

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum

Monday 9th March 2020 at 5.00pm

**At Shaw House Church Road Newbury
RG14 2DR**

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 3 March 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

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



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 9 March 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, 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

Page No.

1	Apologies	
2	Minutes of previous meeting date 20th January 2020	1 - 10
3	Actions arising from previous meetings	11 - 12
4	Declarations of Interest	
5	Membership	13 - 14

Items for Decision

6	Work Programme 2020/21 (Jessica Bailiss)	15 - 18
7	High Needs Block Budget 2020/21 (Jane Seymour)	19 - 54
8	Early Years Block Budget 2020/21 (Avril Allenby)	55 - 58

Items for Discussion

9	A long term view of the HNB Budget and impact of the SEN Strategy (Jane Seymour)	59 - 66
10	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 20/21 Overview (Melanie Ellis)	67 - 70

Items for Information

11	Growth Fund 2019/20 Payments (Melanie Ellis)	71 - 72
----	---	---------



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 9 March 2020 *(continued)*

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 12 | Schools: Deficit Recovery (Melanie Ellis) | 73 - 74 |
| 13 | DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 10 (Ian Pearson) | 75 - 84 |
| 14 | Date of the next meeting
<i>Monday 15th of June 2020, 5pm at Shaw House</i> | |
| 15 | Exclusion of the Press and Public
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.
Rule 8.10.4 of the Constitution refers. | |

Part II

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| 16 | Pat II - Update on the Schools' Catering and Cleaning contracts (Robert Bradfield)
<i>(Paragraph 5 – information relating to legal privilege) and (Paragraph 6 – information relating to proposed action to be taken by the Local Authority)</i> | 85 - 98 |
| 17 | Pat II - Update on the SEN Engaging Potential Contract (Jane Seymour)
<i>(Paragraph 3 – information relating to financial/business affairs of particular person)</i> | 99 - 100 |

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, 20 JANUARY 2020**

Present: Reverend Mark Bennet (Church of England Diocese), Councillor Dominic Boeck (Executive Portfolio: Children, Education and Young People), Jonathon Chishick (Maintained Primary School Governor), Catie Colston (Maintained Primary School Governor), Antony Gallagher (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Keith Harvey (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Jon Hewitt (Maintained Special School Headteacher), Brian Jenkins (Early Years Private, Voluntary and Independent Provider Representative), Hilary Latimer (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Sheila Loy (Academy School Governor), Councillor Ross Mackinnon (Executive Portfolio Holder: Finance), Julia Mortimore (Academy School Headteacher), Ian Nichol (Maintained Primary School Governor), Councillor Erik Pattenden (Shadow Portfolio Holder: Children, Education and Culture), Janet Patterson (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Gemma Piper (Academy School Headteacher (Substitute for Derek Peale)), Chris Prosser (Maintained Secondary School Headteacher), David Ramsden (Maintained Secondary School Headteacher), Jayne Steele (Non School Post 16 Provider), Suzanne Taylor (Maintained Nursery School Headteacher) and Charlotte Wilson (Academy School Headteacher)

Also Present: Melanie Ellis (Chief Accountant), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service) and Lisa Potts (Accountant), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Ann Kells (Schools Accountant) and Michelle Sancho (Principal EP & Service Manager)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Jacquie Davies, Derek Peale, Jane Seymour, Graham Spellman and Bruce Steiner

(As both the Chairman and Vice Chairman had given their apologies for the meeting, Keith Harvey was appointed to chair the meeting)

Keith Harvey in the Chair

PART I**62 Minutes of previous meeting dated 9th December**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 9th December 2019 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

63 Actions arising from previous meetings

The Chairman drew the Schools' Forum's attention to the actions from the last meeting on 9th December 2019. All actions were completed or were in hand.

64 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

65 Membership

Jessica Bailiss introduced the report (Agenda Item 5), which aimed to ensure members of the Schools' Forum were kept informed regarding the membership of the Forum.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

On the 9th December, the Schools' Forum had agreed that the Term of Office for Schools' Forum members be extended from three to four years. Jessica Bailiss reported that the Schools' Forum's constitution had been updated accordingly and any new members joining the Forum from the 9th December 2019 would have a Term of Office of four years. Those who were members prior to this date would continue on their three year term.

Regarding vacancies, Jessica Bailiss reported that there were still three vacancies on the Forum and the necessary work was taking place to try and fill the positions, including an election that was scheduled to take place in the spring for the maintained governor position.

66 De-delegations 2020/21 (Ian Pearson/Melanie Ellis)

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

Ian Pearson explained that the de-delegation proposals had been discussed in great detail at previous Heads' Funding Group and Schools' Forum meetings. The de-delegation proposals had formed part of the consultation with schools and the result of this were included under section 11 of the report. Further details on each service up for de-delegation was also included within the appendices to the report.

Antony Gallagher noted under section 11 of the report, that one Secondary School had disagreed with the proposal to top the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund up to £200k. Antony Gallagher stressed that this comment was irrelevant as it was not a concern for Secondary School Headteachers, being a fund that was de-delegated by Primary Schools only.

The Chairman invited the Schools' Forum to vote on the de-delegation proposals for 2020/21 as set out under section two of the report.

Maintained Primary Schools

Antony Gallagher proposed that maintained primary schools support the de-delegation of the following services and this was seconded by Hilary Latimer. At the vote the motion was carried.

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

Maintained Secondary Schools

Chris Prosser proposed that maintained secondary schools support the de-delegation of the following services and this was seconded by David Ramsden. At the vote the motion was carried.

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

- Trade Union Representation
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff
 - Health and Safety (Level 1 Support)

Maintained Special, Nursery and PRU Schools

John Hewitt proposed that maintained Special, Nursery and PRU Schools support the de-delegation of the following services and this was seconded by Suzanne Taylor. At the vote the motion was carried.

- 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)

RESOLVED that the proposals as set out above and in section two if the report, were agreed by the Schools' Forum.

67 Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (Melanie Ellis)

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 7), which set out of the result from the consultation with all schools on the proposed primary and secondary school funding formula for 2020/21 and made a final recommendation.

Melanie Ellis drew attention to the recommendations under section 2.1 of the report and explained that schools that had responded to the consultation had largely been supportive of recommendation one to five:

- To mirror the DfE's National Funding Formula to calculate the funding allocations
- To introduce the mobility factor into the local formula
- To address any surplus or shortfall in funding by a combination of reduced AWPU rates and a cap on gains
- To agree the criteria for additional funds as per the consultation
- To agree the de-delegations and to top up the Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty fund to £200k

Consultation results had been closer in relation to recommendation six concerning a transfer of funding from the Schools' Block to support high needs. Eight schools had opted against the transfer and nine in favour of it. Melanie Ellis reported that the item had been considered by the Heads' Funding Group (HFG), which had supported the proposed transfer of 0.25% and this had also been supported by the Council's Executive.

Catie Colston noted that only 17 schools out of 81 schools had responded to the consultation and therefore only those that had made the effort to respond were driving the recommendation. Ian Pearson added that a view to support the transfer had also been taken at the HFG however, the final decision would need to be taken by the Schools' Forum.

David Ramsden added that the matter had been raised a number of times at the Schools' Forum and Antony Gallagher reported that it had also been discussed by with primary heads.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

Hilary Latimer commented that the recommended transfer had been discussed at the HFG and it had been made very clear that the transferred funds would be used for invest to save initiatives, which had made the proposed transfer more favourable.

Reverend Mark Bennet queried how 0.25% would help solve the problem being faced within the High Needs Block (HNB) budget. Ian Pearson explained that pressure within the area of high needs was something that was being faced by schools throughout the country. The Government had made additional funding available for high needs and West Berkshire had received a proportion of this funding, which had been factored into the figures included in the paperwork. Ian Pearson explained that if agreed, a top slice of 0.25% would only be applied in 2020/21 and was one off money. Activity carried out under the invest to save proposals would support children and schools over a 12 month period.

Ian Pearson reported that there was reference to a Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) Strategy within the report. The SEND Strategy included five strands that were important when considering expenditure pressures. There would not be a decision required on the HNB until the next round of meetings however, a decision on the 0.25% transfer was required in order to configure the amount of funding available to high needs services and set the schools' budget. Early intervention and ensuring schools were adequately equipped to support students with a higher level of need were important elements moving forward.

Ian Pearson added that a report was likely to be required by the Department for Education (DfE) later in 2020 on deficit recovery in West Berkshire. This would be the same for all Local Authorities across the country facing a deficit over a percentage threshold.

Melanie Ellis highlighted that page 66 of the report detailed the responses to the consultation with schools.

Mark Bennet stated that the proposal put forward seemed to fund schools' priorities rather than issues directly affecting high needs services. Ian Pearson disagreed and felt that this statement was misleading. Through the invest to save proposals there would be free access to a Language and Literacy Service (LALs); a designated officer for Therapeutic Thinking; increased support for ASD, which was one of the main elements driving the deficit up. Finally there would be increased short term funding available through the Vulnerable Children's Grant (VCF) for schools that needed to provide support to vulnerable pupils with complex needs.

Jonathon Chishick queried if 0.25% was sufficient. Ian Pearson responded that a lead was being taken from schools on how much they were willing to contribute rather than how much was actually needed. The detail of what was required was set out in the SEND implementation plan. If more money was available then more could be done however, it was important to be realistic.

Councillor Erik Pattenden asked how much money would be required to do everything required within the area of high needs. Ian Pearson stated that it was unclear if further increased funding would be available from Government in subsequent years. In response to Councillor Pattenden's question it was estimated that an extra £1.6/1.8m investment would be required.

Chris Prosser reported that the Secondary Heads Group had met recently and a reluctance to top slice funding had been voiced. If the top slice in funding did go ahead it was important that it was used in a way that represented the needs of schools and Chris Prosser reported that there had been support for the proposed invest to save approach. A long conversation had taken place at the Secondary Heads Group and it had been

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

agreed that if a top slice was to go ahead then a percentage lower than 0.25% would be preferred.

David Ramsden added that each element had been discussed at the Secondary Heads meeting. There had been good support for the VCG and investment in LALs. The LALs had been reduced in past years and impacted negatively upon the deficit. There had been support for Therapeutic Thinking however, it was felt that evaluation of the service was required. David Ramsden explained that there had been a little less support for the appointment of two ASD Teaching Assistants (TAs). David Ramsden reported that he understood that this was needed within schools however, there was uncertainty that two higher level TAs was enough to address the problem and the impact would be difficult to evaluate.

Julia Mortimore stressed the importance of evaluation and that she would find it hard to support a 0.25% transfer, however, would support a smaller transfer that would need to be evaluated in a year's time. Gemma Piper stated that a key aspect was to understand goals and what was being achieved by spend. She was uncertain if the funding would reduce the deficit long term or just meet needs.

Ian Pearson reported that officers had tried to provide information on the evaluation of services as part of the de-delegation and high needs proposals. Some services were new such as the Therapeutic Thinking Services and evaluation was based on feedback from schools and success rates in others areas across the country. Michelle Sancho added that the exclusion rate was lower than it had been for four years and this indicated the impact that the service was having. Michelle Sancho also added that she was also aware of permanent exclusions that had not taken place as a result of support for the VCF. Evaluation information would be available in a year's time. If schools and children could be better supported in mainstream schools, then this would help address the pressure being placed on the HNB.

Jonathon Chishick stated that as far as he understood money would be used to help support children with high needs in mainstream schools. This would however, not help reduce the current deficit on the HNB. He felt that a new model was required that maybe charged schools based on use. He felt that the 0.25% would not have a large enough impact on the deficit.

Jonathon Chishick continued by stating that he had heard Headteachers say that they did not want to top slice by 0.25% however, also that the services being provided were extremely important. David Ramsden disagreed and stated that in past a move had been made to charge schools for services and as a result schools had faced severe difficulties and therefore attempts to reduce this deficit with this approach had been unsuccessful. Michelle Sancho reported that she was aware of situations where Headteachers had been faced with complex needs but had been unable to buy into the service that could provide the support required.

Ian Pearson stated that there was a significant issue being faced across the board regarding the pressure on the area of high needs. He acknowledged Jonathon Chishick's point about a model that charged schools for use however, stated that although this could be applied to the proposed ASD TAs and Therapeutic Thinking Service it could not be applied to the LALs to VCF.

Gemma Piper referred to the deficit recovery plan that would hopefully include outcomes for spend. It was important to clarify the reasoning behind the SEND Strategy and assess impact overtime. Ian Pearson reported that all elements contained within the SEND Strategy had been raised by schools and the four areas proposed as invest to save initiatives had been shortlisted.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

The Chairman invited members of the Schools' Forum to consider recommendations one to five under section 2.1 of the report. David Ramsden proposed that the recommendations be agreed and this was seconded by Catie Colston. At the vote the motion was carried.

It was proposed that the sixth recommendation concerning a 0.25 transfer should be deferred until after the next item on the HNB had been discussed.

RESOLVED that

- 1) Recommendations one to five under section 2.1 of the report were agreed.
- 2) Recommendation six would be considered under the HNB item (item eight).

68 High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2020/21 (Jane Seymour)

Ian Pearson introduced the report, which set 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 set out some of the saving options and some invest to save proposals.

Ian Pearson reported that the report had not changed significantly since it last came to the Schools' Forum in December. Figures within the report were based on the 0.25% transfer being agreed however a decision was still required on this. The budget for the High Needs Block (HNB) would be decided at the next round of meetings.

Paragraph 3.3 of the report set out that savings of £219k had been 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.

Paragraph 3.3 detailed that if the Schools Block transfer was agreed then the total net shortfall in the 2020-21 HNB Budget would be £3,374,029. This included a predicted overspend of £2,209,793.

The table on page 73 of the report gave a clear summary of the position of the HNB and how the budget was allocated, including the likely outturn position. The extra money from the Department for Education (DfE) had been factored into the figures.

Ian Pearson continued and highlighted that Appendix A on page 75 of the report provided further detail on each element of the budget. It was clear that the level of increase was not meeting the level of demand and it was becoming increasingly difficult to meet the level of difficulties being present by children.

Section six under Appendix A detailed the invest to save proposals based on the 0.25% transfer if agreed.

Ian Pearson reported that Appendix B on page 89 of the report provided three saving options. He commented that if all the savings were taken then the amount saved would not offset the overspend in its entirety. Services included in the savings options included the Specialist Inclusion Support Service, PRU Outreach and the Cognition and Learning Team. Each option provided elements for consideration that involved reducing or removing the service. Implications and risks of taking each saving were also provided.

Ian Pearson reported that the Heads' Funding Group (HFG) had considered the saving options and had been reluctant to support any of the savings because of the negative impact that had been caused by cutting such services in the past. If the Schools' Forum wished to pursue any or all of the saving options then more detail could be brought to the next round of meetings. Other areas could also be included if desired.

Appendix C on page 91 of the report provided evaluation and impact data on each of the services included as part of the saving options.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

David Ramsden queried progress with the SEMH Service contract. Ian Pearson reported that the contract had been supported by the Schools' Forum and there had been more than one bidder. Further information on this area would need to be considered under Part II.

Jonathon Chishick commented on the nature of the saving proposals and that they were similar to what was being proposed if the 0.25% of funding was agreed, which he felt was counterproductive. Ian Pearson reported that officers had been asked to present savings options and most could be categorised as early intervention services.

Gemma Piper referred to page 75 of the report regarding place funding and referred to a point that she had also raised at the HFG, in that the table provided the number of places rather than the number of pupil's accessing the service. If actual pupil numbers were not provided then it was not known how many pupils were actually using the service. Ian Pearson explained that places were allocated to provisions including the resource base, PRU, Special Schools and further education. Problems were encountered in that the number of places could vary but were capped. Further funding could not be obtained for increased numbers and places had to be taken from other settings. Gemma Piper stated that at the last meeting she had queried the level of need. If more children were accessing the service then the actual numbers of children should be included. It was agreed that actual numbers would be added to the table.

The Chairman invited members of the Forum to vote on whether the saving options included within the report should be pursued. John Hewitt proposed that the saving options should not be pursued and this was seconded by Catie Colston. At the vote the motion was carried.

The Chairman invited members of Forum to vote on the recommendation under section 2.1 of the Final Schools Funding Formula Report (Item 7), on whether 0.25% should be transferred from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block. Hilary Latimer proposed that the 0.25% of funding be transferred and this was seconded by John Hewitt. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED

- 1) That the number of children accessing services rather than the number of planned places be included in the table on page 75 of the report.
- 2) It was agreed that the identified saving options under Appendix B should not be pursued.
- 3) It was agreed that 0.25% should be transferred from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block.

69 Central Schools Block Budget Proposals 2020/21 (Melanie Ellis)

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 9), which set out the budget proposal for the services funded from the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and proposed measures to enable the budget for this block to be balanced.

The budget for 2019/20 was £1,108,030 and the budget requirement in 2020/21 was £1,007,729. Costs had reduced within a number of areas of the block however, there was still a shortfall in funding. The table of page 71 of the report showed how the shortfall would be met and had been reduced to £49k, through money being realised from the ESG unutilised grant.

Ian Pearson reported that the Early Years Block would be reported on at the next round of meetings as it was based on information from the January school census.

Reverend Mark Bennet noted that capacity was reducing in the CSSB and queried if there was enough capacity to deliver services. Ian Pearson commented that there had

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

been some reductions within services overall in the CSSB. Councillor Erik Pattenden queried what could not be delivered as a result of the reduced capacity. Ian Pearson reported that there had been a 29% reduction in the Schools' Finance Team. Melanie Ellis stated that finance support was restricted however, they were currently managing with fewer staff. Ian Pearson highlighted some of the other reductions in the block and stated that this would need revisiting the following year.

The Chairman invited member of the Forum to consider the recommendation under section 2.1 of the report to agree the 2020/21 budget for the CSSB. Antony Gallagher proposed that the budget be approved and this was seconded by John Hewitt. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum agree the CSSB budget for 2020/21 as set out in section 2.1 of the report.

70 **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2020/21 (Melanie Ellis)**

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 10), which set out the overall calculation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and the funding settlement for 2020/21.

The table under section 4.1 of the report showed the 2020/21 DSG allocation based on the October 2019 census pupil numbers. The total allocation was £137.6m compared to £130.6m in 2019/20.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

71 **Schools: deficit recovery (standing item) (Melanie Ellis)**

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 11), which gave an overview of schools in deficit. Melanie Ellis referred to the first table of page 120 of the report, which detailed four schools that had submitted a WBC Deficit Budget Licence Application for the financial year 2019/20. Period seven submissions showed that two schools were in a better financial position and two were in a worse position than budgeted. Comments from the schools with worsening positions were included within the report.

It was noted under section four of the report that two schools had ended the financial year 2018/19 with unlicensed deficits and one of the schools was predicting a worse position for 2019/20. Comments from the school with a worsening position were included within the report.

Reverend Mark Bennet noted that there was a relatively low number of schools in deficit given the pressures on schools' funding. If this number was to rise it would place increased pressure on the Schools' Finance Team. Reverend Mark Bennet therefore queried how further schools would be taken care of given the reduction in capacity of this team. Melanie Ellis reported that there was a dedicated resource for schools in deficit within the team. In 2018/19 a higher number of schools in deficit (around 8/9) had been supported and therefore there was capacity to go back to this level again if required. Ian Pearson commented that there was a system in place that monitored school budgets and he praised schools for the hard work undertaken to manage their budgets.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

72 **DSG Monitoring 2019/20 Month 9 (Ian Pearson)**

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 12), which set out the forecast financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), highlighting any under of overspends.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 20 JANUARY 2020 - MINUTES

The table on page 124 of the report provided the forecast position at quarter three. Spending within the Early Years Block would need to be monitored as it was particularly volatile and the end of year position was still unclear.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

73 Forward Plan

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the forward plan.

74 Date of the next meeting

Monday 9th March 2020, 5pm at Shaw House.

75 Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that members of the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the under-mentioned item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as contained in Paragraphs 3 and 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the [Local Government \(Access to Information\)\(Variation\) Order 2006](#). [Rule 8.10.4 of the Constitution also refers.](#)

76 Schools' Broadband Contract (Thomas Ng)

*(Paragraph 3 – information relating to financial/business affairs of a particular person)
(Paragraph 6 – information – information relating to proposed action to be taken by the Local Authority)*

The Schools Forum considered an exempt report (Agenda Item 16) which aimed to inform all school representatives of the outcome of a tendering process in order to secure a range of Managed Cloud-based services for schools.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum agreed to proceed with Option 1.

Reason for the decision: As outlined in the exempt report.

Other options considered: As outlined in the exempt report.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 6.20 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
Jan20-Ac1	20th January 2020	High Needs Block Proposals	The number of children accessing services rather than the number of planned places be included in the table on page 75 of the HNB report.	Jane Seymour	Completed. This information will be included with the next HNB Budget Report being considered by the Schools' Forum on 9th March 2020.

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 April 2020/21.

This page is intentionally left blank

Membership Report

Report being considered by:	The Schools' Forum		
On:	9 th March 2020		
Report Author:	Jessica Bailiss		
Item for:	Information	By:	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 Following a request from an elected member to speak at the last Forum meeting, it came to light that there was a discrepancy between the Schools' Forum's constitution and Schools' Forum Regulations 2012.
- 3.2 The Regulations state that only primary members for Children's and Resources are permitted to speak at meetings of the Forum. Therefore going forward only the Executive Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People and the Portfolio Holder for Finance will be permitted to speak at meetings of the Forum.
- 3.3 The Schools' Forum's constitution has been updated accordingly to ensure it reflects the Regulations on this matter.

4. Term of office and vacancies

- 4.1 Any members of the Forum approaching the end of their Term of Office have been contacted and the consultation is taking place accordingly.
- 4.2 There are still currently three vacancies on the Forum including a maintained primary school business manager, a maintained secondary school governor and an academy headteacher position.
- 4.3 An election will take place in April 2020 for the maintained secondary governor position. Consultation is taking place with the relevant groups to try and fill the other two positions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Work Programme 2020/21

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum
On: 9th March 2020
Report Author: Jessica Bailiss
Item for: Decision **By:** All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To present the work programme for the Heads Funding Group and Schools' Forum for 2020/21.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Schools' Forum approve the Work Programme for 2020/21

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

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1 The Schools' Forum is required to agree its work programme on an annual basis. The work programme for 2020/21 largely follows the same pattern as it has in previous years and is subject to change throughout the year.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 That the Schools' Forum approve the work programme for 2020/21.

5. Appendices

- 5.1 Appendix 1 – Work Programme 2020/21

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum Work Programme 2020/21

APPENDIX A

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 5	Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Decision	
	Scheme for Financing Schools 2020/21	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	School Balances 2019/20	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Outturn 2019/20	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Early Years Block Budget - review of overspend position	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Decision	Avril Allenby
	Review of iCollege: 1) To include a review of (50/50) funding arrangements for iCollege between the HNB and schools; proposals insurance scheme. 2) Outcomes of a working party looking into insurance scheme proposals for Funding PE Pupils attending iCollege.	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Decision	Michelle Sancho / Jacquie Davies
	A long term view of HNB Budget and impact of the SEN Strategy	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Review of deficit recovery plan	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis / Ian Pearson
	Trade Union Facilities Time - Annual Report for 2019/20	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Information	Gary Upton
	Vulnerable Children's Fund - Annual Report for 2019/20	27/05/20	03/06/20	09/06/20	15/06/20	Information	Michelle Sancho
Term 6	Schools' Forum Membership and Constitution from September 2020	24/06/20	01/07/20	07/07/20	13/07/20	Decision	Jessica Bailiss
	DSG Monitoring Month 3			07/07/20	13/07/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
	Proposals and implications for schools under increased pressure due to higher numbers of SEN pupils.	24/06/20	01/07/20	07/07/20	13/07/20	Decision	Jane Seymour
Term 1	Schools in Financial Difficulty Bids (TBC)	24/06/20	01/07/20	07/07/20	13/07/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Schools Funding Formula Proposal 2021/22	29/09/20	06/10/20	13/10/20	19/10/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	De-delegations 2021/22	29/09/20	06/10/20	13/10/20	19/10/20	Decision	Lisa Potts
	Additional Funding Criteria 2021/22	29/09/20	06/10/20	13/10/20	19/10/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Schools: deficit recovery (standing item)	29/09/20	06/10/20	13/10/20	19/10/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 6			13/10/20	19/10/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
	Schools in Financial Difficulty Bids (TBC)	29/09/20	06/10/20	13/10/20	19/10/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
Term 2	DSG Funding Settlement Budget Overview 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	Final School Funding Formula 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Final Additional Funding Criteria 2020/21	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Draft Central Schools Block Budget 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	Draft High Needs Budget 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	High Needs Places and Arrangements 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	High Needs Block - Resourced Units	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Outline Early Years Forecast 2020/21 and Budget 2021/22	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Discussion	Avril Allenby
	Schools: deficit recovery (standing item)	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 7			01/12/20	07/12/20	Information	Melanie Ellis
Term 3	Schools in Financial Difficulty Bids (TBC)	17/11/20	24/11/20	01/12/20	07/12/20	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding Settlement and Budget Overview 2021/22	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Discussion	Melanie Ellis
	Final Central School Block Budget Proposals 2021/22	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2021/22	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2020/21	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Information	Melanie Ellis
	Schools: deficit recovery (standing item)	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Information	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 9			19/01/21	25/01/21	Information	Melanie Ellis
Term 4	Schools in Financial Difficulty Bids (TBC)	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Work Programme 2021/22	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Decision	Jessica Bailiss
	Final DSG Budget 2021/22 - Overview	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Decision	Melanie Ellis
	Final High Needs Block Budget 2021/22	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Decision	Jane Seymour
	Final Early Years Block Budget 2021/22	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Decision	Avril Allenby
	Schools: deficit recovery (standing item)	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Information	Melanie Ellis
	DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 10			01/03/21	08/03/21	Information	Melanie Ellis
Schools in Financial Difficulty Bids (TBC)	16/02/21	23/02/21	01/03/21	08/03/21	Decision	Melanie Ellis	

This page is intentionally left blank

High Needs Block Budget 2020/21			
Report being considered by:	Schools Forum on 9 th March 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 the invest to save proposals which were agreed by the Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the predicted shortfall and agree the deficit budget for 2020-21.

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 The net shortfall in the 2020-21 HNB budget, is **£3,359,176**. This includes a predicted 19/20 overspend of **£2,174,560**.

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. 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.

TABLE 1	2019/20 Budget £	2019/20 Forecast £	2020/21 Estimate £
Place Funding	6,016,000	6,016,000	6,082,000
Top Up Funding	12,119,960	11,967,039	12,865,755
PRU Funding (top ups only)	1,089,100	1,345,500	1,375,915
Other Statutory Services	1,501,180	1,501,842	1,541,650
Non Statutory Services	801,470	795,960	1,063,270
Support Service Recharges	127,286	127,286	186,330
Total Expenditure	21,654,996	21,753,627	23,114,920

HNB DSG Allocation	-20,070,067	-20,100,067	-21,667,304
0.25% SB Transfer			-263,000
In year overspend	1,584,929	1,653,560	1,184,616
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	521,000	521,000	2,174,560
Total cumulative deficit	2,105,929	2,174,560	3,359,176

4.3 There is a forecast shortfall of **£1,184,616** in the 2020/21 HNB.

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 was 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. This was agreed by a narrow margin at the Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

4.8 Some savings options were put forward but a decision was taken by the Schools Forum not to take any of these savings because of the negative impact on children with SEND and the risk of additional expenditure being incurred on statutory services as a result of discretionary provision being reduced.

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 – 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	35	230,000	0
Resource Units Academies – pre 16 (DSG top slice)	94	628,000	88	102	684,000	8
Mainstream Maintained – post 16	5	16,000	7	5	25,000	0
Mainstream Academies – post 16 (DSG top slice)	14	82,000	14	16	96,000	2
Further Education	139	746,000	135	133	737,000	-6
PRU Place Funding (90320)	66	660,000	72	66	660,000	0
TOTAL	718	6,016,000		722	6,082,000	4

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	Pupil numbers
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Special Schools Maintained (90539)	3,300,420	3,383,249	3,463,450	3,758,740	295,290	3,986,360	303
Non WBC special schools (90548)	1,098,070	1,009,156	1,065,960	992,664	-73,296	1,194,295	47
Resource Units Maintained (90617)	293,020	274,236	270,350	310,156	39,806	313,650	33
Resource Units Academies (90026)	854,270	822,634	946,530	809,871	-136,659	948,280	94
Resource Units Non WBC (90618)	107,000	126,702	143,580	154,248	10,668	130,600	9
Mainstream Maintained (90621)	541,560	658,073	667,330	803,593	136,263	779,450	248
Mainstream Academies (90622)	185,170	247,075	267,460	349,970	82,510	389,600	118
Mainstream Non WBC (90624)	75,000	78,343	73,030	94,658	21,628	70,590	22
Non Maintained Special Schools (90575)	840,100	747,940	1,030,380	1,019,300	-11,080	1,068,200	27
Independent Special Schools (90579)	2,436,400	2,218,567	2,683,020	2,405,841	-277,179	2,797,000	43
Further Education (90580)	1,396,140	1,270,010	1,408,870	1,197,998	-210,872	1,087,730	103
Disproportionate HN Pupils (90627)	100,000	83,609	100,000	70,000	-30,000	100,000	-
TOTAL	11,227,150	10,919,594	12,119,960	11,967,039	-152,921	12,865,755	

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	Pupil numbers
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
PRU Top Up Funding (90625)	542,950	800,225	757,700	847,980	90,280	818,400	83
PRU EHCP SEMH Placements (90628)	0	223,699	331,400	497,520	166,120	557,515	
Non WBC PRU Top Up Funding (90626)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	542,950	1,023,924	1,089,100	1,345,500	256,400	1,375,915	

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	Pupil numbers
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/(under) £	Estimate £	
Applied Behaviour Analysis (90240)	75,000	116,192	119,120	181,720	62,598	136,580	16
Sensory Impairment (90290)	175,750	241,928	236,000	231,320	-4,680	227,590	190
SEN Commissioned Provision (90577)	456,000	487,772	527,150	527,150	0	567,650	14
Equipment for SEN Pupils (90565)	10,000	11,954	15,000	7,000	-8,000	15,000	-
Therapy Services (90295)	240,760	276,331	261,470	261,470	0	261,470	-
Elective home Education Monitoring (90288)	27,990	22,801	28,240	23,740	-4,500	28,240	150
Home Tuition Service (90315)	245,000	230,567	102,080	102,080	0	0	
Medical Home Tuition (90282)	0	0	119,920	119,920	0	205,000	
Hospital Tuition (90610)	45,000	37,390	36,000	22,000	-14,000	39,060	4
SEND Strategy (DSG) (90281)	0	0	56,200	25,442	-30,758	61,060	N/A
TOTAL	1,275,500	1,424,935	1,501,180	1,501,842	662	1,541,650	

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 £4,500 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	Pupil numbers
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Language and Literacy Centres LALs (90555)	82,400	93,800	98,400	98,400	0	116,200	26
Specialist Inclusion Support Service (90585)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	68
PRU Outreach Service (90582)	61,200	61,200	61,200	61,200	0	61,200	21

TABLE 5 Non Statutory Services	2018/19 Budget		2019/20 Budget			2020/21	Pupil numbers
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 10)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Early Years Inclusion Fund (90238) moved to EY Block	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Special Needs Support Team (90280)	319,170	309,706	325,660	317,660	-8,000	308,130	N/A
ASD Advisory Service (90830)	141,550	140,063	146,210	148,700	2,490	208,390	1,152
Vulnerable Children (90961)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	179,400	52
Early Development and Inclusion Team (90287)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	51,950	102
Dingley's Promise (90581)	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	56
Therapeutic Thinking	0	0	0	0	0	58,000	N/A
TOTAL	774,320	774,769	801,470	795,960	-5,510	1,063,270	

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.

5.4.5 This proposal was agreed at Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

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.

5.9.4 This proposal was agreed at Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

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.
- 5.10.5 This proposal was agreed at Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

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

The proposal to transfer 0.25% of the Schools Block to the HNB in order to fund the following initiatives, with the aim of achieving savings in the longer term, was agreed at Schools Forum on 20th January 2020.

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.

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 B (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 B (ii)

SISS Evaluation 2016-17 Comments

Have you made referrals to SISS for any children/young people?		
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

Were the referrals accepted?		
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.

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 B (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.

Early Years Budget 2020/21

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 9th March 2020

Report Author: Avril Allenby

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

1. Purpose of the Report

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

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 For the Schools Forum to agree the 2020/21 budgets as detailed in table 2.
- 2.2 As there is currently no definitive solution to the budget situation, the Forum can expect an early update regarding the recommended course of action to bring in line the current year outturn and 2020/21 proposed budgets and rates for West Berkshire Early Years funded providers.

Recommendations are subject to further work and discussion by the Early Years Funding Group, who will ensure that a solution which addresses the volatility in this budget is found.

<b style="color: #008080;">Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

3. Funding Framework for 2020/21

- 3.1 The funding rate determined for West Berkshire for 2020/21, is based on the national funding formula below. In 2019/20 the rate of £4.70 has increased by an uplift of 8p to £4.78.

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

- 3.2 Local Authorities are required to set an average funding rate for providers for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate (£4.78 for West Berkshire). This minimum funding level is referred to as the pass through rate. The Government will be monitoring compliance on this, and the "rules" surrounding this have been detailed.

- 3.3 The funding rate paid for 2 year olds has also increased by an 8p uplift from £5.74 to £5.82 per hour.
- 3.4 The Early Years Pupil Premium Grant (EYPPG) is to continue.
- 3.5 A Disability Access Fund (DAF) payment of £615 per child per year will be made for children in receipt of Disability Living Allowance.
- 3.6 An SEN Inclusion fund also continues.
- 3.7 The additional funding for maintained nursery schools will continue for at least 2020/21. This will enable the lump sum to continue to be paid to the two WBC nursery schools.

4. Forecast Outturn for 2019/20

Table 1	2019/20 Budget Set	2019/20 Forecast	2019/20 Variance
	£	£	£
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers			
PVI Providers (90036)	6,344,850	6,326,863	-17,987
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,323,980	1,650,421	326,441
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	917,910	938,113	20,203
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	652,970	756,825	103,855
Pupil Premium Grant (27%) and deprivation funding (73%) (90052)	131,460	188,375	56,915
Total Delegated Funds	9,371,170	9,860,597	489,427
Centrally Managed Funds			
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	266,300	233,300	-33,000
Pre School Teacher Counselling (90287)	60,690	60,690	0
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000	94,000	4,000
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370	16,000	-7,370
SSRs	49,500	58,752	9,252
Total Centrally Managed Funds	489,860	462,742	-27,118
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	9,861,030	10,323,339	462,309
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,646,508	-9,492,073	154,435
IN YEAR OVERSPEND	214,522	831,266	616,744
Early Years clawback from 2018/19	0	-395,886	-395,886
Early Years DSG Block Funding carried forward	247,000	247,000	0
OVERALL NET POSITION	461,522	682,380	220,858

- 4.1 It should be noted that the funding regulations state that the funding for extended hours in 2020/21 will be “based on” January 2020 census data.

5. Budget Model for 2020/21

- 5.1 West Berkshire is now using a single base rate. The rate increased from 1st April 2019 to a base rate of £4.40 and a quality supplement of 0.66p per hour.
- 5.2 The deprivation supplement based upon the current arrangements with the funding being linked to the early year's pupil premium, increased from 1st April 2019 to £1.47.
- 5.3 The increase in the deprivation rate alongside a local campaign to ensure that eligible children are identified and funded has had a positive impact upon uptake. This funding is well below that allocated once a child enters school however as this is such an important time to be supporting young children who are disadvantaged and in many case are those with speech and language delay the Early Years Group and the Forum agreed that an increase in funding would support this area of work.
- 5.4 The hourly rate to providers for 2 year olds increased from 1st April 2019 to £5.65.
- 5.5 The Local Authority is allowed to fund from the grant some centrally provided services, including staffing and IT costs in relation to overseeing the delivery of the free entitlement, sufficiency of places, eligibility checking, and administration of funding payments to providers. However funding for these services is limited by the requirement to set a "pass through rate" for 3 and 4 year olds which is at least 95% of the authority's funding rate.
- 5.6 Spend on provider payments has been set on the assumption that payments in Autumn 2020 and Spring 2021 will be similar to Autumn 2019 and Spring 2020 and that payments in the Summer term 2020 will be 13% higher than Spring 2020. (This forecast is in line with trends in early years numbers in previous years). However, because the take up of extended hours has been higher than expected in the Autumn 2019 and Spring 2020 terms, allowance has been made for a further increase in extended hours of 14,000 hours on average in the financial year 2020/21.
- 5.7 It should be noted that early years providers under the previous funding formula had no rate rises for five years. Since the introduction of the new national funding formula many providers have lower hourly rates and also more free entitlement hours to provide, which is having an impact on sufficiency and the offer to parents in West Berkshire.
- 5.8 In 2019/20 single base rate was increased to support all providers with the additional costs that have impacted on them over the past two years; rises in the minimum wage and pension costs alongside the introduction of the additional free entitlement to working parents.

5.9 The proposed Early Years Block Budget for 2020/21 is set out in the table below:

Table 2	2020/21 Yr 1 Budget £
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers	
PVI Providers (90036)	6,423,352
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,650,421
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	938,113
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	756,825
Pupil Premium Grant (27%) and deprivation funding (73%) (90052)	188,375
Total Delegated Funds	9,957,086
Centrally Managed Funds	
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	258,450
Pre School Teacher Counselling (90287)	51,950
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370
SSRs	66,152
Total Centrally Managed Funds	489,922
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	10,477,008
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,651,877
Transfer to Central Schools Services Block	
Early Years DSG Block Funding carried forward	682,380
OVERALL NET POSITION	1,477,510

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 Propose that as there is currently no definitive solution to the budget situation, the Forum can expect an early update regarding the recommended course of action to bring in line the current year outturn and 2020/21 proposed budgets and rates for West Berkshire Early Years funded providers.
- 6.2 Recommendations are subject to further work and discussion by the Early Years Funding Group, who will ensure that a solution which addresses the volatility in this budget is found.

High Needs Block Savings / SEND Strategy

Report being considered by:	Schools' Forum		
On:	9 th March 2020		
Report Author:	Jane Seymour & Michelle Sancho		
Item for:	Discussion	By:	All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide an indication of the savings opportunities arising from the SEND Strategy 2018-23 and in particular the Invest to Save projects recently agreed by the Schools Forum. This is an initial report; a more detailed report will be brought to the Heads Funding Group in June 2020.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the report is noted and a further more detailed report requested for the June meeting.

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

3. Introduction/Background

3.1 The SEND Review carried out in 2017-18 led to the production of the West Berkshire SEND Strategy 2018-23. The Strategy was coproduced with parents and all relevant partner agencies including schools, FE Colleges, early years settings, the Clinical Commissioning Group, the Royal Berkshire Hospital Trust, the Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, Children and Adults Social Care and the voluntary sector.

3.2 The purpose of the SEND Strategy is to ensure that children with SEND receive the best possible services, delivered as cost effectively as possible and as locally as possible, and that they achieve good life outcomes including:

- Access to paid employment wherever possible
- Living as independently as possible
- Being socially included in their local communities
- Having their health needs met

3.3 The SEND Review identified that the proportion of children with Education, Health and Care Plans attending mainstream schools was reducing, the number of special school placements was increasing, particularly for SEMH and ASD, that the number and cost of FE College placements for young people with SEND was increasing and, whilst there were improvements in access to employment for young people with SEND, there was more work to be done in this area. The effectiveness of processes for transition to adulthood was also identified as an area for development, as was access to health services including mental health support.

3.4 Five key objectives were identified for the SEND Strategy

- To develop the capacity of mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with SEND
- To develop the continuum of local provision for children with SEND, including MLD, ASD and SEMH
- To improve the post 16 SEND offer in the local area for young people with SEND and increase their access to employment
- To improve transition to adulthood, in particular in relation to Social Care and Health Services
- To improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of children with SEND

3.5 The SEND Strategy sets out a number of priority areas under each objective and a range of actions to support the objective. More detailed action plans for each objective are currently in development and will be agreed by the SEND Strategic Partnership Board in March 2020. The report to the SEND Strategic Partnership Board will capture actions which have been completed since the SEND Strategy was approved in November 2018 as well as setting out future actions.

4. Supporting Information

4.1 The SEND Strategy seeks to provide good quality local services for children and young people with SEND, and improve their life outcomes, whilst at the same time making best use of resources and reducing pressure on the High Needs Block Budget.

4.2 Each of the five objectives in the SEND Strategy is associated with potential cost savings although it is difficult to predict with complete accuracy what savings could be made.

4.3 The Invest to Save bids agreed by the Schools Forum will all contribute to Objective 1 of the SEND Strategy, by supporting mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with SEND and thereby potentially reducing exclusions and specialist placements.

4.4 The Invest to Save bids are summarised below:

- Recruitment of a Therapeutic Thinking Officer to further roll out and embed therapeutic thinking approaches in mainstream schools

- Increasing the size of the Vulnerable Children Grant in order to support schools to implement therapeutic thinking approaches, avoid exclusions and to support fresh starts for children who have been permanently excluded
- Recruitment of Higher Level Teaching Assistants within the ASD Team to support children with ASD in mainstream schools
- Ceasing to charge for Language and Literacy Centre places in order to provide parity of access to the service and extend its reach

4.5 This report focuses mainly on potential savings associated with the Invest to Save projects but also makes reference to other activities within the SEND Strategy which should achieve savings.

Objective 1 of SEND Strategy: To develop the capacity of mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with SEND

4.6 Objective 1 of the SEND Strategy contains a wide range of activities to support schools in meeting the needs of children with SEND, including additional training and guidance and greater access to support services and funding. Further detail is contained in the SEND Strategy Objective 1 Action Plan which will be considered by the SEND Strategic Partnership Board on 11th March.

4.7 The implementation and roll out of Therapeutic Thinking approaches in schools, together with increased access to funding through the Vulnerable Children Grant, should reduce exclusions from schools and may also reduce the number of children requiring specialist SEMH placements.

4.8 The increased Vulnerable Children's Grant of £179k will be used in the following ways:

- 50k (the amount allocated in 2019-20) will be "business as usual" i.e. to support unforeseen short term needs in schools e.g. a new arrival with short term needs.
- 50k will be allocated to support reintegration back in to mainstream of hard to place/permanently excluded pupils following Pupil Placement Panel discussion.
- 79k will be allocated to support schools implementing differentiated arrangements for SEMH pupils using therapeutic thinking approaches.

Criteria already exist for the business as usual funds. Stringent criteria will be put in place for the other two options with the Therapeutic Thinking Lead scrutinising applications for the 79k funding stream.

Potential savings to be achieved through reduced permanent exclusions

4.9 Potential savings resulting from reduced permanent exclusions are illustrated below using the cost of a permanent exclusion. As the table below illustrates, the cost varies according to the time of year of the exclusion and the type of school. The maximum saving in the HNB over a one year period were an exclusion to be prevented is £18,389 and the maximum saving to the HNB over a two year period is £39,099. Learners in KS4 have placements of 1,2 or 3 years.

Table 1

<u>Examples of cost to the High Needs Block for exclusions</u>				
	relevant date for calculations	Top Up Cost to HNB for year 1	Top Up Cost to HNB for year 2	Total cost for 2 years
Maintained School	4th May 2020	£16,680.10	£20,710.00	£37,390.10
	14th October 2020	£9,335.10	£20,710.00	£30,045.10
Academy School	4th May 2020	£18,389.20	£20,710.00	£39,099.20
	14th October 2020	£12,246.90	£19,317.40	£31,564.30
* Different relevant dates for exclusions have been used to show different situations				
** These costs assume appropriate funding has been reclaimed from the school making the exclusion				
*** The amount each school is required to contribute varies on their individual formula				

Potential savings to be achieved through reduced SEMH placements

4.10 There are currently 36 children with EHCPs attending special schools for children with SEMH. The costs of these placements vary widely according to whether they are other Local Authorities’ maintained special schools, Free special schools, non- maintained special schools or independent special schools. Placements in other Local Authority maintained special schools would always be sought in the first instance, provided that they can meet the child’s needs, as these placements are usually more cost effective. However, as all Local Authorities are experiencing an increase in demand for SEMH placements it is becoming much more difficult to access other LA maintained special schools for West Berkshire children.

4.11 Given that it is rarely possible now to access other LA SEMH schools, placements for SEMH are having to be made which cost typically between £49,000 and £65,000 per annum. The school which is used most frequently to place children with SEMH costs £54,000 per annum. (Some SEMH placements for children with more complex needs cost significantly more, up to £200,000 per annum, but these are young people who could not be retained in mainstream schools). Avoidance of one SEMH placement could therefore save approximately £54,000 per annum from the High Needs Budget. It is not possible to say at this stage how many SEMH placements might be avoided as a result of additional support for schools to help them meet the needs of children with SEMH.

Potential savings to be achieved through reduced ASD placements

4.12 Increasing the ASD Service to include some highly trained and experienced HLTAs will enable the service to be more responsive in cases where schools may need some more direct, practical support than the ASD Team is currently able to provide. The ASD Advisory Teachers currently have a consultative role and are unable to provide intensive support in schools as they have oversight of over 1,000 children. Being able to deploy an additional resource to support schools may help to avoid situations escalating to the point where the school feels unable to meet the child’s needs.

4.13 Children with ASD whose needs can no longer be met in mainstream schools would usually be considered for a place in a West Berkshire ASD Resource (attached to Theale Primary, Fir Tree Primary, Theale Green Secondary and Trinity Secondary schools). However, in some cases there may not be a place available in the relevant age group, or the child’s anxiety and behaviours may have escalated to such an extent that placement in a ASD Resource is not considered viable.

4.14 West Berkshire uses a variety of specialist placements for children with ASD whose needs can no longer be met in mainstream schools or schools with resourced units. There are currently 53 children with EHCPs attending special schools for children with ASD. Placements for ASD cost typically between £55,000 and £63,000 per annum. It is not possible to say at this stage how many ASD placements might be avoided as a result of additional support for schools to help them meet the needs of children with ASD.

Potential savings to be achieved through reduced Tribunal appeals for specialist dyslexia schools

4.15 Removal of LAL charges is expected to increase the number of children attending LAL to 48 per annum, the level of take up prior to charging being introduced. Since charging was introduced, and the number of children accessing LAL reduced, (currently down to 26), there has been an increase in appeals to the SEND Tribunal for placements in specialist schools for children with dyslexia. Currently 3 children attend such schools, with costs varying between £30,000 and £50,000 per annum.

Objective 2 of SEND Strategy: To develop the continuum of local provision for children with SEND, including MLD, ASD and SEMH

4.16 The main focus of Objective 2 of the SEND Strategy is to create new local provision for children with SEMH / ASD and for children with MLD. In both cases the provision would be attached to mainstream schools.

4.17 Planning work has started on the new SEMH/ASD provision, including proposed staffing models and accommodation briefs. A 12 place primary provision is planned and a 35 place secondary provision. Sites are now being sought for the primary and secondary provision. Opening dates will depend mainly on the scope of building / adaptation work required, once sites have been identified, and viable timescales within which this can happen. As soon as sites have been identified, project plans and timescales will be put in place. Agreement to the revenue costs of the new provision will need to be sought through the HFG and Schools Forum.

4.18 Savings which can be achieved will reflect the difference between the cost of a place in the new provision and the average cost of an equivalent external placement. Unit costs for the new provision are now available based on the proposed staffing models. Work is now being undertaken to determine non staffing costs of the provision in order to identify full placement costs.

4.19 When the new provision is operating at full capacity it should yield some significant savings in the High Needs Block. However, it should be noted that the provision will need to grow in size slowly by admitting a relatively small number of pupils per year, so in the initial stages the unit cost of a place will be disproportionately high and may not be less than the cost of an equivalent external placement.

4.20 The creation of MLD provision in mainstream schools is intended to take pressure off our West Berkshire maintained special schools, Brookfields and The Castle, and to provide parents with a mainstream option, rather than making cost savings. The children who will attend the new MLD provision would otherwise attend our maintained special schools and it is not anticipated that their costs would be lower in the new provision, therefore this development should be cost neutral and will not make savings. It should, however, help to ensure that children with MLD are able to

access specialist provision more promptly than is currently possible due to pressure on our special schools.

Objective 3 of SEND Strategy: To improve the post 16 SEND offer in the local area for young people with SEND and increase their access to employment

4.21 The Children and Families Act 2014 introduced a new right for young people with EHCPs to remain in post 16 provision potentially up to the age of 25, where there are educational outcomes still to be achieved. Under previous legislation, young people with Statements of Special Educational Needs did not remain in FE College beyond the age of 22 years. The SEND Code of Practice gives very little guidance on circumstances in which placement up to age 25 may be justifiable. This change in legislation has led to a local and national pressure for young people with SEND to remain in college much longer than previously, which has in turn placed cost pressures on the High Needs Block.

4.22 In some cases it is very appropriate for young people to remain in college beyond the age of 22 and even up to the age of 25 in a small number of cases. However, some young people have been staying in college longer than would have been necessary if they had been able to access courses which were more suitable in terms of preparing them for employment.

4.23 Newbury College has been working closely with the Local Authority to develop its Post 16 offer for young people with SEND to align it to the SEND Strategy and in particular the ambition to get more young people with SEND in to employment. The new range of courses will be launched in September 2020 and will have a strong focus on employment.

4.24 The Local Authority has also worked with West Berkshire Training Consortium and The Castle School to develop a new one year Supported Internship course, WOW Plus, aimed at getting young people with SEND in to employment at the end of the course. This course opened in September 2019 and the first cohort of 4 students will hopefully achieve employment by summer 2020.

4.25 In addition, West Berkshire Council continues to commission a supported employment service for young people aged 16 to 25. This service works with young people with EHCPs in mainstream and special schools to help them to access and sustain employment.

4.26 The long term aim is that young people with EHCPs in West Berkshire who are capable of employment will have high quality support to help them to access employment as soon as they are ready to do so, so that they do not spend time completing courses which are not leading to a meaningful outcome. We are already starting to see a reduction in the number of FE college places being funded which could in part be related to more young people with EHCPs accessing employment.

4.27 The saving achieved as a result of one young person leaving college to be employed rather than continuing at college would average at £16,000 including top up costs and place funding.

Objective 4 of SEND Strategy: To improve transition to adulthood, in particular in relation to Social Care and Health Services

4.28 The focus of Objective 4 of the SEND Strategy is to ensure processes are in place to allow smooth transitions from children's to adult services for young people with SEND. This is to ensure that young people do not have to wait for, or potentially miss out on, the adult services they need from Health and Social Care. Objective 4 also seeks to change the way adult services are provided so that they become more personalised to the individual and so that service users have more choice and control. In addition, Objective 4 seeks to improve the commissioning of adult services such as supported living so that needs in the local area are planned for more proactively.

4.29 This section of the SEND Strategy aims to improve the experience of transitioning to adulthood for young people with SEND. We want families to become more confident in transition processes and the support which will be available locally for young people with SEND as they enter adulthood, so that there is less demand for placements in specialist residential FE Colleges. Such placements can cost anything from £50,000 to £150,000 depending on the young person's needs. Any residential costs of such placements would fall to Adult Social Care but the educational component of placement costs is a charge to the HNB budget.

Objective 5 of SEND Strategy: To improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of children with SEND

4.30 Objective 5 of the SEND Strategy aims to improve access to health services for children and young people with SEND, including access to support whilst families are waiting for services (eg. ASD assessments by CAMHS). This part of the strategy also aims to improve support for parents and carers of children with SEND so that their own health and wellbeing is supported and they are better able to meet their children's needs.

4.31 Children who require a very high level of personal care sometimes need to be placed in residential placements because parents have reached a point where they are no longer able to care for their children effectively or safely. This can happen because of the pressures of the caring role and the impact this can have on the physical and mental wellbeing of carers. Parents / carers would always be provided with support by the Disabled Children's Team, in order to help them to continue with their caring role, but in some cases children can no longer be cared for at home in spite of a high level of support being provided. If children in these circumstances cannot be placed in a foster home, they will either be placed in a children's home near to their current school or a residential school. As there are few children's homes which can cater for children with significant disabilities, it is more likely that placements will be made in residential schools. In these circumstances, the residential cost would fall to Children's Social Care but the educational costs would be a charge on the HNB.

4.32 It is likely that there will always be a small number of children who require residential placement because their needs are so extreme that parents are unlikely to be able to support them at home beyond adolescence. However, increased support for parents / carers of disabled children may help to reduce or delay residential placements. It is difficult to generalise about the cost of such placements as they can vary significantly depending on the child's needs.

5. Options for Consideration

5.1 Not applicable.

6. Proposals

6.1 See above.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The SEND Strategy aims to provide high quality support for children and young people with SEND as cost effectively as possible. Objective 1 of the Strategy, in particular, seeks to support schools to meet the needs of children with SEND so as to prevent exclusions and reduce specialist placements. It is not possible at this stage to anticipate how many exclusions or specialist placements may be prevented as a result of the additional support being made available to schools, but this will be closely monitored. A more detailed report will be brought to the HFG and Schools Forum in June.

8. Consultation and Engagement

9. Appendices

9.1 None.

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

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum
On: 9th March 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.

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

3. Introduction

3.1 The 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 final agreed block transfer of 0.25% reduced 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 has been agreed that the remaining shortfall of £49k will be 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 currently 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). The 0.25% schools block transfer will 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
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

Growth Fund 2019/20 Payments

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum
On: 9th March 2020
Report Author: Melanie Ellis
Item for: Information **By:** All School representatives

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To inform School Forum Members of payments made to schools from the Growth Fund in 2019/20.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the payments made to schools.

<b style="color: #008080;">Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------	---

3. Introduction

- 3.1 Growth funding is within the Local Authorities' Schools Block national funding formula allocations. For 2019/20, growth funding was allocated by the Department for Education using a new formulaic approach based on lagged growth data.
- 3.2 The purpose of the growth fund is to support maintained schools and Academies which are *required* to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority, and to meet the cost of new and reorganised schools including pre-opening and diseconomy costs. It can also fund schools where very limited pupil number growth requires an additional class *as set out by infant class size regulations*. It cannot be used for general growth in pupil numbers.
- 3.3 The growth fund is also to support new schools with pre-opening costs and diseconomies of scale. We have a commitment to pay for the opening of the new school Highwood Copse.
- 3.4 Following the receipt of the final October 2019 Census data, all schools were invited to make a funding request if they felt that their circumstances met the growth fund criteria. To support their applications, schools were asked to submit information regarding increases in class and teacher numbers between the two academic years. Only growth in relation to basic need requirements in the area (and thus increases in

Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2018/19

PAN or bulge years approved by the local authority for this purpose) qualifies for this funding.

4. Budget and Payments Made 2019/20

- 4.1 The current balance of the growth fund is £183k. It has been agreed by Schools' Forum that any unspent balance will be carried forward and added to next year's growth fund, to ensure that there is enough funding being built up for 2020/21 in order to provide funding for the new primary school, Highwood Copse, when it is planned to be opened in September 2020
- 4.2 Only one school applied for growth funding: Kennet School Academies Trust. The school met the Growth Fund criteria and the relevant payment of £50k has been approved by the Head of Education (the detailed calculations are in Appendix A). This will reduce the growth fund to £133k.

5. Appendices

Appendix A – Growth Fund Calculations 2019/20

Appendix A

Growth Fund Calculation 2019/20

SECONDARY ACADEMY APPLICATION									
SECONDARY SCHOOL NAME:		Kennet School Academies Trust - Kennet							
Please tick the box that forms the basis of your application									
a) Extra class in September to meet basic need								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Increase in Admission number in September by 5 or more to meet basic need								<input type="checkbox"/>	
Year Group:	Pupil Numbers			No. of Classes			No. of Teachers FTE		
	Oct-19	Oct-18	Change	Oct-19	Oct-18	Change	Oct-19	Oct-18	Change
Year 7	331	301	30	11.0	10.0	1.0	17.1	15.3	1.9
Year 8	302	298	4	10.0	10.0	0.0	15.3	15.3	0.0
Year 9	297	285	12	10.0	10.0	0.0	15.6	15.8	-0.2
Year 10	273	285	-12	10.0	10.0	0.0	17.4	17.4	-0.1
Year 11	281	282	-1	10.0	10.0	0.0	17.5	18.1	-0.6
TOTAL All Classes	1,484	1,451	33	51.0	50.0	1.0	82.9	81.9	1.0
Classes Required (assuming 30 pupils per class)									
Total	50	49	1						
Funding Options:	No.	Rate	Funding	No. Mths	Payment	Max Payable	per class:		
Extra class KS3	30	£4,157	124,710	12	£124,710	£50,000			
or									
Extra class KS4		£4,719	0	12	£0	£50,000			
or									
Increase in PAN		£2,079	0	12	£0	£25,000			
Reason for funding approved or for not meeting criteria:							Funding Approved		
LA requested a bulge class							£50,000		

Deficit Schools Update

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum
On: 9th March 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.

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. 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 Nine Budget Monitoring and Forecast report, which have been reviewed by Schools Accountancy and feedback emailed to each school. The Period Nine submissions are shown in the table below with three schools in a better financial position and one in a worse position than budgeted.

School	Main School Budget (MSB) Only		
	2019/20 Budgeted Year-end balance	2019/20 P9 Forecast Year-end balance	Variance
	A £	B £	B-A = C £
Beenham Primary	(24,060)	(35,321)	(11,261)
St Finians Primary	(77,150)	(50,291)	+26,859
Westwood Farm Inf & Jnr	(13,940)	18,443	+32,383
The Willink Secondary	(2,210)	5,524	+7,734

Figures in red brackets indicate a deficit

4. Schools ending 2018/19 with an unlicensed deficit

Two schools ended the financial year 2018/19 with unlicensed deficits. Both schools submitted their Period Nine Budget Monitoring and Forecast report, which have been reviewed by Schools Accountancy and feedback emailed to each school. The Period Nine submissions are shown in the table below with one school forecasting to end 2019/20 in a worse financial position than budgeted, but both schools forecasting no deficit. Both schools are receiving support from Schools Accountancy.

School	Main School Budget (MSB) Only		
	2019/20 Budget – Year-end balance	2019/20 P9 Forecast - Year-end balance	Variance
	A £	B £	B-A = C £
Stockcross Primary	1,525	7,234	+5,709
Welford & Wickham	3,440	2,139	(1,301)

Figures in red brackets indicate a deficit

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

One secondary and six primary schools (including a federation) have informed West Berkshire Council they now expect to end the financial year 2019/20 with an unlicensed deficit. This position will be monitored through until year end.

6. Budget Monitoring and Forecast Submission Dates

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.

Agresso Report	Budget Monitoring	Forecasting	Submission deadline
Period 11 / February	Yes	Yes	13/03/20

Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2019/20 – Month Ten

Report being considered by:	Schools' Forum		
On:	9 th March 2020		
Report Author:	Ian Pearson		
Item for:	Information	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(s)

- 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.

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

3. Background

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring fenced specific grant which can only be spent on school/pupil activity as set out in The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018. 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. Month Ten Forecast (31 January 2020)

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

Table 1 - DSG Block forecast	Original Budget 2019/20	Budget Changes	Amended Budget 2019/20	Quarter One Forecast	Quarter Two Forecast	Quarter Three Forecast	Month Ten Forecast	Month Ten 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	10,265	453
Early Years Block Deficit Rec Target	(215)	0	(215)	0	0	0	0	215
Central School Services Block	972	0	972	972	972	967	924	(49)
High Needs Block	19,793	0	19,793	19,793	19,416	19,927	19,891	99
High Needs Block Deficit Rec Target	(1,650)	0	(1,650)	0	0	0	0	1,650
Total Block Expenditure	93,505	(1,163)	92,342	95,370	94,993	94,479	94,710	2,368
Support Service Recharges	444	0	444	444	444	444	444	0
Total Expenditure	93,949	(1,163)	92,786	95,814	95,437	94,923	95,154	2,368
Funded by:								
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
Net In-year Deficit	0	0	0	1,864	1,488	2,137	2,368	2,368
Deficit Balance in reserves	100	26	126	126	126	126	126	126
Cumulative Deficit	100	26	126	1,990	1,614	2,263	2,494	2,494

5.1 The Month Ten forecast shows an in-year forecast deficit of £2.3m, comprising £503k 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 £2.5m.

6. Reserves Forecast

The total deficit balance on reserves at 31.3.2019 was £100k. After in-year reserves movements and the Month Ten position, the forecast deficit reserve at 31.3.2020 is £2.5m.

Reserve Balances (surplus)/deficit	31.3.2019	Use of reserves	1.4.2019	M10 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Schools Block	(642)		(642)	0	(642)
Early Years Block	247		247	668	915
Central School Services Block	(26)	26	0	(49)	(49)
High Needs Block	521		521	1,749	2,270
Total Deficit Balance	100	26	126	2,368	2,494

7. Schools Block

7.1 There are no forecast variances within the Schools block at Month Ten. 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	M10 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)
Total Surplus Balance	(642)	0	0	(642)

8. Early Years Block

8.1 The Early Years Block is forecasting a £668k overspend at Month Ten, comprising a £215k in-year deficit and a £453k 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	M10 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Early Years Block	247		247	668	915

9. Central Schools Services Block

9.1 The Central School Services Block is currently forecasting an underspend of £49k at Month Ten. 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	M10 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Central School Services Block	(26)	26	0	(49)	(49)

10. High Needs Block

10.1 The High Needs Block is currently reporting a £99k overspend against in-year expenditure, which with the £1.6m deficit recovery target, totals a £1.7m forecast 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	M10 position	31.3.2020 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
High Needs Block	521		521	1,749	2,270

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The DSG is forecasting an in-year overspend of £2.3m, comprising £503k against in-year expenditure and a £1.8m deficit recovery target which remains unallocated at Month Ten. 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 – Month Ten

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 10							
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	
	Schools Block Total	64,793,500	-1,163,440	63,630,060	63,630,060	0	
90583	National Copyright Licences	136,330		136,330	136,770	440	
90019	Servicing of Schools Forum	42,350		42,350	39,950	-2,400	
90743	School Admissions	210,030		210,030	187,030	-23,000	
90354	ESG - Education Welfare	194,020		194,020	177,020	-17,000	
90460	ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	389,680		389,680	382,800	-6,880	
	Central School Services Block DSG	972,410	0	972,410	923,570	-48,840	

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2019/2020 Budget Monitoring Month 10

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	938,113	20,203	
90037	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	1,323,980		1,323,980	1,650,421	326,441	
90036	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	6,344,850		6,344,850	6,326,863	-17,987	
90052	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	131,460		131,460	188,375	56,915	
90053	Disability Access Fund	23,370		23,370	16,000	-7,370	
90018	2 year old funding	652,970		652,970	756,825	103,855	
90017	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	266,300		266,300	233,300	-33,000	saving on Capita One system and staff vacancy
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	60,690		60,690	60,690	0	
90238	Early Years Inclusion Fund	90,000		90,000	94,000	4,000	
90054	Deficit Budget	-214,515		-214,515	0	214,515	
	Early Years Block Total	9,597,015	0	9,597,015	10,264,588	667,573	
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 10

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	
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	70,000	-30,000	
90628	EHCP PRU Placement	331,400		331,400	497,520	166,120	
High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total		13,736,060	0	13,736,060	13,839,540	103,480	
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	
High Needs Block: Place Funding Total		3,754,000	0	3,754,000	3,754,000	0	
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	317,660	-8,000	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	23,740	-4,500	
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 10

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	22,000	-14,000	
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	
High Needs Block: Non Top Up or Place Funding		2,302,650	0	2,302,650	2,297,800	-4,850	
90054	DSG Deficit Recovery Target	-1,650,138		-1,650,138	0	1,650,138	
High Needs Block Total		18,142,572	0	18,142,572	19,891,340	1,748,768	
Total Expenditure across funding bocks		93,505,497	-1,163,440	92,342,057	94,709,558	2,367,501	
SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES		444,000	0	444,000	444,000	0	
TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE		93,949,497	-1,163,440	92,786,057	95,153,558	2,367,501	
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	
NET DSG EXPENDITURE		0	0	0	2,367,501	2,367,501	

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank