF) is used by the Department for Education (DfE) to calculate the blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that was allocated to local authorities in December 2019.

3.2 The DSG consists of four blocks:

- (1) Schools
- (2) High needs
- (3) Central school services
- (4) Early years

3.3 2020/21 is the third year of the NFF for schools, high needs and central school services. The early years block of the DSG will be determined by the separate national formula for early years.

### 4. Overall position

4.1 The following table shows the 2020/21 DSG allocation based on the October 2019 census pupil numbers. The total allocation is £137.6m compared to £130.6m in 2019/20.

Dedicated schools grant (DSG): 2020 to 2021 allocations local authority summary	2020 to 2021 DSG allocations, before recoupment and deductions for direct funding of high needs places by Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA)				
	Schools block (£s)	Central school services block (£s)	High needs block (£s)	Early years block (£s)	Total DSG allocation (£s)
	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]
					= [A] + [B] + [C] + [D]
869 West Berkshire	105,311,181	958,726	21,667,304	9,651,877	137,589,088

## 5. Schools Block

5.1 The DfE final allocation for 2020/21 is shown below compared to (2019/20):

- Primary Unit of Funding £4088.08 x 13,190 pupils = £53.922m (£51.83m)
- Secondary Unit of Funding £5108.48 x 9,620 pupils = £49.146m (£46.16m)
- Allowance for business rates = £1.487m (£1.46m)
- Total schools block (pre block transfer) = £104.555m (£99.45m)
- Growth Fund allocation = £0.756m (£0.56m)
- Total schools block (pre block transfer) = £105.311m (£100.01m)

5.2 The proposed block transfer of 0.25% would reduce the schools block allocation excluding growth fund from £104.555m to £104.292m.

## 6. Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)

6.1 Responsibilities held by local authorities for all schools are funded from the CSSB, with the agreement of schools forums. This covers Statutory and Regulatory duties, Education Welfare, asset management and other duties such as licences, admissions and servicing of Schools' Forum.

6.2 The CSSB DSG funding for 2020/21 is £959k (2019/20 £976k). The CSSB block has been reviewed in the light of the reduced funding, and costs charged to this block have been reduced from £1.108m in 2019/20 to £1.007m in 2020/21. It is proposed that the remaining shortfall of £49k is funded from unspent ESG grant.

## 7. Early Years Block

7.1 The new Early Years formula was introduced in 2017/18 with new funding rates to local authorities, and a revised simplified formula for allocating funding to providers was also brought in. All providers are now on the same rates.

7.2 Funding for 2020/21 has been announced as £9.652m (2019/20 £9.491m)

## 8. High Needs Block (HNB)

8.1 As part of the education funding announcement the Government has pledged an extra £700 million for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in 2020/21.



8.2 The 2020/21 allocation for West Berkshire has been announced as £21.667m (2019/20 £20.1m). A 0.25% schools block transfer would increase this to £21.404m.

## 9. DSG balances

9.1 The DfE will require a report from any local authority that has a cumulative DSG deficit of more than 1% at the end of the financial year – in this case as at 31 March 2020. It is highly likely that West Berkshire will exceed this threshold due to the current forecast overspend on the High Needs Block.

9.2 Recovery plans need to be discussed with the schools forum and should set out the authority’s plans for bringing the DSG account back in balance within a timely period (three years).

## 10. Timetable for Setting the Budget

10.1 A draft timetable has been put together but due to the delay in the funding announcements, there are only two Heads Funding Group and Schools Forum meetings to review the formula and consultation. The proposed timetable for setting all the elements of the DSG budget is set out below:

Date	Deadline	Who	Item
8.1.20	2.1.20	HFG	Review funding formula consultation responses and final formula calculations and make a recommendation. Review budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years in light of funding announcement.
16.1.20	7.1.20	Executive	Approval of School Formula
20.1.20	14.1.20	SF	Review HFG recommendations, final calculations and final formula. Review budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years. Agree budget strategy and determine any further work.
21.1.20	21.1.20	LA	Deadline for submission of final APT to ESFA
21.1.20 to 18.2.20	18.2.20	LA	Finalisation by officers of central schools, high needs, and early year’s budget proposals.
25.2.20	18.2.20	HFG	Review final proposals and make recommendation to Schools’ Forum.
29.2.20	29.2.20	LA	Statutory deadline for providing primary and secondary maintained schools with funding allocation
9.3.20	3.3.20	SF	Agree final budgets.

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Deficit Schools

---

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020  
**Report Author:** Melanie Ellis  
**Item for:** Information      **By:** All Maintained Schools Representatives

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report provides details of:

- (1) The four schools which submitted deficit budgets for 2019/20,
- (2) The two schools which ended the 2018/19 financial year with unlicensed deficit balances and,
- (3) Summaries of schools that have informed West Berkshire Council they now expect to end the 2019/20 financial year with an unlicensed deficit balance.

### 2. Recommendation

2.1 That the report be noted.

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

### 3. Deficit Schools

- 3.1 Four schools submitted a WBC Deficit Budget License Application for the financial year 2019/20. All four had licensed deficits in the financial year 2018/19.
- 3.2 All four schools submitted their period seven Budget Monitoring and Forecast report, which have been reviewed by Schools Accountancy and feedback emailed to each school. The period seven submissions are shown in the table below with two schools in a better financial position and two in a worse position than budgeted.

School	Main School Budget (MSB) Only		
	2019/20 Budgeted Year-end balance	2019/20 P7 Forecast Year-end balance	Variance
	A £	B £	B-A = C £
Beenham Primary	(24,060)	(36,008)	(11,948)
St Finians Primary	(77,150)	(44,988)	+32,162
Westwood Farm Inf & Jnr	(13,940)	16,919	+30,859
The Willink Secondary	(2,210)	(17,569)	(15,359)

Figures in red brackets indicate a deficit

- 3.3 Beenham Primary have reported that the forecast position has worsened due to unforeseen additional costs relating to long term sickness of a teacher. The school does have sickness absence insurance in place, however the nature of this illness was not covered by the policy.
- 3.4 The Willink Secondary have reported the following explanation as to why the licenced deficit has been exceeded by £15k.
- (1) Staffing budget: the P7 forecast included an increment rise for all teachers upon completion of pay review which did not occur. This will therefore result in a saving in P9.
  - (2) Non-staffing budget: planned overspend which will remain in P9.
  - (3) Income and funding: P7 forecast is in excess of the budget. This position will improve with the non-budgeted contribution from the Teaching School.
  - (4) In summary at P9 the school expects to clear this deficit at the end of this financial year.

#### 4. Schools ending 2018/19 with an unlicensed deficit

- 4.1 Two schools ended the financial year 2018/19 with unlicensed deficits.
- 4.2 Both schools submitted their period eight Budget Monitoring and Forecast report, which have been reviewed by Schools Accountancy and feedback emailed to each school. The period eight submissions are shown in the table below with one school forecasting to end 2019/20 in a worse financial position than budgeted. Both schools are receiving support from Schools Accountancy.

School	Main School Budget (MSB) Only

	2019/20 Budgeted Year-end balance	2019/20 P8 Forecast Year-end balance	Variance
	A £	B £	B-A = C £
Stockcross Primary	1,525	6,152	4,627
Welford & Wickham	3,440	(4,047)	(7,487)

Figures in red brackets indicate a deficit

- 4.3 Welford & Wickham has reported that the P8 position was a worst case scenario, including £2k impact of teacher salary increased costs, £1k prediction of electricity costs, (now more accurately assessed from a working meter), £1k rent of school field (now to be taken from sports funding) and £750 over payment of admin staff (to be clawed back).

The position is expected to improve at P9, with a number of the P8 items being resolved, additional income forecast and the school is now predicting a small

Agresso Report	Budget Monitoring	Forecast	Submission Deadline
Period 9 / December	Yes	Yes	17/01/20
Period 10 / January	Yes	Yes	14/02/20
Period 11 / February	Yes	Yes	13/03/20

surplus of £2k for the end of the financial year. This does not include a potential further saving in supply costs. The school is very much hoping that they will end the financial year almost in line with the initial budget projection of £3,440.

## 5. Schools that expect to end 2019/20 with an unlicensed deficit balance

- 5.1 In addition to schools reported above one secondary and two primary schools (including a federation) have informed West Berkshire Council they now expect to end the financial year 2019/20 with an unlicensed deficit.

## 6. Budget Monitoring and Forecast Submission Dates

- 6.1 Submission deadlines for the remainder of the 2019/20 financial year are shown below for licensed deficit schools 2019/20 and those that ended 2018/19 with an unlicensed deficit.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2019/20 – Quarter Three

**Report being considered by:** Schools Forum  
**On:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020  
**Report Author:** Ian Pearson  
**Item for:** Recommendation **By** All Forum Members

### 1. Purpose of the Report

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

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 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. 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.

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

### 3. Background

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring fenced specific grant which can only be spent on school/pupil activity as set out in The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018. There are four DSG funding blocks: Schools, High Needs, Early Years and Central Schools Services.

### 4. 2019/20 Funding

- 4.1 The 2019/20 Dedicated Schools Grant allocation is £131m. This includes £38m which funds Academies and post 16 high needs places and is paid direct by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) to schools. The DSG budget for 2019/20 has been built utilising the remaining grant of £92.4m, other funding of £0.2m and an in-year £1.8m deficit recovery target.
- 4.2 The £1.8m is a deficit recovery requirement for the current financial year, and represents the difference between the expenditure budgets set across the blocks and actual funding received for 2019/20. £1.6m of the deficit is within the High Needs Block and £0.2m in the Early Years Block. This is in accordance with the 2019/20 budget agreed by Schools Forum at the meeting held on 11/03/2019.

- 4.3 In addition to this, there is a cumulative deficit of £100k from previous years.
- 4.4 All local authorities that have a cumulative DSG deficit of 1% or more (of the grant funding) at the end of a financial year are required to submit a recovery plan outlining how they will bring their deficit back into balance in a three-year time frame. The current 2019/20 deficit equates to 2.4%. Recovery plan information needs to be submitted to the ESFA by June 2020.

## 5. Quarter Three Forecast (31 December 2019)

The forecast position at Quarter Three is shown in Table 1. A more detailed position per cost centre is shown in Appendix A.

Table 1 - DSG Block forecast	Original Budget 2019/20	Budget Changes	Amended Budget 2019/20	Quarter One Forecast	Quarter Two Forecast	Month Seven Forecast	Quarter Three Forecast	Quarter 3 Forecast over/ (under) spend
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Schools Block (inc ISB)	64,794	(1,163)	63,630	64,794	64,794	63,630	63,630	0
Early Years Block	9,812	0	9,812	9,812	9,812	9,956	9,956	144
Early Years Block Deficit Rec Target	(215)	0	(215)	0	0	0	0	215
Central School Services Block	972	0	972	972	972	967	967	(6)
High Needs Block	19,793	0	19,793	19,793	19,416	19,767	19,927	134
High Needs Block Deficit Rec Target	(1,650)	0	(1,650)	0	0	0	0	1,650
<b>Total Block Expenditure</b>	<b>93,505</b>	<b>(1,163)</b>	<b>92,342</b>	<b>95,370</b>	<b>94,993</b>	<b>94,319</b>	<b>94,479</b>	<b>2,137</b>
Support Service Recharges	444	0	444	444	444	444	444	0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>93,949</b>	<b>(1,163)</b>	<b>92,786</b>	<b>95,814</b>	<b>95,437</b>	<b>94,763</b>	<b>94,923</b>	<b>2,137</b>
<b>Funded by:</b>								
DSG Grant	(93,722)	1,163	(92,558)	(93,722)	(93,722)	(92,558)	(92,558)	0
Other Funding	(228)	0	(228)	(228)	(228)	(228)	(228)	0
<b>Net In-year Deficit</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,864</b>	<b>1,488</b>	<b>1,977</b>	<b>2,137</b>	<b>2,137</b>
Deficit Balance in reserves	100	26	126	126	126	126	126	126
<b>Cumulative Deficit</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>1,990</b>	<b>1,614</b>	<b>2,103</b>	<b>2,263</b>	<b>2,263</b>

- 5.1 The Quarter Three forecast shows an in-year forecast deficit of £2.1m, comprising £272k against in-year expenditure and a £1.8m deficit recovery target which is as yet un-met. When added to the cumulative deficit of £126k, the forecast year end deficit on the DSG is £2.3m.

## 6. Reserves Forecast

The total deficit balance on reserves at 31.3.2019 was £100k. After in-year reserves movements and the Quarter Three position, the forecast deficit reserve at 31.3.2020 is £2.3m.



Reserve Balances (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	1.4.2019	Q3 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Schools Block	(642)		(642)	0	(642)
Early Years Block	247		247	359	606
Central School Services Block	(26)	26	0	(6)	(6)
High Needs Block	521		521	1,784	2,305
<b>Total Deficit Balance</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>2,137</b>	<b>2,263</b>

## 7. Schools Block

7.1 There are no forecast variances within the Schools block at Quarter Three. There is however a risk of overspend in this block due to business rates, where properties may be revalued (as schools are funded according to their actual rates bill). De-delegated budgets within the Schools Block will be forecast as on line during the year. Any over or under spends are carried forward as part of the 2020/21 budget setting process as balances are only attributable to these specific services and cannot be allocated generally across the DSG.

7.2 The Schools Block reserve is detailed below:

Schools Block Reserve (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	Q3 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k
Schools in Financial Difficulty	(252)			(252)
Growth Fund	(193)			(193)
School Improvement	(41)			(41)
EMTAS	(45)			(45)
BST	(2)			(2)
Schools (re rates adj)	(109)			(109)
<b>Total Surplus Balance</b>	<b>(642)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(642)</b>

## 8. Early Years Block

8.1 The Early Years Block is forecasting a £359k overspend at Quarter Three, comprising a £215k in-year deficit and a £144k overspend relating to forecast hours for two, three and four year old hours, including the extended hours provision.

8.2 Due to the nature of the volatility, it is difficult to forecast as the funding (the final grant allocation will be determined by the January 2020 census), and payments to providers (payments are made according to actual number of hours of provision each term) are unpredictable.

8.3 The reserve summary is shown below.

Reserve Balances (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	1.4.2019	Q3 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Early Years Block	247		247	359	606

## 9. Central Schools Services Block

9.1 The Central School Services Block is currently forecasting a slight underspend of £6k at Quarter Three. This is mainly due to savings on staff costs and additional income from Fixed Penalty Notices.

9.2 The reserve summary is shown below.

Reserve Balances (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	1.4.2019	Q3 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Central School Services Block	(26)	26	0	(6)	(6)

## 10. High Needs Block

10.1 The High Needs Block is currently reporting a £134k overspend against in-year expenditure, which with the £1.6m deficit recovery target, totals £1.8m overspend. The main variances against expenditure are as follows:

- £63k pressure relating to the approval of four new personal budgets, one of which has created a £68k saving on the Independent Special School cost centre. Additional support for CYP in mainstream schools also agreed.
- Special Schools Top Up Funding has a significant overspend of £295k due to some very high needs pupils needing additional support to maintain their current placements.
- Top up funding for mainstream schools are reporting a current year pressure of £219k due to the increased number of EHCP and higher level of bandings.
- £256k pressures relate to Top ups for i-college. This relates to permanent exclusions, sixth form students and an increasing number of pupils with EHCP being placed within i-college.
- Underspends of £73k have been found from Non WBC top ups as pupils have moved from other placements to i-college
- Significant savings of £211k have been made on further education top up funding. Part of the saving is due to more pupils moving to employment, rather than college placements.
- £277k saving from utilising local mainstream and specialist provision instead of using independent special schools for four of the predicted transitions children.
- 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.

10.2 Further work needs to be undertaken to ascertain if any of the current year savings are ongoing. This will help in compiling a recovery plan for 2020/21.

10.3 The reserve summary is shown below.

Reserve Balances (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	1.4.2019	Q3 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
High Needs Block	521		521	1,784	2,305

## 11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The DSG is forecasting an in-year overspend of £2.3m, comprising £272k against in-year expenditure and a £1.8m deficit recovery target which remains unallocated at Quarter Three. It will remain unallocated until permanent savings against individual budgets can be identified to enable a permanent reduction of the target.
- 11.2 There has been an announcement that £700 million additional one off funding for the High Needs Block will be available for the 2020/21 financial year. West Berkshire have received notification confirming the 2020/21 allocation is an additional £1,597,237 (8%) compared to the 2019/20 allocation.

## 12. Appendices

Appendix A – DSG 2019/20 Budget Monitoring Report Quarter Three

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 9							
Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2019/20	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2019/20	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90020	Primary Schools (excluding nursery funding)	48,316,300	-1,163,440	47,152,860	47,152,860	0	funding adjustment due to Francis Baily academisation
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Primary	0		0	0	0	
90025	Secondary Schools (excluding 6th form funding)	15,197,160		15,197,160	15,197,160	0	
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Secondary	0		0	0	0	
90230	DD - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools)	0		0	0	0	
90113	DD - Trade Union Costs	51,470		51,470	51,470	0	
90255	DD - Support to Ethnic minority & bilingual Learners	187,770		187,770	187,770	0	
90349	DD - Behaviour Support Services	213,900		213,900	213,900	0	
90424	DD - CLEAPSS	3,320		3,320	3,320	0	
90470	DD - School Improvement	0		0	0	0	
90423	DD - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	167,780		167,780	167,780	0	
90235	School Contingency - Growth Fund/Falling Rolls Fund	655,800		655,800	655,800	0	
	<b>Schools Block Total</b>	<b>64,793,500</b>	<b>-1,163,440</b>	<b>63,630,060</b>	<b>63,630,060</b>	<b>0</b>	
90583	National Copyright Licences	136,330		136,330	136,770	440	
90019	Servicing of Schools Forum	42,350		42,350	39,500	-2,850	
90743	School Admissions	210,030		210,030	210,030	0	
90354	ESG - Education Welfare	194,020		194,020	187,020	-7,000	
90460	ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	389,680		389,680	393,210	3,530	
	<b>Central School Services Block DSG</b>	<b>972,410</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>972,410</b>	<b>966,530</b>	<b>-5,880</b>	

## Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 9

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2019/20	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2019/20	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90010	Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	917,910		917,910	910,520	-7,390	
90037	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	1,323,980		1,323,980	1,550,830	226,850	
90036	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	6,344,850		6,344,850	6,218,430	-126,420	
90052	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	131,460		131,460	155,520	24,060	
90053	Disability Access Fund	23,370		23,370	23,370	0	
90018	2 year old funding	652,970		652,970	706,280	53,310	
90017	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	266,300		266,300	240,000	-26,300	saving on Capita One system
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	60,690		60,690	60,690	0	
90238	Early Years Inclusion Fund	90,000		90,000	90,000	0	
90054	Deficit Budget	-214,515		-214,515	0	214,515	
	<b>Early Years Block Total</b>	<b>9,597,015</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,597,015</b>	<b>9,955,640</b>	<b>358,625</b>	
90026	Academy Schools RU Top Ups	946,530		946,530	809,870	-136,660	
90546	Special Schools - Place Funding Post 16	527,000		527,000	527,000	0	
90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	3,463,450		3,463,450	3,758,740	295,290	
90548	Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	1,065,960		1,065,960	992,660	-73,300	
90575	Non LEA Special School (OofA)	1,030,380		1,030,380	1,019,300	-11,080	
90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	2,683,020		2,683,020	2,405,840	-277,180	Placements now in Mainstream or Other Specialist Provision.
90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,408,870		1,408,870	1,198,000	-210,870	
90617	Resourced Units top up Funding maintained	270,350		270,350	310,160	39,810	
90618	Non WBC Resourced Units - Top Up Funding	143,580		143,580	154,250	10,670	
90621	Mainstream - Top Up Funding maintained	667,330		667,330	803,590	136,260	

## Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 9

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2019/20	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2019/20	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	267,460		267,460	349,970	82,510	
90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	73,030		73,030	94,660	21,630	One new placement .
90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	757,700		757,700	847,980	90,280	
90627	Disproportionate No: of HN Pupils NEW	100,000		100,000	100,000	0	
90628	EHCP PRU Placement	331,400		331,400	497,520	166,120	
<b>High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total</b>		<b>13,736,060</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13,736,060</b>	<b>13,869,540</b>	<b>133,480</b>	
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)	234,000		234,000	234,000	0	
<b>High Needs Block: Place Funding Total</b>		<b>3,754,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,754,000</b>	<b>3,754,000</b>	<b>0</b>	
90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	119,120		119,120	181,720	62,600	New personal budgets agreed creating savings elsew here . Additional support in Mainstream setting.
90280	Special Needs Support Team	325,660		325,660	307,400	-18,260	Saving on Capita One costs
90281	SEND Strategy (DSG)	56,200		56,200	25,440	-30,760	Part Year vacancy
90282	Medical Home Tuition	119,920		119,920	119,920	0	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	40,000		40,000	40,000	0	
90288	Elective Home Education Monitoring	28,240		28,240	25,240	-3,000	
90290	Sensory Impairment	236,000		236,000	231,320	-4,680	
90295	Therapy Services	261,470		261,470	261,470	0	
90315	Home Tuition	102,080		102,080	102,080	0	
90370	Behaviour Programme (Invest to Save)	0		0	0	0	
90371	PPEP Care Programme	0		0	0	0	Underspend from 18/19 to be added for next budget monitoring reporting cycle

## Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 9

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2019/20	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2019/20	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90555	LAL Funding	98,400		98,400	98,400	0	
90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	15,000		15,000	7,000	-8,000	
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	527,150		527,150	527,150	0	
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	36,000		36,000	36,000	0	
90830	ASD Teachers	146,210		146,210	148,700	2,490	
90961	Vulnerable Children	50,000		50,000	50,000	0	
90581	Dingleys Promise	30,000		30,000	30,000	0	
<b>High Needs Block: Non Top Up or Place Funding</b>		<b>2,302,650</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,302,650</b>	<b>2,303,040</b>	<b>390</b>	
90054	DSG Deficit Recovery Target	-1,650,138		-1,650,138	0	1,650,138	
<b>High Needs Block Total</b>		<b>18,142,572</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18,142,572</b>	<b>19,926,580</b>	<b>1,784,008</b>	
<b>Total Expenditure across funding bocks</b>		<b>93,505,497</b>	<b>-1,163,440</b>	<b>92,342,057</b>	<b>94,478,810</b>	<b>2,136,753</b>	
<b>SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES</b>		<b>444,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>444,000</b>	<b>444,000</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE</b>		<b>93,949,497</b>	<b>-1,163,440</b>	<b>92,786,057</b>	<b>94,922,810</b>	<b>2,136,753</b>	
90030	DSG Grant Account	-93,721,680	1,163,440	-92,558,240	-92,558,240	0	funding adjustment due to Francis Baily academisation
	Council Funding	-227,817		-227,817	-227,817	0	
<b>NET DSG EXPENDITURE</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,136,753</b>	<b>2,136,753</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 13

## Schools Forum Work Programme 2019/20

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 4	Work Programme 2020/21			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	Melanie Ellis
	Final Central Schools Block Budget 2020/21	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis/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
	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019/20	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
	Schools: deficit recovery ( <i>standing item</i> )	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	Update on the Schools' Catering and Cleaning Contracts	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Discussion	Robert Bradfield
	DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 10			03/03/20	09/03/20	Information	Ian Pearson
	Update on the SEN Engaging Potential Contract <i>To be considered under Part II due to (Paragraph 3 – information relating to financial/business affairs of particular person) and (Paragraph 6 – information information relating to proposed action to be taken by the Local Authority).</i>	18/02/20	25/02/20	03/03/20	09/03/20	Information	Jane Seymour

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 16

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank