

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum

Monday, 7th December, 2020 at 5.00pm

This meeting will be held in a virtual format in accordance with The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 (“the Regulations”)

The Council will be live streaming its meetings.

This meeting will be streamed live here: www.westberks.gov.uk/schoolsforumlive

You can view all streamed Council meetings here:
<https://www.westberks.gov.uk/councilmeetingslive>

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 1 December 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, 7 December 2020 (continued)

Forum Members: Reverend Mark Bennet, Dominic Boeck, Jonathon Chishick, Catie Colston (Vice-Chair), Jacquie Davies, Antony Gallagher, Richard Hawthorne, Keith Harvey, Jon Hewitt, Brian Jenkins, Hilary Latimer, Sheila Loy, Ross Mackinnon, Maria Morgan, Julia Mortimore, Ian Nichol, Janet Patterson, Gemma Piper, Chris Prosser, David Ramsden, Campbell Smith, Graham Spellman (Chair), Jayne Steele and Charlotte Wilson

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| 1 | Apologies | |
| 2 | Minutes of previous meeting dated 19th October 2020
The minutes of the meeting held on the 19th October 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman. | 1 - 12 |
| 3 | Actions arising from previous meetings
It was noted that all actions were completed or in hand. | 13 - 14 |
| 4 | Declarations of Interest | |
| 5 | Membership | |

Items for Decision

- | | | |
|---|--|---------|
| 6 | Final School Funding Formula 2021/22 (Melanie Ellis) | 15 - 18 |
| 7 | Budgets and Criteria for Additional Funds 2021/22: High needs (Melanie Ellis) | 19 - 20 |
| 8 | De-delegations 2021/22 (Ian Pearson/Melanie Ellis) | 21 - 58 |

Items for Discussion

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 9 | Update on RPA For Schools (Leah Rinaldi) | 59 - 62 |
| 10 | DSG Funding Settlement Budget Overview 2021/22 (Melanie Ellis) | 63 - 66 |



Agenda - Schools Forum to be held on Monday, 7 December 2020 *(continued)*

11	Draft Central Schools Block Budget 2021/22 (Melanie Ellis)	67 - 72
12	Draft High Needs Budget 2021/22 (Jane Seymour)	73 - 88
13	Outline Early Years Forecast 2020/21 (Avril Allenby)	89 - 92
14	Financial Impact of Covid19 on the Early Years Block (Avril Allenby)	93 - 96

Items for Information

15	Scheme for Financing Schools (Melanie Ellis)	97 - 98
16	DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 7 (Ian Pearson)	99 - 106
17	Forward Plan	107 - 108
18	Date of the next meeting <i>Monday 25th January 2021 on Zoom</i>	

Sarah Clarke
Service Director: Strategy and Governance

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, 19 OCTOBER 2020

Present: Reverend Mark Bennet (Church of England Diocese), Councillor Dominic Boeck (Executive Portfolio: Children, Young People and Education), Jonathon Chishick (Maintained Primary School Governor), Catie Colston (Maintained Primary School Governor), Jackie Davies (Pupil Referral Unit Headteacher), Antony Gallagher (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Keith Harvey (Maintained Primary School Headteacher), Jon Hewitt (Maintained Special School Headteacher), Lee Hunt (Post 16 Representative Substitute), 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 and Economic Development), Maria Morgan (Maintained Nursery School Headteacher), Julia Mortimore (Academy School Headteacher), Ian Nichol (Maintained Primary School Governor), Gemma Piper (Academy School Headteacher), Chris Prosser (Maintained Secondary School Headteacher), David Ramsden (Maintained Secondary School Headteacher), Graham Spellman (Roman Catholic Diocese) and Charlotte Wilson (Academy School Headteacher)

Also Present: Alice Pye (Senior Health and Safety Advisor), Avril Allenby (Early Years' Service Manager), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer), Melanie Ellis (Chief Accountant), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Services), Lisa Potts (Finance Manager), Jane Seymour (Service Manager, SEN & Disabled Children's Team), Moira Fraser (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager) and Michelle Sancho (Principal EP & Service Manager)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Janet Patterson and Jayne Steele

PART I

25 Election of Chairman

Ian Pearson opened the meeting. Members of the Schools' Forum had been notified that Bruce Steiner, Chairman of the Schools' Forum, had stood down from his role as a Governor and as Chairman of the Forum. Ian Pearson reported that a letter had been sent to Bruce Steiner thanking him for his service on behalf of the Forum.

Ian Pearson invited the Schools' Forum to nominate and vote on the position of Chairman for the coming year.

RESOLVED that Graham Spellman would be Chairman of the Schools' Forum for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

Graham Spellman invited the Schools' Forum to nominate and vote on the position of Vice-Chairman for the coming year.

RESOLVED that Catie Colston would be Vice-Chairman of the Schools' Forum for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

26 Minutes of previous meeting dated 13th July 2020

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13th July were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27 Actions arising from previous meetings

The Chairman drew the Schools' Forum's attention to the actions for the last meeting on 13th July 2020. All actions were completed or were in hand.

28 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

29 Membership

Jessica Bailiss provided the following Membership updates:

- Chris Prosser's current term of office was due to end and the end of October 2020. Chris had consulted with maintained secondary heads and had confirmed that he would continue for a further four year term.
- An election was undertaken for the maintained secondary governor vacancy from September into October 2020 however, no nominations were received.
- An election would be arranged to fill the Academy Governor vacancy.
- No other forum members were approaching the end of their term of office at that time.

30 Schools Funding Formula Proposal 2021/22 (Melanie Ellis)

Melanie Ellis stated that the main report was brief and the full detail could be found in the consultation document under Appendix A, which would go out to all schools for consultation. The Government was still planning to move to a hard funding formula and when this happened the Government would set the school funding rates rather than the Local Authority.

There were two technical changes for 2021/22. The formula funding would now include the Teachers Pay Grant and Pension Employer Contribution Grant, so these would not be received separately.

Melanie Ellis reported that there had been a 4% increase in funding overall and the main change involved sparsity funding. Sparsity funding had increased from £26k to £45k for primary schools. Local Authorities would continue to be able to transfer up to 0.5% of their schools block to other blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), with approval from the Schools' Forum.

The option to lower the amount of sparsity funding received by eligible schools and allocate the remaining funding across all primary schools had been included as a question within the consultation document. In December 2020, decisions would be required from the Schools' Forum regarding how any shortfalls or surpluses should be dealt with.

The consultation also included a question regarding the de-delegation of particular services. All the consultation proposals could be viewed on page 23 of Appendix A.

Jonathan Chishick stated that he had raised a question earlier in December 2019 regarding certain schools having to deal with a disproportionate number of children with Special Education Needs that did not have an Education, Health and Care Plan. He had asked whether this issue could be factored into the funding formula going forward. Ian Pearson reported that this matter had been discussed at the last Heads Funding Group (HFG) and a report had been provided by Jane Seymour. It had been given serious consideration however, decided by the group that it would place further pressure on the

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

High Needs Block (HNB). Jonathan Chishick was satisfied that the issue had been discussed and asked for a copy of the report that had gone to the HFG.

Gemma Piper referred to the transfer of funds to the HNB and queried if there was any additional information yet regarding how this money would be used. Ian Pearson reported that if a transfer was agreed it could be used to either cover some of the deficit or alternately it could be used for invest to save projects. If a transfer was agreed, the amount that could be transferred would also need to be decided. Gemma Piper queried if the consultation was asking if schools were happy to consider a transfer or if they were happy to commit to a transfer amount of 0.5%. Ian Pearson confirmed that at this stage schools were being asked more broadly if they supported the notion of a transfer. Further detail and options would then be brought to the next HFG in November 2020.

David Ramsden explained that in 2019 it had been felt that a transfer of 0.5% had been too much. He would support a continuation of a 0.25% transfer as had been agreed in 2019. It was felt that different options should be included as part of the consultation. Melanie Ellis confirmed that this could be included.

The Chairman invited the relevant members of the Forum to consider the proposal under section 2.1 of the report. This was proposed by David Ramsden, seconded by Jonathan Chishick and at the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that:

- Different A copy of the report that went to the Heads' Funding Group regarding schools under pressure due to high numbers of children with SEN, be sent to Jonathan Chishick.
- Funding transfer options from the schools block, to be included within the consultation with schools.
- All school members of the Schools' Forum including the PVI representative agreed the recommendation under section 2.1 of the report, that the consultation be undertaken with all schools before setting the school funding formula for 2021/22.

31 Additional Funding Criteria 2021/22 (Melanie Ellis)

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 8), which set out the proposed budgets for additional funds for 2021/22 and to agree the criteria for accessing these funds to go out to consultation with all schools.

Melanie Ellis referred to the recommendations within the report and suggested that the Schools' Forum consider the funds under section 3 a, b and d of the report and that the Schools' in Financial Difficulty Funding (section 3d) be considered as part of Item 10 (Delegations report).

Melanie Ellis reported that the information included within the report linked to the previous report on the Schools' Funding Formula and that agreement was being sought for the information to be included as part of the consultation with schools. The proposals were included in detail under section four of the report. Melanie Ellis reported that it was not being proposed that the Falling Rolls Fund should be reinstated.

Jonathan Chishick noted that funding for schools with disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils had been underspent in 2018/19 and 2019/20 and queried why this money had not been spent. He was surprised that there was not a need to increase this fund in line with inflation. Melanie Ellis reported that she would look into this and carry out an analysis and report back.

Reverend Mark Bennet queried why the Growth Fund was be allowed to increase year on year. Melanie Ellis reported that Growth Funding was allocated to local authorities by the Department for Education (DfE). Reverend Bennet queried if there was any intention

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

to use the funding. Melanie Ellis reported that any under or overspends of the Growth Fund formed part of Dedicated School Grant (DSG) balances. Bids had not yet been requested to Growth Fund for 2020/21 however, more information would be available on this by the end of the year.

Catie Colston referred to section 4.1(a) and noted that the Growth Fund was based on the growth in pupil numbers, which was taken from school census information. Catie Colston queried whether Covid had the potential to impact on this. Ian Pearson reported that the Department for Education (DfE) had produced guidance on this and there had been an allowance based on Covid absences to ensure schools were not negatively impacted on. The same principle was applied to free school meals.

Ian Pearson commented on the high costs associated with opening new schools and added that the Growth Fund had been allowed to strategically grow in anticipation of these costs. This was explained in more detail under section 4.1(a) of the report.

The Chairman invited the relevant Members of the Forum to consider the recommendation under section two of the report.

Catie Colton proposed that the Schools' Forum agree recommendation 2.1 and this was seconded by Antony Gallagher. At the vote the motion was carried.

Jonathan Chishick proposed that the Schools' Forum agree recommendation 2.2 and this was seconded by Jon Hewitt. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that:

- Melanie Ellis would look into underspends in funding for schools with disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils and report back at the next meeting.
- The Schools Forum agreed recommendation 2.1 that the proposed budgets for additional funds (the Growth Fund (a) and Funding for schools with disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils (c)) for 2021/22 as set out in section 2.1 of the report (The Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund (b) would be considered under agent item 10).
- The Schools' Forum agreed recommendation 2.2 that the criteria for additional funds go out to consultation with all schools.

32 Scheme for Financing Schools 2020/21 (Melanie Ellis)

Melanie Ellis introduced the report which sought to approve the proposed consultation on the updated Scheme for Financing Schools.

Melanie Ellis reported that it was an annual report that required approval from the Schools' Forum on the proposed consultation. Appendix A to the report set out the changes that had been made to the Scheme for Financing Schools. It was proposed that the updated document should go out to consultation for three weeks from 21st October until 11th November 2020 and that the updated Scheme was in place from 1st April 2021.

Catie Colston referred to page 48 of the agenda pack, which highlighted some of the changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools. Catie Colston drew attention to the directed revision under paragraph 2.3.1; Submission of financial forecasts, which stated that 'From the 2021 to 2022 funding year each school must submit a 3-year budget forecast' Catie Colston queried if schools would have enough information to do this. Melanie Ellis reported that the section referred to was a directed revision and therefore had to be adopted. Schools would however, be supported with this.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

Catie Colston noted the section on redundancies was being removed however, queried why there was nothing to replace it. Melanie Ellis believed that the missing information was an error and not a material change.

The Chairman invited the relevant members of the Schools' Forum to consider the recommendation under section 2.1 of the report. Chris Prosser proposed that the recommendation be agreed and this was seconded by David Ramsden. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that all maintained school members of the Schools' Forum agreed that the updated Scheme for Financing Schools go out to consultation in line with the recommendation under section 2.1.

33 De-delegations 2021/22 (Lisa Potts)

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 10) which set out the details, 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 reported that the proposals for de-delegations aligned to that of previous years and included the same areas.

Ian Pearson reported that at this stage a decision was required on whether the information should be included within the consultation with schools. Decisions would then be required from maintained primary and secondary schools at the next Schools' Forum meeting in December 2020, on whether the services should be de-delegated. Other provision such as iCollege, nursery schools and special schools would have the opportunity to buy in to services. Most services were also available to academy schools. The report set out detail on each of the services including any changes in cost.

(Richard Hawthorne left the meeting at 6pm)

Information on the Health and Safety Services was set out in more detail on page 121 and Alice Pye, Senior Health and Safety Advisor at West Berkshire Council, was in attendance to answer any questions.

Jonathan Chishick asked for clarification on whether there would be a basic and enhanced level of health and safety service available in 2021/22 and queried what the cost of the basic level would be. Ian Pearson explained that the consultation would be asking schools for views on whether they wished to delegate the health and safety service and secondly what level they wished to delegate it at. Once the responses from schools had been analysed this information would be brought back to the Schools' Forum for decision.

In response to Jonathan Chishick's question Alice Pye confirmed that there would be two levels of health and safety service available. The system currently in place was a Level 1 and Level 2 service and this would be included in the proposal going out for consultation with schools. The second proposal was to bring the service to an equal level, like what had been provided throughout the Covid pandemic. Alice Pye confirmed that the cost for the Level 1 service in 2021/22 was £4.47 and if a joint service was opted for then the cost would be the same as the Level 1 service with a top up fee depending on the size of a school.

David Ramsden commented that there had been much discussion about the health and safety service over the years and in the past schools had been provided with the choice to buy in to the level of service they wanted. David Ramsden queried what had changed to stop the same approach being taken. Alice Pye reported that the service had run at a loss over several years and was sustained by the level of Level 2 buy back. When the level of buy back dropped, the level of service dropped considerably. During Covid the decision had been taken to provide all schools with the Level 2 service as schools

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

needed this additional support in the changing situation. If in April 2021, if the level of buy back dropped, the level of service provided would also have to reduce. Providing an equal level to all schools would help to sustain the service so that it continue to provide the level of service that schools had required during the Covid pandemic.

David Ramsden queried if it was therefore a question of how many schools currently buying into Level 1 would be willing to buy into Level 2. Alice Pye stated that this was not necessarily the case as the level of schools buying into Level 2 changed each year due to individual budget pressures. Alice Pye was conscious of the budgetary pressures on all schools going forward and therefore the increased likeliness that many would cut spending going forward. There was still a corporate responsibility to provide the service to schools but a balance needed to be sought regarding what level schools required. Covid had highlighted that all schools required additional support through exceptional circumstances.

David Ramsden queried how the heightened level of service to all schools had been funded. Alice Pye confirmed that this had been supported through schools that had bought back the Level 2 service.

Ian Pearson reminded members of the Forum that the proposals would be included in the consultation with schools. Any issues that occurred would be discussed at the Heads Funding Group in November before the report returned to the Schools' Forum in December 2020.

The Chairman invited the relevant members of the Forum to consider the recommendations set out in the report and also invited primary school members to consider whether they agreed that the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund should be topped up to £200k.

Jon Hewitt proposed that the recommendation under section 2.1 of the report be agreed and this was seconded by Antony Gallagher. At the vote the motion was carried.

Keith Harvey proposed that the recommendation to agree that the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund should be topped up to £200k, be approved. This was seconded by Antony Gallagher. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that:

- Maintained school members of the Schools' Forum agreed that the proposals set out in Table 7 of the report be included in the consultation with schools.
- Maintained primary school members of the Schools' Forum agreed that the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund should be topped up to £200k.

34 A long term view of HNB Budget and impact of the SEN Strategy (Jane Seymour)

Jane Seymour introduced the report (Agenda Item 11) which provided an indication of the savings opportunities arising from the SEND Strategy 2018/23 and sought approval in principle for continued resourcing of the SEND Strategy Officer post, the Therapeutic Thinking Officer post, the ASD Team posts and the increased Vulnerable Children's Grant, as there were deemed essential to achieve long term savings in the High Needs Block (HNB).

Jane Seymour reported that she had been requested to provide a report that attempted to project savings going forward as a result of implementation of the SEND Strategy. The report set out each of the objectives within the SEND Strategy and assessed potential cost savings associated with each one. The report included background to the SEND Strategy, which had been in place for two years. The aim of the Strategy was to provide the best possible services with children with SEND as locally as possible and to improve

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

life outcomes. Services also needed to be provided in a cost effective way and this was a theme throughout the Strategy.

The report looked at each of the objectives within the Strategy in detail and attempted to make assumptions about savings for each one. The detail on this was set out from page 137 of the report.

Page 147 of the report included a table, which detailed the total potential savings for the High Needs Block (HNB) if all the measures set out section four of the report were taken over the seven year period of the SEND Strategy. The total estimated reduction in spend, as a result of implementing the Strategy over the seven years was £1.7 million. Jane Seymour explained that this would only be a net reduction if demand across other areas of the HNB was retained and everything remained the same. It however, had to be considered that there could be continued growth in pressure against other areas of the budget.

Jane Seymour reported it would be recommended as part of the budget setting process for the HNB that invest to save initiatives, which had been originally been agreed for one year, should be allowed to continue. These were critical to reducing spend. A more detailed report on the HBN budget including proposals, would be brought to the next meeting of the Schools' Forum in December 2020.

Jane Seymour drew attention to the recommendation under section 2.2 of the report, which was seeking agreement to make the SEND Strategy Officer a permanent post. The position was currently recruited to on a three year basis. The current post holder was leaving for a permanent role and Jane Seymour stressed that it was particularly difficult to recruit and retain staff for short term posts. The role was critical to driving the Strategy forward and achieving savings.

Hilary Latimer referred to Jane Seymour's recommendation to make the SEND Strategy Officer a permanent position and queried if there would be any employment law implications involved in the matter. Jane Seymour confirmed that the current member of staff had been seconded from a permanent role within the authority and although was leaving because the post was short term, they did have a permanent substantive role to return to.

Gemma Piper noted that the item was titled 'a long term view of the High Needs Block (HNB) and impact of the SEN Strategy' and noted that the SEND Strategy was just an element of the HNB. She queried how the savings achieved by the SEND Strategy would sit within the wider plan for the HNB. Ian Pearson commented that the budget monitoring report later on the agenda highlighted that the deficit was in excess of £1.7m potential saving referred to by Jane Seymour, which could possibly be achieved through implementation of the strategy. Ian Pearson reported that West Berkshire was in a similar situation to many other local authority areas regarding the HNB. This had been recognised by the Department for Education (DfE) and the struggles faced to bring budgets back into balance. As a result the DfE wanted to hold discussions with local authorities during 2020 about possible ways forward. Ian Pearson commented that one of the biggest issues faced was that the amount of money coming through the system was not enough and as a result of this being recognised by the DfE there had been an increase in SEN funding.

Ian Pearson explained that alongside invest to save proposals, historically a menu of saving options had been also formed. Cuts had been made significantly in the past. Recently focus had moved away from cutting services because it has been argued that some of the cuts implemented had been counterproductive. This signified the complexity of the area of work. In recent years the deficit had been driven by increased numbers of children requiring specialist provision, including an increase in children requiring

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Ian Pearson stated that some savings options would need to be brought to the next round of meetings in November/December. Ian Pearson added that there was the other issue of charging schools for particular services such as for Learning and Literacy support. This had been done in the past however, had resulted in decreased take-up of placements. All issues would need to be looked at collectively and possible ways to solve them.

Charlotte Wilson raised a question regarding HLTAs for ASD and the spend to save initiative for this area. She asked if recruitment was taking place for the teacher post as well or had the two ASD TAs replaced this post. Jane Seymour confirmed that the teacher role would be recruited too as well as the two ASD TA positions.

Charlotte Wilson raised a further query regarding resource unit funding. It was noted that this area had not been mentioned and she hoped that this would be included when the HNB was considered more generally. Ian Pearson confirmed that this would be included in discussions at the next round of meetings.

Finally Charlotte Wilson queried Therapeutic Thinking. She noted that this was detailed heavily in the SEND Strategy however, it had been highlighted at the secondary heads meeting that not all schools had bought into it and therefore this was a concern. In response to Charlotte Wilson's point, Michelle Sancho reported that even if schools had not bought into the Therapeutic Thinking approach or undertaken training they would be able to access funding available and therefore all schools were still able to benefit. In representing secondary heads, Charlotte Wilson stated that they would not be in support of a criteria that had to be met in order to access funding.

David Ramsden concurred with the points raised by Charlotte Wilson. The issue was that it was difficult to know how much to cut and by when and therefore it was difficult to put a deficit recovery plan in place. David Ramsden asked if there was any clarification from the DfE regarding how long discussions with local authority areas would take, otherwise a difficult situation was being faced as it was unknown how deep cuts needed to be made. Ian Pearson stated that it was currently unclear in terms of what would be expected however, it was hoped that there would be some answers by December however, it was possible that there would not be clarity in time for the next Heads Funding Group and Schools' Forum.

Ian Pearson further commented that in the past the approach taken had included giving consideration to areas that could deliver savings through investment and also looking at areas where potential savings could be made. A judgment would then need to be made on which of these approaches should be taken.

Gemma Piper queried if the proposals outlined in the report around savings would balance the budget in year for the SEND element of the HNB. Ian Pearson drew attention to the budget monitoring report where it could be seen the budget had been set for the current year and figures suggested that there was a £200k overspend against the deficit budget. Ian Pearson did not see that it would be possible to bring the budget back into balance for 2021/22. It would however, be possible to plan to reduce the deficit.

The Chairman invited member of the Forum to consider the recommendation under 2.2 of the report to make the SEND Strategy Officer a permanent position. Jon Hewitt proposed that this be agreed and this was seconded by Chris Prosser. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the recommendation under 2.2 of the report to make the SEND Strategy Officer a permanent position was agreed by the Schools' Forum.

35 Early Years Block Budget - Deficit Recovery Plan (Avril Allenby)

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

Avril Allenby introduced the report (Agenda Item 12) which sought to update the Schools' Forum on the deficit recovery options considered by the Early Years Funding Group.

Avril Allenby provided some background, which was detailed under section two of the report. Avril Allenby stressed that any plans for recovery would impact upon a very wide range of providers. The report provided background information on action taken so far including by the Early Years Funding Group (EYFG), which had explored a range of options, which were included under Appendix A to the report.

Section three of the report provided some information on the Early Years Budget for 2020/21. The current year forecast was showing a reduced deficit of £999,952 and the main reason for this was because of a higher than expected grant adjustment for the hours relating to 2019/20. Avril Allenby reported on the significant impact on the sector from Covid-19 including on vulnerable children, which was detailed under section four of the report.

Avril Allenby drew attention to recommendations from the EYFG included under section five of the report. This group included a large range of providers from across the early year's sector. Section five highlighted that the impact of Covid-19 had resulted in early evidence of financial difficulty for many early years providers with many being close to closure. The ongoing uncertainty was likely to further compound issues being faced. Therefore the recommendation from the EYFG was to apply a tapered reduction in rates with a lower impact on rates in the first two years increasing to meet the deficit over a five year period. The EYFG had proposed that Option 4 Version B be adopted because this option was fairly equal in terms of its impact and safeguarded funding for the most vulnerable children. The EYFG also recommended that the deficit recovery plan was delayed until April 2022 to ensure current providers could deal with the ongoing impact of Covid-19.

Avril Allenby drew attention to section six of the report, which reflected discussions that had taken place at the Heads' Funding Group (HFG). Avril Allenby highlighted that although the HFG was represented on the Schools' Forum there were limited representatives with early years classes attached to their schools.

The HFG had challenged the proposals put forward to delay the deficit recovery until April 2022 and had recommended that this be removed. The HFG had also suggested that further modelling work take place to ensure the full amount of the deficit was recovered by the end of the five year period. Comments from the HFG had been taken on board however Avril Allenby wanted this information to be presented to the next EYFG before returning to the Schools' Forum for agreement.

Avril Allenby concluded that further work was required to develop a suitable model that covered the deficit in full but also ensured that the impact on all types of provider was carefully considered to ensure no part of the sector was disadvantaged.

Maria Morgan reminded members of the Forum that in early years funding was attached to children's age rather than a cohort. Many early years settings were only full in the summer term and this funding often acted as a buffer for other times of the year when settings were not full, to help meet fixed staff costs. Many settings had lost private income normally generated in the summer, due to Covid-19. Also regarding the early years pupil premium funding, Maria Morgan raised the point that it worked differently in early years. Schools only had to apply for this once, whereas early years setting had to apply for this funding on a termly basis.

Ian Pearson commented that there had been a very in depth discussion on the item at the HFG. He referred to section six of the report, which detailed the recommendations of the HFG and these needed to be considered by the Forum in terms of agreeing a way forward.

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

Brian Jenkins felt that points raised were very valid however, stressed that the ongoing threat of Covid-19 to early years settings further exacerbated the issues already faced by the sector. Covid-19 was having a devastating impact on the early years sector.

Brian Jenkins felt that the recommendations under section 6.1 of the report were inappropriate and he urged that a different approach should be taken to give the PVI sector a chance of survival. He felt that the EYFG were better positioned to make recommendations regarding the sector than the HFG.

Ian Nichol commended the work that gone into the financial modelling and he supported a tapered approach, given the current economic situation. Ian Nichol noted the needs of vulnerable children that had been reported on and felt that an equalities impact assessment should accompany the final report that would be considered March 2020. He was concerned about the proposal for the HFG and concurred with Bryan Jenkins. Given the huge uncertainties and nature of the sector he felt to decide on a set of savings in March 2020 that needed to be implemented from April 2020 was inappropriate and there should be an opportunity for the sector to adjust to any decisions taken. Ian Nichol stated that he would also like to see a report on how the HFG had engaged with the sector in forming its recommendations.

Reverend Mark Bennet stated that it was hoped that Covid-19 was a short term issue however, it was acknowledged that the impact would be high. Reverend Bennet stated that he had been unaware that the level of support from The Government for the early sector had been so low. Catch-up funding had been mentioned however for vulnerable children it was known that crucial time was in the early years. He felt that there was a political point that need to be raised and suggested that elected Members who advised the Forum could lobby on the issue. It was also an issue that would impact on schools later on as children in early years moved into schools.

David Ramsden, as a member of the HFG explained that the group had undertaken a very detailed and robust discussion on the matter. The group was recommending that there was no delay in a budget deficit recovery for a year and a half. The HFG had suggested that the recovery begin and regular reviews be undertaken and did not feel it would be wise to delay deficit recovery until 2022. The HFG had been of the view that a sensible approach to deficit recovery overtime should be taken, which supported the sector but could also be adjusted accordingly.

Gemma Piper concurred with David Ramsden and had also formed part of the discussion at the HFG. Gemma Piper referred to comments made earlier in the meeting that there was uncertainty around how much needed to be saved by when.

Maria Morgan referred to the comments made by Reverend Bennet regarding Covid-19 and vulnerable children being affected. Early years was the gateway service into special needs The current waiting time for some services was 12 months and therefore some children might not be able to access support services until starting school. This highlighted the vastness of the impact in terms of how schools would be impacted on going forward.

In response comments made by David Ramsden, Brian Jenkins reported that the deficit for early years had reduced as highlighted in the report. This showed that the issue was ongoing and had been tackled. He was not requesting that efforts should stop in terms of achieving the deficit recovery position however, it would be wrong not to delay plans and allow the sector a fighting chance.

Ian Pearson reported that a decision was not required on the report currently. The root of the issue was how the sector was funded. The Government needed to look at funding for the early years sector and the impact on children moving through education. Ian Pearson highlighted that a decision on the deficit recovery plan was not necessarily

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

required at the next meeting of the Forum in December. The Early Years Budget was normally set in March. Given the volatile situation around Covid-19 and funding, Ian Pearson did not feel that they would be in a position to set the budget in December 2020. The EYFG needed to consider the recommendation from the HFG and put together a model that started the deficit recovery in April 2021. A counter model could however, be put together by the EYFG that begin in April 2022. Both models could then be presented to the Schools' Forum and a decision taken.

David Ramsden added that it had been made clear at the HFG and within the report that there did not need to be the same level of deficit recovery achieved in each year and it could be tapered. The HFG were however, keen that recovery efforts were not left until 2022.

Councillor Dominic Boeck noted that a political view had been sought. He sympathised with the challenges being faced by the sector and that funding for early years needed to improve. Local MP Laura Farris was keenly interested in education and particularly early years and Councillor Boeck confirmed that he would raise the issue with her. Councillor Boeck concurred with David Ramsden that there was a problem to face and work needed to commence on this as soon as possible.

The Chairman invited the Schools' Forum to consider whether it endorsed the proposals from the HFG.

RESOLVED that:

- Councillor Dominic Boeck to raise the issues discussed regarding the early years sector with Local MP Laura Farris.
- The Schools' Forum endorsed the proposals from the HFG that would be considered by the EYFG.

36 Contracts - Review of Energy Arrangements (Chris Harris/Karen Felgate)

Ian Pearson referred to the report for information (Agenda Item 13), which aimed to inform the Schools' Forum of the intention by the Council to review the current energy arrangements which would affect a number of schools and their energy provision. A report would be brought back to the Schools' Forum at a later stage.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

37 DSG Monitoring 2020/21 Month 6 (Ian Pearson)

Ian Pearson introduced the report (Agenda Item 14) that provided the forecast financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), highlighting any under or over spends, and to highlight the cumulative deficit on the DSG.

Ian Pearson reported that the key points were highlighted on page 161 of the report. The Early Years Block (EYB) was forecasting a £795k overspend in Quarter Two. This had reduced from £1.477m, so although there was still a deficit, this was positive.

Regarding the High Needs Block (HNB) there was a deficit deficiency target of £1.2m, which had been added to by an in-year overspend of £180k. The main variances in spending were included under section 9.1.

Melanie Ellis added that the deficits referred to were in-year positions and the accumulative deficit could be seen under 10.2 and the total forecast deficit on the DSG amounted to £3.9m.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

38 Deficit Schools (Melanie Ellis)

SCHOOLS FORUM - 19 OCTOBER 2020 - MINUTES

Melanie Ellis introduced the report (Agenda Item 15) which provided details of four schools which had submitted deficit budgets for 2020/21, one school that expected to recover its deficit position in 2020/21 and two schools which ended the 2019/20 financial years with unlicensed deficit balances.

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the report.

39 Forward Plan

RESOLVED that the Schools' Forum noted the Forward Plan.

40 Date of the next meeting

Monday 7th December 2020 at 5pm.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and closed at 7.20 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

Agenda Item 3

Actions from previous meeting

Ref No.	Date of meeting(s) raised	Item	Action	Responsible Officer	Comment / Update
Oct20-Ac1	19th October 2020	Schools Funding Formula Proposal 2021/22	A copy of the report that went to the Heads' Funding Group regarding schools under pressure due to high numbers of children with SEN, be sent to Jonathan Chishick.	Jessica Bailiss	Completed
Oct20-Ac2	19th October 2020	Schools Funding Formula Proposal 2021/22	Funding transfer options from the schools block, to be included within the consultation with schools.	Melanie Ellis	Completed
Oct20-Ac3	19th October 2020	Additional Funding Criteria 2021/22	Melanie Ellis would look into underspends in funding for schools with disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils and report back at the next meeting.	Melanie Ellis	The budget requirement has been revised from £100k to £40k in line with recent years spend and estimated requirement for 21/22.
Oct20-Ac4	19th October 2020	Early Years Block Budget - Deficit Recovery Plan	Councillor Dominic Boeck to raise the issues discussed regarding the early years sector with Local MP Laura Farris.	Councillor Dominic Boeck	Councillor Boeck spoke to Laura Farris MP who said she had already raised the matter with the Chancellor who was sympathetic to her concerns. Councillor Boeck is now working with Laura and Education to explore funding proposals for consideration by the Treasury.

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Funding Formula 2021/22

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

Item for: Decision **By:** All School Members and Early Years PVI Rep / All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To set out the results from the consultation with all schools on the proposed primary and secondary school funding formula for 2021/22 and to make a final decision.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Agree the following for setting the school funding formula for 2021/22, to go as a recommendation for political ratification:

- (1) To mirror the DfE's 2021/22 National Funding Formula to calculate the funding allocations
- (2) To award a lower increase to the schools sparsity factor in the local formula (Appendix A)
- (3) To address any surplus or shortfall in funding by adjusting the AWPU values
- (4) To apply a top slice of 0.25% to the schools' funding, in order to support High Needs (Appendix A)
- (5) To approve the criteria for additional funds as per the consultation (Appendix B:D)
- (6) To approve the proposed de-delegations.

2.2 The above proposals will be politically ratified by Individual Decision.

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 2021/22 is the fourth year of the National Funding Formula (NFF). The government has confirmed its intention to move to a single 'hard' NFF to determine every school's budget, and will work closely with local authorities and other stakeholders in making this transition in the future.

3.2 As in previous years, each LA will continue to have discretion over their schools funding formulae, in consultation with local schools. The LA is responsible for making the final decisions on the formula. Political ratification must be obtained before the 21 January 2021 deadline.

Modelled formula impact 2021/22		2020/21 FINAL ALLOCATION (after 0.25% HNB contribution)			2021/22 INITIAL ALLOCATION		2021/22 ALLOCATION after primary cap on sparsity			2021/22 ALLOCATION after primary cap on sparsity and 0.25% HNB transfer		
School Name	Phase	Pupil count	Formula allocated	Per pupil funding	Indicative allocation	Indicative per pupil funding	Indicative allocation	Indicative per pupil funding	Gain/loss	Indicative allocation	Indicative per pupil funding	Gain/loss
Aldermaston C.E. Primary School	Primary	148	£645,892	£4,364	£707,524	£4,781	£708,928	£4,790	£1,403	£706,410	£4,773	(£2,518)
Basilidon C.E. Primary School	Primary	153.0	£637,462	£4,166	£681,649	£4,455	£683,100	£4,465	£1,451	£680,497	£4,448	(£2,603)
Beedon C.E. (Controlled) Primary	Primary	49	£306,572	£6,257	£352,322	£7,190	£341,226	£6,964	(£11,096)	£340,393	£6,947	(£834)
Beenham Primary School	Primary	56	£322,114	£5,752	£343,551	£6,135	£343,551	£6,135	£0	£343,551	£6,135	£0
Birch Copse Primary School	Primary	421	£1,603,634	£3,809	£1,784,880	£4,240	£1,784,880	£4,240	£0	£1,784,880	£4,240	£0
Bradfield C.E. Primary School	Primary	159	£650,845	£4,093	£702,699	£4,419	£704,207	£4,429	£1,508	£701,502	£4,412	(£2,705)
Brightwalton C.E. Aided Primary S	Primary	88	£430,235	£4,889	£483,491	£5,494	£472,765	£5,372	(£10,726)	£471,268	£5,355	(£1,497)
Brimpton C.E. Primary School	Primary	52	£314,852	£6,055	£337,534	£6,491	£337,534	£6,491	£0	£337,534	£6,491	£0
Bucklebury C.E. Primary School	Primary	118	£530,361	£4,495	£571,296	£4,841	£572,415	£4,851	£1,119	£570,407	£4,834	(£2,008)
Burghfield St Mary's C.E. Primary S	Primary	209	£820,786	£3,927	£889,182	£4,254	£889,875	£4,258	£693	£889,182	£4,254	(£693)
Calcot Infant School and Nursery	Primary	198	£857,581	£4,331	£922,019	£4,657	£923,896	£4,666	£1,878	£920,528	£4,649	(£3,369)
Calcot Junior School	Primary	279	£1,153,506	£4,134	£1,237,109	£4,434	£1,239,755	£4,444	£2,646	£1,235,008	£4,427	(£4,747)
Chaddleworth St Andrew's C.E. Pri	Primary	30	£234,519	£7,817	£255,027	£8,501	£255,027	£8,501	£0	£255,027	£8,501	£0
Chieveley Primary School	Primary	201	£788,005	£3,920	£870,308	£4,330	£870,308	£4,330	£0	£870,308	£4,330	£0
Cold Ash St Mark's CE Primary Sch	Primary	183	£716,918	£3,918	£781,824	£4,272	£781,824	£4,272	£0	£781,824	£4,272	£0
Compton C.E. Primary School	Primary	194	£794,950	£4,098	£860,785	£4,437	£862,625	£4,447	£1,840	£859,324	£4,430	(£3,301)
Curridge Primary School	Primary	102	£450,807	£4,420	£483,549	£4,741	£484,517	£4,750	£967	£482,781	£4,733	(£1,735)
Denefield School	Secondary	973	£4,957,510	£5,095	£5,345,240	£5,494	£5,345,240	£5,494	£0	£5,320,805	£5,468	(£24,435)
Downsway Primary School	Primary	214	£858,139	£4,010	£925,701	£4,326	£927,731	£4,335	£2,029	£924,090	£4,318	(£3,641)
Enborne C.E. Primary School	Primary	70	£355,120	£5,073	£378,148	£5,402	£378,148	£5,402	£0	£378,148	£5,402	£0
Englefield C.E. Primary School	Primary	97	£436,424	£4,499	£468,859	£4,834	£469,779	£4,843	£920	£468,129	£4,826	(£1,650)
Falkland Primary School	Primary	453	£1,727,799	£3,814	£1,921,553	£4,242	£1,921,553	£4,242	£0	£1,921,553	£4,242	£0
Fir Tree Primary School and Nurse	Primary	177	£789,068	£4,458	£843,672	£4,767	£845,351	£4,776	£1,678	£842,340	£4,759	(£3,011)
Francis Bailly Primary School	Primary	581	£2,186,515	£3,763	£2,436,511	£4,194	£2,436,511	£4,194	£0	£2,436,511	£4,194	£0
Garland Junior School	Primary	221	£915,935	£4,145	£993,051	£4,493	£995,147	£4,503	£2,096	£991,387	£4,486	(£3,760)
Hampstead Norreys C.E. Primary S	Primary	89	£432,073	£4,855	£464,815	£5,223	£465,659	£5,232	£844	£464,145	£5,215	(£1,514)
Hermitage Primary School	Primary	181	£732,987	£4,050	£790,525	£4,368	£792,241	£4,377	£1,716	£789,162	£4,360	(£3,079)
Highwood Copse Primary School	Primary	17.5	£128,013	£7,315	£135,349	£4,512	£135,515	£4,517	£166	£135,217	£4,507	(£298)
Hungerford Primary School	Primary	357	£1,381,260	£3,869	£1,534,408	£4,298	£1,534,408	£4,298	£0	£1,534,408	£4,298	£0
Inkpen Primary School	Primary	66	£343,139	£5,199	£366,909	£5,559	£367,535	£5,569	£626	£366,412	£5,552	(£1,123)
John O'gaunt School	Secondary	281	£2,193,069	£5,756	£2,373,759	£6,230	£2,373,759	£6,230	£0	£2,364,232	£6,205	(£9,527)
John Rankin Infant and Nursery Sc	Primary	354	£983,078	£3,870	£1,081,094	£4,256	£1,081,094	£4,256	£0	£1,081,094	£4,256	£0
John Rankin Junior School	Primary	351	£1,343,154	£3,827	£1,491,753	£4,250	£1,491,753	£4,250	£0	£1,491,753	£4,250	£0
Kennet School	Secondary	1484	£7,502,709	£5,056	£8,188,873	£5,518	£8,188,873	£5,518	£0	£8,151,691	£5,493	(£37,181)
Kennet Valley Primary School	Primary	197	£866,685	£4,399	£932,407	£4,733	£934,276	£4,743	£1,868	£930,924	£4,726	(£3,352)
Kintbury St Mary's C.E. Primary Sch	Primary	159	£681,077	£4,284	£732,070	£4,604	£733,577	£4,614	£1,508	£730,872	£4,597	(£2,705)
Lambourn CofE Primary School	Primary	177	£773,146	£4,368	£822,791	£4,649	£824,469	£4,658	£1,678	£821,458	£4,641	(£3,011)
Little Heath School	Secondary	1282	£6,564,380	£5,120	£7,148,974	£5,576	£7,148,974	£5,576	£0	£7,116,813	£5,551	(£32,161)
Long Lane Primary School	Primary	214	£857,971	£4,009	£925,451	£4,325	£927,480	£4,334	£2,029	£923,839	£4,317	(£3,641)
Mortimer St John's C.E. Infant Sch	Primary	170	£702,643	£4,133	£757,381	£4,455	£758,993	£4,465	£1,612	£756,101	£4,448	(£2,892)
Mortimer St Mary's C.E. Junior Sch	Primary	212	£828,791	£3,909	£895,787	£4,225	£897,797	£4,235	£2,010	£894,190	£4,218	(£3,607)
Mrs Bland's Infant School	Primary	174	£760,534	£4,371	£820,082	£4,713	£821,732	£4,723	£1,650	£818,772	£4,706	(£2,960)
Pangbourne Primary School	Primary	196	£806,010	£4,112	£868,614	£4,432	£870,472	£4,441	£1,859	£867,138	£4,424	(£3,335)
Park House School	Secondary	905	£4,627,987	£5,114	£5,020,954	£5,548	£5,020,954	£5,548	£0	£4,998,349	£5,523	(£22,605)
Parsons Down Infant School	Primary	135	£606,637	£4,494	£650,803	£4,821	£652,083	£4,830	£1,280	£649,786	£4,813	(£2,297)
Parsons Down Junior School	Primary	268	£1,059,734	£3,954	£1,151,080	£4,295	£1,151,080	£4,295	£0	£1,151,080	£4,295	£0
Purley CofE Primary School	Primary	103	£481,999	£4,680	£516,858	£5,018	£517,834	£5,028	£977	£516,082	£5,011	(£1,752)
Robert Sandilands Primary School	Primary	238	£1,011,898	£4,252	£1,072,280	£4,505	£1,072,280	£4,505	£0	£1,072,280	£4,505	£0
Shaw-cum-Donnington C.E. Prima	Primary	80	£430,911	£5,386	£455,925	£5,699	£455,925	£5,699	£0	£455,925	£5,699	£0
Shefford C.E. Primary School	Primary	44	£303,915	£6,907	£342,185	£7,777	£331,042	£7,524	(£11,143)	£330,293	£7,507	(£749)
Speenhamland School	Primary	311	£1,272,760	£4,092	£1,371,197	£4,409	£1,374,146	£4,418	£2,949	£1,368,855	£4,401	(£5,291)
Springfield Primary School	Primary	300	£1,150,779	£3,836	£1,279,100	£4,264	£1,279,100	£4,264	£0	£1,279,100	£4,264	£0
Spurcroft Primary School	Primary	446	£1,736,503	£3,894	£1,927,493	£4,322	£1,927,493	£4,322	£0	£1,927,493	£4,322	£0
St Bartholomew's School	Secondary	1332	£6,720,699	£5,046	£7,291,786	£5,474	£7,291,786	£5,474	£0	£7,291,786	£5,474	£0
St Finian's Catholic Primary School	Primary	186	£747,768	£4,020	£807,871	£4,343	£809,635	£4,353	£1,764	£806,471	£4,336	(£3,164)
St John the Evangelist C.E. Nursery	Primary	180	£732,554	£4,070	£796,728	£4,426	£798,435	£4,436	£1,707	£795,373	£4,419	(£3,062)
St Joseph's Catholic Primary Schod	Primary	211	£884,671	£4,193	£966,149	£4,579	£968,150	£4,588	£2,001	£964,560	£4,571	(£3,590)
St Nicolas C.E. Junior School	Primary	256	£973,888	£3,804	£1,076,916	£4,207	£1,076,916	£4,207	£0	£1,076,916	£4,207	£0
St Paul's Catholic Primary School	Primary	311	£1,183,211	£3,805	£1,304,760	£4,195	£1,304,760	£4,195	£0	£1,304,760	£4,195	£0
Stockcross C.E. School	Primary	103	£456,670	£4,434	£489,775	£4,755	£490,752	£4,765	£977	£488,999	£4,748	(£1,752)
Streatley C.E. Voluntary Controlle	Primary	99	£453,237	£4,578	£477,553	£4,824	£477,553	£4,824	£0	£477,553	£4,824	£0
Sulhamstead and Ufton Nervet Sc	Primary	101	£454,813	£4,503	£490,039	£4,852	£490,997	£4,861	£958	£489,278	£4,844	(£1,718)
Thatcham Park CofE Primary	Primary	349	£1,383,105	£3,963	£1,499,673	£4,297	£1,502,982	£4,307	£3,310	£1,497,045	£4,290	(£5,938)
The Downs School	Secondary	954	£4,797,446	£5,029	£5,193,463	£5,444	£5,193,463	£5,444	£0	£5,193,463	£5,444	£0
The Ilsleys Primary School	Primary	67	£354,914	£5,297	£409,316	£6,109	£398,390	£5,946	(£10,925)	£397,251	£5,929	(£1,140)
The Willink School	Secondary	951	£4,862,677	£5,113	£5,261,371	£5,532	£5,261,371	£5,532	£0	£5,257,935	£5,529	(£3,437)
The Willows Primary School	Primary	364	£1,597,566	£4,389	£1,723,774	£4,736	£1,727,226	£4,745	£3,452	£1,721,033	£4,728	(£6,193)
The Wincombe School	Primary	438	£1,801,824	£4,114	£1,921,469	£4,387	£1,921,469	£4,387	£0	£1,921,469	£4,387	£0
Theale C.E. Primary School	Primary	312	£1,197,351	£3,838	£1,362,302	£4,366	£1,362,302	£4,366	£0	£1,362,302	£4,366	£0
Theale Green School	Secondary	439	£2,376,198	£5,413	£2,579,383	£5,876	£2,579,383	£5,876	£0	£2,568,420	£5,851	(£10,963)
Trinity School	Secondary	923	£4,911,911	£5,322	£5,302,764	£5,745	£5,302,764	£5,745	£0	£5,279,671	£5,720	(£23,094)
Welford and Wickham C.E. Primar	Primary	98	£468,364	£4,779	£534,351	£5,453	£523,719	£5,344	(£10,631)	£522,052	£5,327	(£1,667)
Westwood Farm Infant School	Primary	177	£744,298	£4,205	£801,507	£4,528	£803,185	£4,538	£1,678	£800,174	£4,521	(£3,011)
Westwood Farm Junior School	Primary	238	£957,249	£4,022	£1,032,067	£4,336	£1,034,324	£4,346	£2,257	£1,030,275	£4,329	(£4,049)
Whitelands Park Primary School	Primary	341	£1,320,379	£3,872	£1,445,524	£4,239	£1,448,757	£4,249	£3,234	£1,442,956	£4,232	(£5,801)
Woolhampton C.E. Primary School	Primary	93	£423,975	£4,559	£458,823	£4,934	£459,705	£4,943	£882	£458,123	£4,926	(£1,582)
Yattendon C.E. Primary School	Primary	91	£437,639	£4,809	£497,875	£5,471	£487,178	£5,354	(£10,698)	£485,630	£5,337	(£1,548)
High Needs Block										£287,295		£287,295
Primary Total			£54,777,217		£59,715,074		£59,715,075		£1	£0		£0
Secondary Total			£49,514,580		£53,706,568		£53,706,568		£0	£0		£0
Total all Schools		22,832	£104,291,796		£113,421,641		£113,421,642		£1	£113,421,642		£0

This page is intentionally left blank

Budgets and Criteria for Additional Funds 2021/22: High needs

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis, Ian Pearson

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

1. Purpose of the Report

To set out the proposed budgets for additional funds for 2021/22 in relation to high needs only. The full report was agreed at the Schools Forum in October, but the budget for high needs requires further discussion.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 Agree the proposed budget for additional funds for 2021/22.

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 Funding can be used from the high needs block to allocate additional funding to schools which have a disproportionate number of high needs pupils. This has to be determined by a formulaic method.

4. Proposals

4.1 The budgets for the growth fund and primary schools in financial difficulty were agreed at the last Schools Forum. The budget for additional high needs funding now needs to be agreed. Previous year's budgets and actual are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1	Growth Fund	Primary Schools in Financial difficulty	Additional High Needs Funding
2017/18 Budget Set	162,000	119,980	100,000
<i>2017/18 Actual Spend</i>	126,287	55,551	100,972
2018/19 Budget Set	280,710	379,120	100,000
<i>2018/19 Actual Spend</i>	87,500	127,073	83,609
2019/20 Budget Set	655,800	252,047	100,000
<i>2019/20 Actual Spend</i>	183,048	70,880	68,001
2020/21 Budget Set	756,100	200,000	100,000

4.2 Further analysis has been undertaken of the additional funding for high needs. The budget has been set at £100k for a number of years but this level of spend has not been required. It is therefore proposed that the budget for 2021/22 is set at £40k.

This page is intentionally left blank

De-delegation Proposals 2021/22

Report being considered by: The Schools' Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis, Ian Pearson

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

1. Purpose of the Report

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

2. Recommendation

2.1 That representatives of maintained primary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2021/22 financial year for:

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

2.2 That representatives of maintained secondary schools should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2021/22 financial year for:

- Behaviour Support Services
- Ethnic Minority Support
- Trade Union Representation
- CLEAPSS
- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff
 - Health and Safety (enhanced support – level one plus a top up level two)

2.3 That representatives of maintained special, nursery and PRU heads should agree to de-delegate funds in the 2021/22 financial year for:

- Statutory and Regulatory Duties comprising:
 - Statutory accounting functions in respect of schools
 - Internal Audit of schools
 - Administration of pensions for school staff
 - Health and Safety (enhanced support – level one plus a top up level two)

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

Yes:

No:

3. Summary of Proposals

TABLE A	2021/22 Primary Budget £	Agreed by HFG	2021/22 Secondary Budget £	Agreed by HFG	2021/22 Early Years & High Needs Budgets £	Agreed by HFG
Therapeutic Thinking Support	176,317	Yes	48,459		n/a	n/a
Ethnic Minority Support	182,156	Yes	3,571		n/a	n/a
Trade Union Representation	42,929	Yes	11,799		n/a	n/a
Schools In Financial Difficulty	27,500	Yes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CLEAPSS	1,856	Yes	1,215	Yes	n/a	n/a
Statutory and Regulatory Duties with H&S enhanced package including top up fee	152,540 + top up	Yes	41,924 + top up	Yes	5,894 + top up	
Statutory and Regulatory Duties with H&S basic package	152,540	No	41,924	No	5,894	

4. Background

- 4.1 De-delegated services are for maintained schools only. Funding must be allocated through the formula but can be passed back, or de-delegated for maintained primary and secondary schools with schools forum approval.
- 4.2 Funds cannot be de-delegated from Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs for these services, but those schools will have the option to buy back these services at a cost based on the same amount per pupil as for primary and secondary schools. Academies may also be given the option to buy into the service.
- 4.3 The schools funding regulations for 2021/22 have now been published and these confirm that similar arrangements for de-delegation of the cost of these services will apply for 2021/22. Funding arrangements are expected to change in 2022/23, but details of the changes have not yet been announced.
- 4.4 Primary and secondary school representatives are required to recommend to Schools Forum on whether each service is to be de-delegated or not. The services below were de-delegated in 2020/21 and are proposed to be de-delegated in 2021/22:

Primary and Secondary only:

- Behaviour Support Services
 - Ethnic Minority Support
 - Trade Union Local Representation
 - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools only)
 - CLEAPSS
- 4.5 Education responsibilities held by local authorities for **all** schools are funded from the Central Schools Services Block of the DSG. Education responsibilities held by

local authorities for **maintained schools only** are funded from maintained schools budgets only, with agreement of the maintained schools members of schools forums.

- 4.6 Representatives of all maintained schools (including Special and Nursery Schools and PRUs) are required to recommend to Schools Forum whether or not funds should be de-delegated for these education functions for maintained schools for 2021/22:

All Maintained Schools:

- 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 (basic support)

- 4.7 Academies and other non-maintained schools also may be able to choose to buy into any of the above services subject to service provider agreement.
- 4.8 Appendix A sets out the total cost of each service and an initial estimate of the amount to be de-delegated from each school. This estimate is based on the October 2019 census, however the final amounts will be based on the October 2020 census when that data becomes available.

5. Therapeutic Thinking Service (previously Behaviour Intervention)

- 5.1 The Therapeutic Thinking Service proposal for 2021/22 is set out in Appendix B.
- 5.2 Table 1 shows the budget and unit charge for 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The total cost will be divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2020 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2019 census this is estimated to be £15.20 per pupil but the final rate will be determined according to the October 2020 census.

TABLE 1	2020/21			2021/22		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	11,603	£16.09	£186,716	11,603	£15.20	£176,317
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,189	£16.09	£51,318	3,189	£15.20	£48,459
Total			£238,034			£224,776

6. Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service

- 6.1 The detail of the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) is set out in Appendix C.
- 6.2 Table 2 shows the budget and the estimated unit charge for the service for 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The total cost in respect of Primary and Secondary schools will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (EAL) in the October 2020 census to determine a unit charge per EAL pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. As all schools will have access to all aspects of the service, the same unit charge will

apply to both primary and secondary schools. The estimated unit charge is based on the October 2019 census, but the final rate will be determined according to the number of EAL pupils in the October 2020 census.

TABLE 2	2020/21			2021/22		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil with EAL	Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	731	£318.03	£232,498	731	£249.17	£182,156
Maintained Secondary Schools	14	£318.03	£4,558	14	£249.17	£3,571
			£237,056			£185,727

7. Trade Union Representation

- 7.1 The detail of the service provided by Trade Union representatives to schools is set out in Appendix D.
- 7.2 Table 3 shows the budget and unit charge for the service for 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The proposal for 2021/22 is based on the cost of 1FTE supply teacher on UPS3. It is assumed there will also be some buy in from academy schools. The total net cost in respect of primary and secondary schools will be divided by the total number of pupils in the October 2020 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based on. As all schools have access to all representatives (regardless of which school they are based in), the same unit charge will apply to both primary and secondary schools. Based on the October 2019 census this currently estimated to be £3.70 per pupil but the final rate will be determined according to the October 2020 census.

TABLE 3	2020/21			2021/22		
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Budget	Number of pupils	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	11,603	£3.53	£40,934	11,603	£3.70	£42,929
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,189	£3.53	£11,250	3,189	£3.70	£11,799
			£52,184			£54,728

8. Schools in Financial Difficulty

- 8.1 The Schools in Financial Difficulty fund was topped up by £19k to £200k as part of the 2020/21 budget process. This fund is largely used for one off exceptional costs such as those in relation to staffing restructures.
- 8.2 Bids amounting to £27,500 have been approved so far in 2020/21, therefore a decision needs to be made whether to de-delegate this service in 2021/22, in order to top up the fund to £200k.

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

- 9.1 The detail of the service provided by this subscription is set out in Appendix E.
- 9.2 As the actual pricing from CLEAPSS will not be available until after the schools budget has been set, an assumption has been made on the 2021/22 fee. Any over or under spend will be recovered the following year, as in all de-delegated services.

Table 5 shows the budget and unit charge for the service for 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The unit charge includes the administration fee. Note that secondary schools will need to pay the fee relating to sixth form pupils separately as de-delegation is based on pre 16 pupils only.

TABLE 5	2020/21				2021/22			
	Number of pupils	Unit Charge per pupil	Charge per school	Budget	Number of pupils	Est Unit Charge per pupil	Est Charge per school	Estimated Budget
Maintained Primary Schools	11,603	£0.16		£1,856	11,603	£0.16		£1,856
Maintained Secondary Schools	3,189	£0.16	£235	£1,215	3,189	£0.16	£235	£1,215
				£3,072				£3,072

10. Education Functions for Maintained Schools

- 10.1 Education functions consist of the statutory and regulatory duties held by the local authority in respect of maintained schools. These consist of Accountancy, Internal Audit, Pension scheme administration and Health and Safety. The Accountancy, audit and pension administration services are described in appendix F.
- 10.2 In 2020/21 funds to provide the basic Health and Safety support were de-delegated but individual schools were given the choice whether or not to buy back the enhanced support. The Health and Safety service is proposing two alternative options for de-delegation in 2021/22, as set out in appendix G. Option 1 is to de-delegate funds to provide an enhanced support for all maintained primary and secondary schools to include level one and level two. Option 2 is the same arrangement as for 2020/21 which is to de-delegate the basic level of level one support.
- 10.3 Table 6 shows the budget and estimated unit charges for these services in 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The total cost will be divided by the total numbers of pupils in the October 2020 census to determine a unit charge per pupil on which the de-delegated amount per school will be based. The same unit charges will apply to both primary and secondary schools. The estimated unit charges shown are based on the October 2019 census but the final rates will be determined according to the October 2020 census.

TABLE 6	2020/21		2021/22				
	Charge per Pupil	Budget	Estimated Unit Charge per pupil	Estimated Total Budget	Estimated Primary Budget	Estimated Secondary Budget	Estimated budget for Nursery, Special Schools and PRUs
Accountancy	£3.06	£47,857	£3.18	£48,491	£36,918	£10,147	£1,426
Audit	£2.93	£45,700	£3.09	£47,081	£35,844	£9,852	£1,385
Pension Scheme Administration	£2.35	£36,729	£2.41	£36,729	£27,963	£7,685	£1,080
Health and Safety Enhanced level including a top up fee			£4.47	£68,057 + top up	£51,814 + top up	£14,241 + top up	£2,002
Health and Safety Basic level	£4.33	£67,606	£4.47	£68,057	£51,814	£14,241	£2,002
Total Education Functions including H&S Basic	£12.67	£197,892	£13.15	£200,358	£152,540	£41,924	£5,894

11. Consultation and Engagement

- 11.1 The proposals set out in this report will be included in the consultation with all schools on the proposed school funding arrangements for 2021/22.

12. Appendices

Appendix A – Indicative De-delegations per school for 2021/22

Appendix B – Therapeutic Thinking Support Service

Appendix C – Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service

Appendix D – Trade Union Representation Service

Appendix E – CLEAPSS Service

Appendix F – Accountancy, Audit and Pension Administration

Appendix G - Health and Safety

Appendix H – Health and Safety Service Level Provision

Appendix I – Health and Safety Legal Duty Holders

Indicative De-Delegations for 2021/22 - Based on October 2019 Census Data														
	De-delegations					Education functions for maintained schools								
	Behaviour Intervention	Ethnic Minority Support	Trade Union Representation	Schools in Financial Difficulty	CLEAPSS	Total De-delegations	Statutory Accounting Functions	Internal Audit of Schools	Pension Scheme Administration	Health and Safety Support Basic	Total Education Functions	Total De-delegations and Education Functions		
Proposed Primary Delegation	£176,317	£182,156	£42,929	£27,500	£1,856	£430,758	£36,918	£35,844	£27,963	£51,814	£152,540	£583,298		
Proposed Secondary Delegation	£48,459	£3,571	£11,799	£0	£1,215	£65,045	£10,147	£9,852	£7,685	£14,241	£41,924	£106,969		
Total Proposed Delegation	£224,776	£185,727	£54,728	£27,500	£3,072	£495,803	£47,065	£45,696	£35,649	£66,055	£194,464	£690,267		
Estimated income from other maintained schools	£0	£0	£1,659	£0	£59	£1,718	£1,426	£1,385	£1,080	£2,002	£5,894	£7,611		
Total Cost of Service	£224,776	£185,727	£56,387	£27,500	£3,131	£497,521	£48,491	£47,081	£36,729	£68,057	£200,358	£697,879		
Indicative cost per primary pupil	£15.20	£249.17	£3.70	£2.37	£0.16	£271	£3.18	£3.09	£2.41	£4.47	£13.15	£284		
Indicative cost per secondary pupil	£15.20	£249.17	£3.70	n/a	£0.16	£268	£3.18	£3.09	£2.41	£4.47	£13.15	£281		
Indicative cost per other maintained school pupil	n/a	£249.17	£3.70	n/a	£0.16	£253	£3.18	£3.09	£2.41	£4.47	£13.15	£266		
Fixed cost per secondary school	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	£235.00	£235	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	£235		
School	Pupil No's	EAL No's												
Aldermaston Church of England Primary School	148	1.1	2,249	273	548	351	24	3,444	471	457	357	661	1,946	5,390
Basildon Church of England Primary School	153	0.0	2,325	0	566	363	24	3,278	487	473	369	683	2,011	5,290
Beedon Church of England Controlled Primary School	49	1.2	745	291	181	116	8	1,341	156	151	118	219	644	1,985
Beeham Primary School	56	0.0	851	0	207	133	9	1,200	178	173	135	250	736	1,936
Birch Copse Primary School	421	14.1	6,397	3,516	1,558	998	67	12,536	1,340	1,301	1,015	1,880	5,535	18,071
Bradfield Church of England Primary School	159	1.1	2,416	277	588	377	25	3,684	506	491	383	710	2,090	5,774
Brighton Church of England Aided Primary School	88	1.2	1,337	289	326	209	14	2,174	280	272	212	393	1,157	3,331
Brimpton Church of England Primary School	52	0.0	790	0	192	123	8	1,114	165	161	125	232	684	1,798
Bucklebury Church of England Primary School	118	0.0	1,793	0	437	280	19	2,528	375	365	284	527	1,551	4,080
Burghfield St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	209	1.2	3,176	289	773	495	33	4,767	665	646	504	933	2,748	7,515
Calcot Infant School & Nursery	198	30.7	3,009	7,649	733	469	32	11,891	630	612	477	884	2,603	14,494
Calcot Junior School	279	10.0	4,240	2,492	1,032	661	45	8,469	888	862	672	1,246	3,668	12,137
Chaddwell orth St. Andrew's Church of England Primary School	30	1.3	456	311	111	71	5	954	95	93	72	134	394	1,349
Chieveley Primary School	201	3.4	3,054	849	744	476	32	5,155	640	621	484	898	2,642	7,798
Cold Ash St. Mark's Church of England Primary School	183	2.3	2,781	585	677	434	29	4,505	582	565	441	817	2,406	6,911
Compton Church of England Primary School	194	3.5	2,948	879	718	460	31	5,035	617	599	468	866	2,550	7,586
Curridge Primary School	102	1.1	1,550	286	377	242	16	2,471	325	315	246	455	1,341	3,812
Dow nsw ay Primary School	214	11.6	3,252	2,898	792	507	34	7,483	681	661	516	956	2,813	10,296
Enborne Church of England Primary School	70	0.0	1,064	0	259	166	11	1,500	223	216	169	313	920	2,420
Englefield Church of England Primary School	97	2.4	1,474	597	359	230	16	2,675	309	300	234	433	1,275	3,950
Falkland Primary School	453	16.2	6,884	4,031	1,676	1,074	72	13,737	1,441	1,399	1,092	2,023	5,955	19,692
Garland Junior School	221	4.0	3,358	1,006	818	524	35	5,741	703	683	533	987	2,905	8,646
Hampstead Norreys Church of England Primary School	89	0.0	1,352	0	329	211	14	1,907	283	275	214	397	1,170	3,077
Hermitage Primary School	181	2.4	2,750	593	670	429	29	4,471	576	559	436	808	2,380	6,851
Hungerford Primary School	357	14.8	5,425	3,683	1,321	846	57	11,332	1,136	1,103	860	1,594	4,693	16,025
The Isleys' Primary School	67	0.0	1,018	0	248	159	11	1,436	213	207	161	299	881	2,316
Inken Primary School	66	1.2	1,003	310	244	156	11	1,724	210	204	159	295	868	2,592
John Rankin Infant & Nursery School	254	29.1	3,860	7,244	940	602	41	12,686	808	785	612	1,134	3,339	16,025
John Rankin Junior School	351	11.0	5,334	2,741	1,299	832	56	10,261	1,117	1,084	846	1,567	4,614	14,876
Kennet Valley Primary School	197	20.3	2,994	5,057	729	467	32	9,278	627	609	475	880	2,590	11,868
Kinrbury St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	159	1.1	2,416	277	588	377	25	3,684	506	491	383	710	2,090	5,774
Long Lane Primary School	214	10.4	3,252	2,898	792	507	34	7,483	681	661	516	956	2,813	9,993
Mortimer St. John's Church of England Infant School	170	9.0	2,583	2,249	629	403	27	5,892	541	525	410	759	2,235	8,126
Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England Junior School	212	2.0	3,222	498	784	502	34	5,041	675	655	511	947	2,787	7,828
Mrs. Bland's Infant & Nursery School	174	24.6	2,644	6,139	644	412	28	9,867	554	538	419	777	2,288	12,154
Pangbourne Primary School	196	10.6	2,978	2,648	725	465	31	6,847	624	605	472	875	2,577	9,424
Parsons Down n Infant School	135	7.8	2,051	1,941	459	320	22	4,833	430	417	325	603	1,775	6,508
Parsons Down Junior School	268	3.0	4,072	748	992	635	43	6,490	853	828	646	1,197	3,523	10,013
Purley Church of England Infants School	103	5.7	1,565	1,426	381	244	16	3,633	328	318	248	460	1,354	4,987
Robert Sandilands Primary School & Nursery	238	26.3	3,617	6,557	881	564	38	11,657	757	735	574	1,063	3,129	14,786
Shaw -cum-Donnington Church of England Primary School	80	8.8	1,216	2,184	296	190	13	3,899	255	247	193	357	1,052	4,950
Sheffield Church of England Primary School	44	0.0	669	0	163	104	7	943	140	136	106	196	578	1,521
Springfield Primary School	300	13.0	4,559	3,237	1,110	711	48	9,665	955	927	723	1,340	3,944	13,609
Spurcrott Primary School	446	27.9	6,777	6,964	1,650	1,057	71	16,520	1,419	1,378	1,075	1,992	5,863	22,383
St. Finian's Catholic Primary School	186	16.6	2,826	4,133	688	441	30	4,118	592	575	448	831	2,445	10,563
St. John the Evangelist Infant & Nursery School	180	39.0	2,735	9,718	666	427	29	13,574	573	556	434	804	2,366	15,941
St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	211	73.4	3,206	18,299	781	500	34	22,820	671	652	509	942	2,774	25,594
St. Nicolas Church of England Junior School	256	18.0	3,890	4,485	947	607	41	9,970	815	791	617	1,143	3,366	13,336
St. Pauls Catholic Primary School	311	39.6	4,726	9,863	1,151	737	50	16,526	990	961	750	1,389	4,089	20,615
Stockeross Church of England Primary School	103	1.2	1,565	288	381	244	16	2,495	328	318	248	460	1,354	3,849
Streatley Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	99	1.2	1,504	301	366	235	16	2,422	315	306	239	442	1,302	3,723
Sulhamstead and Upton Nervet Church of England Voluntary	101	1.1	1,535	283	374	239	16	2,447	321	312	243	451	1,328	3,775
Thatcham Park Church of England Primary School	349	24.3	5,303	6,067	1,291	827	56	13,545	1,110	1,078	841	1,558	4,588	18,133
Theale Church of England Primary School	312	21.0	4,741	5,221	1,154	739	50	11,906	993	964	752	1,393	4,102	16,008
Welford and Wickham Church of England Primary School	98	0.0	1,489	0	363	232	16	2,100	312	303	236	438	1,288	3,388
West wood Farm Infant School	177	26.2	2,690	6,520	655	420	28	10,312	563	547	427	790	2,327	12,639
West wood Farm Junior School	238	8.0	3,617	1,993	881	564	38	7,093	757	735	574	1,063	3,129	10,222
The Willows Primary School	364	34.2	5,531	8,530	1,347	863	58	16,328	1,158	1,124	877	1,625	4,785	21,114
The Winchcombe School	438	88.1	6,656	21,943	1,621	1,038	70	31,327	1,394	1,353	1,056	1,956	5,758	37,085
Woolhampton Church of England Primary School	93	1.2	1,413	293	344	220	15	2,286	296	287	224	415	1,223	3,509
Yattendon Church of England Primary School	91	2.5	1,383	613	337	216	15	2,563	290	281	219	406	1,196	3,759
The Dow n School	954	4.0	14,497	1,007	3,530	388	388	19,421	3,035	2,947	2,299	4,260	12,542	31,963
Little Heath School	1,284	7.3	19,511	1,816	4,751	440	440	26,519	4,085	3,967	3,094	5,734	16,880	43,399
The Willin School	951	3.0	14,451	748	3,519	387	387	19,104	3,026	2,938	2,292	4,247	12,502	31,607
PRIMARY TOTAL	11,603	731	176,317	182,156	42,929	27,500	1,856	430,758	36,918	35,844	27,963	51,814	152,540	583,298
SECONDARY TOTAL	3,189	14	48,459	3,571	11,799	0	1,215	65,045	10,147	9,852	7,68			

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021/22

Therapeutic Thinking Support Team

Outline of Proposed Service 2021/22

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

Key Features

1. Quick and flexible response for schools who have pupils presenting with difficult and dangerous behaviours.
2. Different levels of response within the team (whole school, group, individual).
3. Support and advice in relation to Therapeutic Thinking; developing therapeutic plans, anxiety mapping, conscious and subconscious checklists

Team Members

1. The Team –
 - Beth Cartwright (TTST Manager & Senior EP)
 - Amy Bushell (TTST EP)
 - Gerry Heaton (Primary TTST Adviser)
 - Sue Keepax (Secondary TTST Adviser)
 - Kayleigh Chocian (SEMH Practitioner)
 - Jessica Durham (SEMH Practitioner)
 - Madeleine Williams (SEMH Practitioner)
 - Roslyn Arthur (Exclusions Officer)
 - Piyush Bharania (Admin Assistant)

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

The service has changed name to represent an increased emphasis on a therapeutic way of working that recognises adverse childhood experiences and trauma. An increased offer has been maintained with a range of professionals and expertise in the team. This will be delivered without a significant increase in the cost of the service. This is due to a more efficient deployment of resources.

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

What would schools get?

1. Screening and signposting for identified mental health difficulties.
2. A stepped approach using the Therapeutic Thinking flowchart to support analysis and help identify appropriate strategies and interventions, which is likely to often lead to writing or revision of a mini or full Therapeutic plan.
3. Having identified a child or young person's need following consultation and use of the Therapeutic Thinking tools, a TTST worker may offer an intervention to develop the unmet need, e.g. Social skills through Lego Therapy, reading and social emotional skills through Storylinks
4. Write up and actions as well as agreed review of cases where appropriate.
5. Links with other support services and help in securing necessary actions
6. More direct support with very complex cases involving a wide range of services.
7. Access to support for challenging whole school situations through advisers with senior level management experience and experienced educational psychologists.
8. Direct links into PPP (Pupil Placement Panel & Fair Access process), VCF (Vulnerable Children's Fund) and other relevant systems/services

9. Support from practitioners where appropriate to help implement/model strategies in school.
10. Clear information of key personnel and agencies within West Berkshire –regularly updated.
11. Suggestions and links regarding potential training needs
12. Access to circle of adults meetings facilitated by an educational psychologist and a TTST worker for pupils at risk of permanent exclusion.

Feedback from 2019/2020 delivery

Comments from Primary Schools:

- Staff felt they were supported, having an external person come in raises that level of feeling supported by staff
- Staff were more confident in supporting children during tricky times
- Support strategies were very effective for one child in particular – resulting in calmer behaviour at home and in school
- Fewer whole class disruptions due to protective consequences

The average satisfaction rating from the primary schools that responded was 9.75 out of 10.

Comments from Secondary Schools:

- 'Staff felt supported; external verification of behaviour self-evaluation was extremely useful; excellent support was provided for individual students with challenging behaviours.
- TTST always offers practical support which is unique to this context. Meetings designed to plan appropriate support serve well to generate thought amongst SLT about whole school issues. We really value an objective view; sometimes we get too caught up by the details of the day.

Two of the three secondary schools supported by TTST rated their satisfaction with the support they received as 10 out of a maximum of 10 and one rated the support as 8 out of 10.

Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2021/22

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2021/22. It is based on employing the team members outlined above.

	2019/20 £	2020/21 £	2021/22 Proposed £	% decrease
Staffing Costs	207,750	210,245	198,192	
Other Costs	6,150	6,150	6,150	
Support Service Recharges	21,390	21,639	20,434	
Total Cost	235,290	238,034	224,776	-5.9%
Less Surplus Brought Forward				
Amount to be De-Delegated	235,290	238,034	224,776	-5.9%

The overall cost of delivering the service has reduced by 5.9% taking into account the academisation of Francis Baily in September 2019. This takes into account the expected April 2021 pay award and salary increments. As the underspend in 2019/20 has been requested to be added to 2020/21 budgets there is no carry forward from previous years.

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

Method of charging in 2021/22

The total net cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2020 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2019 census data to provide an indicative amount, this would equate to £15.20 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the indicative total amount per school.

Other Options which *may* be considered

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

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021/22

Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS)

Context

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

Current Structure

The resignation of the Team Manager at the end of the academic year 2019/20 has allowed for a restructuring of the service; the first of which was to move the team into the Education Welfare and Safeguarding Service. Through an overall FTE reduction it has been possible to reduce the total cost of the service.

Currently, EMTAS is led by a Team Leader (0.6FTE), supported by a Learning Adviser EAL (1.0 FTE). There are 3 part time Pupil Support Officers (Teaching Assistant level posts) who are employed for a total of 1.6 FTE. The service has administrative support for 1 day per week.

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

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

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

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

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

- Bilingual support is provided for Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, Italian and Romanian pupils.
- Support is focused on helping pupils to access the curriculum and English acquisition which can include pre-teaching of concepts; support for written work; translations; support for external examinations.
- Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking children and young people receive weekly support in class from EMTAS

De-delegation Proposals 2021/22

- PSOs support schools with parent meetings/ FSM letters/interpreting for parents at SEND reviews/EHC planning/CP and CIN cases.
- The Pupil Support Officer for GRT pupils has a wider brief involving intensive liaison between families and staff as well as supporting pupils in schools. GRT families are supported with attendance, admissions, transition, access to extra-curricular activities and engagement with learning.

Benefits of Service

EAL assessments

Referrals for EAL assessments were received from 16 Primary and 2 Secondary Schools from the beginning of the academic year until the schools closed to the majority of pupils at the end of March 2020.

EAL assessments, including guidance and reports, were completed in the following schools in during that period

Brimpton	Speenhamland
Compton	Spurcroft
Downsway	St John the Evangelist
Fir Tree	St Finians
John Rankin Juniors	St Josephs
Mortimer St John's	The Willows
Robert Sandilands	Theale Primary
Shaw cum Donnington	Westwood Farm
St Bartholomew's	Trinity

During June and July, 43 referrals were made from 12 Primary schools for EAL assessments for pupils moving from FS2 to Year 1. These were allocated 20 TA hours or bilingual support from September 2020 as they were not assessed face to face due to COVID restrictions.

Pupil Support Officer (Romanian)

Bilingual support has been provided in the following schools in 2019/20:

The Winchcombe	The Willows
St Joseph's	

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

Pupil Support Officer (Polish)

Polish bilingual support and/or translation has been provided in the following schools in 2019/20:

<i>Theale Primary</i>	<i>Inkpen</i>
<i>Mrs Blands</i>	<i>Birch Copse</i>
<i>Parsons Down Infants</i>	<i>Robert Sandilands</i>
<i>St John the Evangelist</i>	<i>The Willows</i>
<i>St. Joseph's Catholic</i>	<i>Westwood Farm Infant</i>
<i>The Downs</i>	<i>Little Heath</i>

The Polish PSO has had meetings with the prospective Polish GCSE and A level students who would have taken their exams in May/June 2020. In the previous years all the students who took their Polish GCSE/A level exams had 100% pass rate.

Schools have also received assistance with Polish first language assessments, Student Assisted Programme (SAP) meetings and EHC planning meetings, translating documents (including medical documentation) and interpreting during meetings between parents and school, enabling fluent communication between all the parties involved.

Pupil Support Officer (Portuguese/Italian/Spanish)

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

St.Joseph's Catholic	Thatcham Park
St John the Evangelist	Spurcroft
Theale Primary	Mortimer St John's
St Finians	Park House

A total of 13 pupils have been supported.

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

EMTAS was due to assist in the GCSE Portuguese in a secondary schools but this did not happen due to the GCSEs not taking place.

During the lockdown period, pupils were supported with their acquisition of English language and pastoral support was also provided for the families and pupils via zoom.

Pupil Support Officer (Urdu)

Bilingual support and/or translation has been provided in the following schools in 2019/20:

Speenhamland	Fir Tree
St Bartholomew's	

Pupil Support Officer (UASC)

Two secondary aged unaccompanied asylum seeking children have been supported this year in two different secondary schools. EMTAS has been actively involved with the children who have arrived as part of the Syrian Resettlement Programme (VPRS). EMTAS staff have assessed the children's language, provided guidance to school staff supporting the children plus a range of Arabic/English resources. EMTAS provides one to one academic, exam and pastoral support in lessons and in tutor time. This PSO also provides information for Personal Education Planning meetings, liaises with SENCOs, Social Workers, Heads of Year and the Virtual School. Support has been provided at the following schools this year:

Park House (Academy)	Denefield (Academy)
----------------------	---------------------

Teaching Assistant funding

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

Number of TA funded hours given to schools:

2019/20
1085 hours (EAL)
75 hours (GRT)
Total £12098.80

Schools in receipt of GReaT 1 to 1 project funding during 2019/20 to provide targeted intervention for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. (hours included in the figures above):

Mrs Bland's: 1 pupil, 15 hours funding	Aldermaston: 1 pupil, 15 hours funding
John Rankin Junior: 1 pupil, 15 hours funding	Yattendon: 1 pupil, 15 hours funding

Training provided (both general and school specific)

2019/20
EAL Co-ordinator's Network meeting
TA training to support EAL pupils in school:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St John the Evangelist - 4 TAs • Spurcroft – 1 TA • Thatcham Park – 6TAs • Long Lane – 1 TA • Westwood Farm – 1TA (to support Syrian refugees)

Number of families supported by Pupil Support Officer (GRT)

West Berkshire has 133 children who are ascribed as Gypsy, Roma or Traveller. 40 West Berkshire schools have Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils on roll. This is an increase of 11 pupils from the previous academic year.

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

Number of schools supported with GRT pupils

The following schools/colleges have received support from EMTAS for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. EMTAS Pupil Support Officer for GRT pupils has been involved in 240 sessions/meetings between Sept'19 - March '20, in support of children and families from GRT backgrounds. Between March '20 - July '20 support continued via phone or video calls.

Aldermaston	Yattendon
Garland Junior	John Rankin Juniors
The Downs	i-College – Inspiration
Thatcham Park	i-College – The Pod

Fir Tree (Academy)	Mrs Bland's Infants
Hampstead Norreys	Westwood Farm
The Willink	Mortimer St. Mary's
Trinity (Academy)	John O'Gaunt (Academy)
Theale Green (Academy)	Newbury College (pupils with EHCP)

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

Number of pupils attending the Autumn 2019 Michaelmas Fair 'School'

The Michaelmas Fair 'school' did not take place due to staffing and funding. However, PSO attended the site and Learning Packs were distributed to the children.

Number of outreach sessions on Traveller Site

Three outreach sessions were delivered from September 2019 to Nov 2019 on the 'Bus of Hope'. Subsequent monthly sessions were disrupted due to the Bus of Hope's inactivity during particular icy conditions during winter and Covid19 restrictions. This service operates from Paices Hill Traveller site and has provided Parent and Toddler activities for families and support with school applications for children who stay on a short term basis on the site. These sessions have been supported by the Family Hub staff. Children have attended sessions at different times over the course of the year; some of these families were travelling and staying temporarily on the transit part of the site.

Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2021/22

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2021/22 in comparison with 2020/21 and 2019/20.

	2019/20 £	2020/21 £	2021/22 Proposed £	% decrease
Staffing Costs	196,920	198,640	171,455	
Other Costs	26,020	26,020	26,020	
Support Service Recharges	22,294	22,466	19,748	
Total Cost	245,234	247,126	217,223	-13.8%
Less Surplus Brought Forward	-35,170	-10,070	-31,496	
Amount to be De-Delegated	210,064	237,056	185,727	-27.6%

The overall cost of delivering the service has decreased by 27.6% taking into account the academisation of Francis Baily and the restructure of the team. This also takes into account the expected April 2021 pay award and salary increments. The underspend from prior years is used to off-set the cost of service for 20/21.

Method of charging in 2021/22

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded as having English as an additional language (for up to 3 years after they enter the statutory school system) in the October 2020 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Based on October 2019 census data, this equates to £244.26 per pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the total amount per school.

Other Options which may be considered

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

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

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

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021-22

Trade Union Representation Service

Outline of Proposed Service 2021/22

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

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

What union officers do

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

Individual casework issues

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

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

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

Collective Issues

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

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

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

Proposed Cost of Delivery in 2021/22

The following table summarises the proposed cost of the service for 2021/22, compared to 2020/21. It is based on engaging a representative from each of the unions:

Union	2020/21	Proposed 2021/22
NASUWT	£15,786	£16,254
NEU	£29,261	£30,129
NAHT	£3,494	£3,597
ASCL	£2,400	£2,471
Support Service Recharges	£5,094	£5,245
Total Cost	£56,034	£57,697
Income from Academies	£1,765	£1,310
Cost to Maintained Schools	£54,269	£56,387
Income from Nursery and Special Schools and PRUs	£2,418	£1,659
Cost to Primary and Secondary Schools	£51,851	£54,728

The proposed budget for 2021/22 is based on:

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

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

Method of charging in 2021/22

The total cost of the service will be divided by the total number of pupils recorded in the October 2020 census to arrive at a per pupil amount for charging purposes. Using October 2019 census data to provide an indicative amount, this would equate to £3.70 per primary and secondary pupil. Appendix A of the main report shows the indicative total amount per school. Academies and other schools may choose to buy into the service at the same per pupil rate (this would provide funding for additional hours).

Other Options which *may* be considered

It should be noted that once a decision has been made to discontinue pooling arrangements, it would be almost impossible to reverse that decision at a later date.

De-delegation Proposals 2021/22

Therefore the HFG and SF need to be aware that a decision to cease pooling arrangements for this budget would be permanent.

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

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021-22

CLEAPSS Service

Outline of Proposed Service 2021/22

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

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

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

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

Benefits of Service

CLEAPSS covers:

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

CLEAPSS provides:

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

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

Costs and Method of charging for 2021/22

CLEAPSS set the pricing each year in January/February for the financial year April to March ahead. In 2020/21 the charge to schools was 16 pence per pupil including administration costs. For secondary schools who require the service of a Radiation Protection Officer (delivered by WBC Health & Safety Team) and a Radiation Protection Adviser (delivered by CLEAPSS) there are additional costs of £185 per annum for the Radiation Protection Officer and £50 per annum for the Radiation Protection Adviser totalling £235 for the RPA and RPO services.

The proposal for 2021/22 is to set a rate per pupil of 16 pence per pupil which we hope will cover any increase in the CLEAPSS fee and the cost of administration. As the de-delegation covers pre-16 pupils only, maintained secondary schools will need to pay the 6th form element of the fee as a separate sum. Any shortfall or surplus will be carried forward to the following year.

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

Other Options which *may* be considered

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

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

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

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021-22

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

Accountancy (Statutory Functions)

Description of Duties:

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

Overview of school budget submissions & budget monitoring reports.

Monitoring of schools in financial difficulty/deficit.

Monitoring adherence to Scheme for Financing Schools.

Returns to Central Government – CFR, CFO grants return.

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

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

Cost: £48,491

0.31 FTE Accountants; 0.43 FTE Senior Accountant; 0.12 FTE Finance Manager
Total FTE 0.86

Pension Scheme Administration

Description of Duties:

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

Amending and updating employee records in relation to pensions

Responding to queries from employees in relation to pensions

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

Cost: £36,729

1.0 FTE Pensions Assistant

Internal Audit of Schools – Statutory Requirements

Description of Duties:

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

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

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

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

Cost: £47,789

0.65 FTE Senior Auditor; 0.09 FTE Audit Manager

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools**Proposal to De-Delegate Formula Funding 2021-22****Statutory and Regulatory Duties – Health and Safety****1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Council has an established, professional and well regarded Health and Safety Team that already supports West Berkshire schools, currently through two service level options, Level One (Basic) and Level Two (Enhanced).
- 1.2 Over the course of 2019/20 pandemic the Schools Health and Safety Team have been significantly involved in producing guidance and helping schools to develop and review their covid secure plans, risk assessments and arrangements.
- 1.3 Responding to the pandemic and schools needs has meant that we have had to largely set aside the two level service and provide support and advice to all schools. This has shown the value of the service but this now needs to be reflected by a new proposal set out below to help fund the provision of the team and the services it provides in a fair and equitable way for all schools.

2. Background and Legislative Context

- 2.1 The principal legislation in the United Kingdom for health and safety is the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974. There is also a considerable amount of health and safety legislation under the Health and Safety at Work Etc Act 1974 including the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations etc.
- 2.2 The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations set out that every employer shall appoint one or more competent persons to assist him in undertaking the measures s/he needs to take to comply with the requirements imposed by the relevant statutory provisions.
- 2.3 The regulations state that the employer shall ensure that the number of competent persons appointed, the time available for them to fulfil their functions and the means at their disposal are adequate having regard to the size of the undertaking, the risks to which employees are exposed and the distribution of those risks throughout the organisation. It should be noted that the regulations do not suggest any limit or scope to the competent advice or how it should be delivered practically.
- 2.4 The regulations also state that where there is a competent person in the employer's employment, that person shall be appointed in preference to a competent person not in his employment.
- 2.5 The duties imposed by the health and safety at work Act 1974 and associated regulations apply to the Council as an employer and it would also apply to the Council in relation to Local Authority maintained schools as the Council is the employer.

- 2.6 In the case of Foundation and Voluntary Aided schools the Governors are the employer. In independent schools and Academies the Governors or the Academy Trust are the employers.
- 2.7 The Council also has the general “duty to educate”, even where the Governors or an Academy Trust are the employer, there could be some limited involvement for the Council if a serious incident were to occur. See Appendix I for further information on the legal duty holders.

3. The Councils Health & Safety Support Service to Schools

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

Schools Senior Health and Safety Adviser posts and retaining the currently vacant Schools Health and Safety Adviser post (some adjustment to person specification / job description / grade and pay would likely be necessary).

- 3.10 The Council would also need to review the scope of the service but it is likely that we would remove or drastically reduce health and safety training available to schools.
- 3.11 The service would likely comprise of access to competent advice (mostly remote via email and phone), accident/incident investigation via Crest and schools needs assessments but on a less frequent basis and no services would be offered to schools other than those that are Council maintained.

4. Update on position since last year

- 4.1 An options paper setting out a number of alternative ways that the schools health and safety service could be funded into the future was taken to the Schools Funding Forum in 2020/21. There were options to move to a uniform service level to all maintained schools funded by all maintained schools paying an equal share or to remain with the part funded and part buy-back service. Head Teachers voted to remain with the part funded and part buy-back service with a basic Level 1 core service (funded by all schools) and the enhanced Level 2 buy-back service.
- 4.2 Head Teachers accepted that if the Level 2 buy-back drops off then this would jeopardise the future provision of the service and requested that a further report be brought for their consideration if that was to happen.
- 4.3 As was somewhat expected at this time last year the overall buy-back of the service by schools did reduce with around five schools dropping out due to budget constraints but another four schools bought into the service.
- 4.4 Buy back for the year 20/21 is around £125,000 with staffing costs at around £180,000 if all posts are filled including overheads, leaving a shortfall of around £55,000. Funding for the Level 1 post (approx £41k), which is held vacant still offsets this reducing the shortfall to around £12,000.
- 4.5 We need to establish the structure and funding for the Schools H&S Team going forward as the current system is unlikely to be viable in the longer term.
- 4.6 We were successful in retaining work for health and safety support service to the Excalibur Academies Trust for approximately £23,000 per annum. This is included in the £125,000.

5. Proposals

Enhanced level one and two

- 5.1 The full schools health and safety service would be provided to all maintained schools, thus removing the differing levels of service. This will meet the requirements of the employer under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations and other related legislation.

- 5.2 Moving to an equal service will mean that schools that currently buy back to level 2 will pay less but level 1 schools will pay slightly more but they will receive the full health and safety service including training etc.
- 5.3 Schools will pay a graduated fee based on pupil numbers for the Level 1 element of the service and a top up cost to cover the combined service. All maintained schools will need to agree to be part of this collective agreement to equitably fund the service.
- 5.4 The 3 posts supporting schools (one currently vacant) would be reduced to 2 to reduce costs but to maintain a robust and viable service comparative to the current enhanced level 2 service.
- 5.5 A buy-back option would continue to be offered to schools such as academy and independent schools. Income generated from buy-back services would be invested in the service or offset to reduce costs for the schools in the collective agreement.
- 5.6 Table 1 below shows the 20/21 cost for Level 2 that schools who buy back pay on top of the de-delegated fee. If all Local Authority maintained schools, Voluntary Controlled, Voluntary Aided and special schools agree to one equal service the total cost to each school would be on line 21/22.

Table 1

	Pupil No's	Band A 0-60	Band B 61 - 100	Band C 101-200	Band D 201-300	Band E 301+	Band F Secondary
20/21	Cost	£1,240.97	£1,758.04	£1,964.88	£2,378.53	£2,585.36	£3,619.00
21/22	Cost	£800.00	£1,300.00	£1,600.00	£2,000.00	£2,600.00	£5,507.04

Note: the above costs reflect the Level 2 element of the buy-back only. Each school covered by the DSG also currently pays a share of the Level 1 costs in addition to Level 2 costs.

- 5.7 Table 2 below shows some approximate cost summaries based on schools around the mid-point in terms of pupils numbers according to the price per pupil (Level 1 contribution) and price banding set out in Table 1 above. Column A, B and C show the costs for schools in 20/21 under the current arrangements. For 21/22, Column D shows the Level 1 contribution, Column E is the top up fee for the combined service and Column F is the total cost for the service to schools but is based on all maintained schools agreeing to be part of this collective agreement. In order to compare year on year costs review Column C and F. Discounts based on federated schools and other similar arrangements would cease.

Table 2

Table 2 School	Column A Level 1 cost @ £4.33 per pupil 20-21	Column B Level 2 Actual cost in 20/21	Column C Total Cost 20/21	Column D Level 1 cost @ £4.47 per pupil 21-22	Column E Level 2 Top up fee 21- 22	Column F Total combined costs for new service 21/22
Band A Typical School up to 60 pupils Level 2 (Based on 60 pupils)	£259.80	£1,240.97	£1,500.77	£268.20	£531.80	£800.00
Band A Typical School up to 60 pupils Level 1 (Based on 60 pupils)	£259.80	£0.00	£259.80	£268.20	£531.80	£800.00
Band B Typical School 61-100 pupils Level 2 (Based on 85 pupils)	£368.05	£1,758.04	£2,126.09	£379.95	£920.05	£1,300.00
Band B Typical School 61-100 pupils Level 1 (Based on 85 pupils)	£368.05	£0.00	£368.05	£379.95	£920.05	£1,300.00
Band C Typical School 101-200 pupils Level 2 (Based on 165 pupils)	£714.45	£1,964.88	£2,679.33	£737.55	£862.45	£1,600.00
Band C Typical School 101-200 pupils Level 1 (Based on 165 pupils)	£714.45	£0.00	£714.45	£737.55	£862.45	£1,600.00
Band D Typical School 201-300 pupils Level 2 (Based on 250 pupils)	£1,082.50	£2,378.53	£3,461.03	£1,117.50	£882.50	£2000.00
Band D Typical School 201-300 pupils Level 1 (Based on 250 pupils)	£1,082.50	£0.00	£1,082.50	£1,117.50	£882.50	£2000.00
Band E Typical School 301+ pupils Level 2 (Based on 325 pupils)	£1,407.25	£2,585.36	£3,992.61	£1,446.25	£1,153.75	£2,600.00
Band E Typical School 301+ pupils Level 1 (Based on 325 pupils)	£1,407.25	£0.00	£1,407.25	£1,446.25	£1,153.75	£2,600.00
Band F Typical Secondary School Level 2 (Based on 1232 pupils)	£5,334.56	£3,619.00	£8,953.56	£5,507.04	£0	£5,507.04
Band F Typical Secondary School Level 1 (Based on 1232 pupils)	£5,334.56	£0.00	£5,334.56	£5,507.04	£0	£5,507.04

- 5.8 Table 3 below shows the cost of providing the enhanced level one and level two service:

Table 3	2021/22 Proposed £
Staffing Costs	124,650
Other Costs	5,000
Support Service Recharges	12,965
Total Cost	142,615
De-delegated basic level one income @ £4.47 per pupil	-66,055
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special & PRU schools	-2,002
Remainder cost to be met by all Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools via a top up for enhanced Health & Safety package	74,558

Basic level one

- 5.9 Maintain the current split in the service levels and funding, with a Level 1 service funded through the de-delegated agreement with those schools equally and equitably sharing the costs of the provision of the basic Level 1 service. Those schools that decide to purchase the enhanced Level Two schools health and safety service will then be provided the enhanced Level 2 health and safety service.
- 5.10 The level two service already operates at a deficit that is only offset by not appointing to the vacant level one post. If the level of buy-back were to reduce significantly in 21/22 it is likely that we would need to make significant changes to the service offer.
- 5.11 Table 4 below shows the cost of providing the basic level one service:

Table 4	2021/22 Proposed £
Staffing Costs	56,870
Other Costs	5,000
Support Service Recharges	6,187
Total Cost	68,057
Less: Charge to maintained nursery, special & PRU schools	-2,002
Total Cost of service proposed to be met by Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	66,055
Estimated rate per Pupil	£4.47

6. Recommendation

- 6.1 Schools consider the options set out above and choose the best option that suits their needs, resources and meets legal requirements for financial year 2021/22.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The Council recognises that safety is important but needs to be approached creatively and should not be seen as simply another legal burden or bureaucratic chore. A planned approach to managing risk should be seen as an enabler, not just to prevent accidents and work related health problems for both staff and pupils but to build a culture of sensible risk management, linked to a curriculum where teaching young people can develop their capability to assess and manage risk.
- 7.2 The Council will continue to support sensible and pro-active health and safety management in schools by providing a supportive infrastructure and service to schools.
- 7.3 The pandemic has brought health and safety front and centre in the minds of everyone in 2020 and schools continue to be under significant pressure and scrutiny around their covid arrangements.
- 7.4 The Schools Health and Safety Team have been significantly involved in helping schools to develop and review their covid secure plans, risk assessments and arrangements.

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Health and Safety Service 2021/22

Overview of Service

West Berkshire Council has a professional and dedicated Schools Health and Safety Team who provide support and advice to schools on all aspects of health and safety including an online safety management system incorporating accident reporting, compliance management and a resource library.

The Schools Health and Safety Team also work on policy development and effective implementation, user friendly guidance and information, support in completing risk assessments, a complete range of health and safety training, safety alerts and health and safety newsletters.

The Schools Health and Safety Team have also been very involved in producing guidance and reviewing schools risk assessments and covid secure plans.

Schools Health & Safety Needs Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1

Benchmark	Overall Score	Description	Score Range Achieved	Frequency between needs assessments
Outstanding	91%+	Schools judged as 'outstanding' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 5 years. Support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	91% and above	Up to 5 years
Good	80% to 90%	(1) Schools judged as 'good' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 4 years. Support will be provided in intervening years on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	80% to 90%	Up to 4 years
Requires Improvement	55% to 79%	(2) Schools judged as 'requires improvement' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 2 years. Support will be provided in intervening year on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	60% to 79%	Up to 3 years
Inadequate	Up to 54%	(3) Schools judged as 'inadequate' on the previous needs assessment will require a new needs assessment completed in up to 1 year. Support will be provided in intervening months on the areas identified for improvement and topic specific assessments will be completed for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.	59% and below	Up to 1 year

West Berkshire Council Health and Safety

Table 2

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

	school. Identify and/or nominate key staff tasked with health and safety responsibilities.
6) Planning and implementing:	<p>Review the existing arrangements; ensure the school adequately documents the standards and procedures required for a safe place of work.</p> <p>Following written review and prioritisation of issues, help the school to progress the areas for improvement by providing support and guidance. Improvement will be achieved with the schools full commitment and involvement.</p>
7) Health and Safety Risk Assessment:	<p>Provide the school with initial or refresher training to nominated persons regarding completion of <i>local</i> Risk Assessments.</p> <p>Provide on-site review of the schools risk assessments, to support their completion.</p> <p>Provide basic refresher training to nominated groups of key staff. Ensure a practical understanding of the training by jointly completing several specific health and safety risk assessments required by the school.</p> <p>Provide support and guidance in terms of prioritising risk assessments to be completed or reviewed etc.</p>
8) Telephone/Incident response:	<p>Provide general telephone health and safety advice as required.</p> <p>Please note that where the topic is of a specific nature, additional time may be required for a detailed response following the initial call.</p> <p>Whilst every endeavour is made to provide an immediate answer to health and safety queries via telephone/email, requests may require additional research time. Therefore, where it is not possible to provide an answer of sufficient depth at the time of the call, or the same day, every endeavour shall be made to provide a follow-up call the next working day.</p> <p>Should the associated risk to safety or health warrant a school visit, this shall be arranged by the Health and Safety Team.</p>
9) Health and Safety Training	<p>The Health and Safety Team run school specific health and safety courses. All health and safety training is included for all maintained schools and those schools purchasing the service.</p> <p>Further details of courses available and costs can be obtained from CYP Training http://info.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=29858.</p> <p>On-site training can also be arranged at no additional cost. Much of the training offer can now be completed by attending virtual training sessions vis zoom/teams meaning costs in terms of staff availability and downtime for training are reduced.</p>
10) Fire Management	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a review of the schools Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>Your advisor will also: Complete a site inspection to verify recommendations have been implemented. Discuss any issues outstanding and how to address these. Your advisor will help schools to complete an assessment to ensure you have adequate numbers of appropriately trained staff to deal with fire safety issues.</p> <p>Your advisor can also provide Fire Awareness training to school</p>

	staff at an agreed time and date on site.
11) Asbestos Management	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a condition check of ACM (asbestos containing materials) with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>Your advisor will also review: The Asbestos Management Plan The Asbestos Register The Asbestos Survey</p> <p>Additionally any asbestos related risk assessment you may have in place will be reviewed to ensure it is correct and relevant.</p> <p>Your advisor can also provide tool box talks to your staff to allay any fears they may have regarding retained ACMs and also to highlight their responsibilities in respect of Health and Safety regarding asbestos.</p>
12) Legionella Management	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a review of the legionella risk assessment with their Health and Safety Advisor.</p> <p>The advisor will also check that the school are working within the written scheme suggested and in line with the recommendations of the risk assessment.</p>
13) Playground Equipment	<p>Schools will receive a regular site visit to complete a playground equipment inspection with their Health and Safety Advisor. This will be a guided check to ensure staff are confident with what should be checked, what should be recorded and what action to take.</p> <p>We will also review the playground equipment risk assessment with the school to ensure it is suitable and sufficient.</p> <p>This will give a specific opportunity for any concerns to be discussed and queries answered.</p> <p>We can also provide on-site training and support to staff if required.</p>

West Berkshire Council Maintained Schools

Legal Duty Holders for Health and Safety

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Risk Protection Arrangement for Schools

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Leah Rinaldi

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To advise the group of the RPA for maintained schools.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the RPA scheme is highlighted to schools with a comparison of WBC's Insurance programme.

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 DfE introduced the Risk Protection Arrangement for Academy schools as an alternative to traditional insurance cover. Local authority insurance is not able to cover Academies as the local authority does not have an insurable interest in an Academy. The scheme has now been made available to maintained schools.
- 3.2 The RPA is not insurance; it is a risk transfer mechanism. An insurance policy is a legally enforceable contract; under the RPA, claim payments are discretionary.
- 3.3 The current cost of the RPA is £18 per pupil, per year and £18 per place, per year for special and alternative provision academies, special schools and pupil referral units. According to the DfE, the cost for the next financial year (2021/2022) will be reviewed at the end of 2020. The price per pupil could easily rise in the current economic conditions – a 25% increase is expected increasing the price per head to £23 - £24. Under WBC's arrangements, schools are charged a proportion of WBC's external insurance premiums based on the sum insured of the school buildings and the school's payroll cost, together with the cost of the Insurance's team services to schools and not a per pupil price. WBC's total price also includes Engineering Insurance and Inspection which is not provided by the RPA. It is not yet known if there will be changes to the scheme itself when it is reviewed at the end of the year.
- 3.4 3 WBC schools joined the RPA scheme with effect from 1 April 2020.

4. Supporting Information

4.1 There are many pros and cons of the RPA scheme to be considered by schools when considering joining the scheme. The RPA cover is currently in many respects much wider than that offered by insurance generally, e.g. Public Liability indemnity level is unlimited whereas WBC's limit of indemnity is £50m. It is not known whether an unlimited level of cover is financially sustainable.

- 4.2 Most local authorities, with insurers help, have proactively worked with schools over many years to improve the risk, ensuring buildings are safe, secure and pupils are safeguarded. There is no suggestion that the RPA will be able to offer proactive help and assistance.
- 4.3 The RPA has no risk management provision, with the cost being a fixed price. It highlights there is no incentive for schools to improve or effectively manage their risks. Local authority insurers often undertake a programme of schools surveys to help identify risks and make recommendations to improve them.
- 4.4 Under a conventional insurance contract, as long as the policy conditions are met, the insured is entitled to indemnity and the insurer will pay claims. The RPA, like a discretionary mutual, is not contractually obliged to pay out on claims.
- 4.5 In the event of a major loss, the RPA is not obliged to replace a school to the quality or requirements for the community; insurers have a proven record of working with the school, community and local authority in this area, both in the short-term after a major loss, and in the long-term.
- 4.6 The RPA does not cover the risks of Engineering insurance and inspection, motor insurance and medical malpractice insurance. All 3 covers are included in West Berkshire's package. Under the RPA, cover for Works in Progress is limited to £250,000 – this is cover for the works at properties which are undergoing repair, renovation or major rebuilding work. The Council cannot arrange alternative or additional cover as the cover goes with whoever is responsible for the property insurance. It is not clear who will cover any shortfall, if anyone.
- 4.7 If a large number of schools leave the Council's arrangements, either in one go or over the policy year, there is the possibility that the current property insurer will consider this to be a break of the Long Term agreement (LTA) the Council has with them and therefore decline to cover the remaining schools.
- 4.8 If a significant number of schools leave the Council's arrangements, then the Council will need to decide whether it is viable to still offer an insurance package to the remaining schools. The Council will not achieve any economies of scale for those schools remaining. Those remaining schools would then either need to join the RPA or source their own insurance arrangements. Any alternative arrangements must meet the Council's minimum requirements and standards.
- 4.9 If a large number of schools leave the Council's arrangements, there is no guarantee of any refund of premium from the insurer, as again this may be considered a break of the LTA.
- 4.10 The Insurance Team works with schools to resolve claims and offer support on risk improvements. Insurance and Risk teams have knowledge and can offer support that is fundamental when a school has an issue and needs someone to help them. Under the RPA this knowledge and support will not be there.
- 4.11 It is unclear how the RPA will provide information and opportunities to schools, so they are aware of current and emerging risks and have the knowledge and skills to manage them.

5. Options for Consideration

- 5.1 The RPA scheme should be highlighted to schools as a possible alternative for schools to WBC's current arrangements.

6. Proposals

- 6.1 Information on the RPA scheme is passed to schools for individual decisions

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant 2021/22

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

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

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To set out the provisional Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation for 2021/22.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the provisional funding allocation for the 2021/22 budgets.

<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 The National Funding Formula (NFF) is used by the Department for Education (DfE) to calculate the blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that will be allocated to local authorities in December 2020.

3.2 The DSG consists of four blocks: Schools, High needs, Central school services and Early years. 2021/22 is the fourth year of the NFF for schools, high needs and central school services. The early year's block of the DSG is determined by the separate national formula for early years.

4. Overall position

4.1 The following table shows the provisional 2021/22 DSG allocation based on the October 2019 census pupil numbers. This will be updated in December 2020 for the October 2020 census.

	Schools block (excl. growth fund)	High needs block	Central school services block	Early years block
DSG funding allocation	£m	£m	£m	£m
2020/21 final allocation	104.56	21.67	0.96	9.65
2021/22 provisional allocation	113.36	23.58	0.93	tbc
Increase on last year	8.80	1.91	(0.02)	

5. Schools Block

5.1 The provisional allocation for 2021/22 is shown below:

- Primary Unit of Funding £4443 x 13,190 pupils = £53.92m
- Secondary Unit of Funding £5537 x 9,621 pupils = £49.15m
- Allowance for business rates = £1.5m
- Total schools block = £113.36m
- Growth Fund allocation = £tbc
- Total schools block (pre block transfer) = £tbc

5.2 A block transfer of 0.25% would reduce the schools block allocation by £0.283m.

6. High Needs Block (HNB)

6.1 The 2021/22 provisional allocation for West Berkshire is £23.58m (2020/21 £21.67m). A 0.25% schools block transfer would increase this by £0.283m to £23.86m.

7. Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)

7.1 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.

7.2 The provisional CSSB DSG funding for 2021/22 is £935k, a reduction of £24k from last year. The CSSB block expenditure requirement has increased by just 1% or £11k from last year. However, the 2020/21 budget was balanced with use of a previous under spend and together with the funding reduction and increased costs, the block is showing a provisional shortfall of £84k for 2021/22. The block has been reviewed in the light of the reduced funding, and proposals made for balancing the block.

8. Early Years Block

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

8.2 Funding for 2021/22 has yet to be announced.

9. Timetable for Setting the Budget

9.1 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	Who	Item
20.7.20	DfE	Operational guidance published
July to Sept 2020	DfE	NFF illustrative allocations published and APT issued

Sept 2020	LA	Modelling of new primary & secondary school formula (once received national formula rates from ESFA)
6.10.20	HFG	Approve consultation proposals
tbc		School Admin (finance staff) briefing
19.10.20	SF	Approve consultation proposals
21.10.20	Schools	School funding formula consultation with schools.
Nov 2020	LA	High needs and Early years initial budget proposals worked on by officers
24.11.20	HFG	Review school formula consultation responses and make recommendation to Schools' Forum. Review high needs budget proposals.
7.12.20	SF	Review central schools, high needs, and early years' budget proposals.
Mid Dec 2020	DfE	DSG funding allocations and APT issued with updated census data
Mid Dec 2020	LA	Updating by officers of formula and the funding rates in light of actual DSG funding
13.1.21	HFG	Review final proposals and make recommendation to Schools' Forum. Review budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years in light of funding announcement.
25.1.21	SF	Review HFG recommendations, final calculations and final formula. Review budget proposals for central schools, high needs, and early years. Agree budget strategy and determine any further work.
By 31.1.21	Political ratification	Approval of School Formula
31.1.21	LA	Deadline for submission of final APT to ESFA
31.1.21 to 18.2.21	LA	Finalisation by officers of central schools, high needs, and early year's budget proposals.
28.2.21	LA	Statutory deadline for providing primary and secondary maintained schools with funding allocation
8.3.21	SF	Agree final budgets.

This page is intentionally left blank

Central Schools' Services Block Budget 2021/22

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 7 December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis/Ian Pearson/Lisa Potts

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

1. Purpose of the Report

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

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To balance the Central Schools Services Block by transferring funds from other blocks and by reducing costs.

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 Schools Funding Regulations for 2018/19 introduced a new Central Schools' Services Block within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This block consists of centrally retained services:

- (1) Admissions, licences and servicing of Schools' Forum, which were previously funded from the Schools Block, and
- (2) Education welfare, asset management, and statutory & regulatory duties, which were previously funded from the Education Services grant which was withdrawn in 2017/18.

- 3.2 The CSSB covers funding allocated to Local Authorities (LAs) to carry out central functions on behalf of pupils in state-funded maintained schools and academies in England. All the services funded by this block are statutory and have to be carried out.

- 3.3 The provisional allocation of funding for the Central Schools Services Block for 2021/22 is £934,757, which is a £23,970 reduction on the previous year.

4. Budget Requirement for the Central Schools Services Block

- 4.1 The following table shows the budget requirement for the services that fall within the Central Schools Services Block for 2021/22 compared to 2020/21.

	Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)	2020/21 Budget	2021/22 Budget Requirement	Increase/Decrease	Change
		£	£	£	%
	Budget Requirement:				
1	School Admissions	213,020	225,896	12,876	6%
2	National Copyright Licences	140,190	142,994	2,804	2%
3	Servicing of Schools Forum	51,290	52,640	1,350	3%
4	Education Welfare	214,890	206,986	-7,904	-4%
5	Statutory & Regulatory Duties:				
a	Provision of Education Data	207,510	212,329	4,819	2%
b	Finance Support for the Education Service	84,060	81,071	-2,989	-4%
c	Strategic Planning of the Education Service	96,770	99,900	3,130	3%
	Total Budget Requirement	1,007,730	1,021,816	14,086	1%

4.2 For 2021/22, costs have increased overall by 1% or £14k. There have been staff reductions in Finance support and the Education Welfare Service. The Support Service Recharges have been reallocated accordingly.

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

5. Funding

5.1 There has been a funding shortfall on the block since it was established.

- (1) In 2018/19, the shortfall was £251k and was balanced by transfers from Early Years and High Needs blocks and one off Council funding.
- (2) For 2019/20, costs were brought down by £135k, mainly from staffing reductions, and the block was balanced using under spends and some remaining ESG funding.
- (3) The 2020/21 grant funding for the CSSB reduced by £24k to £952k. This was balanced following a review of all the budgets and removing £9k of services budgets as well as re-coding staff time. There was an underspend from 2019/20 of £54k which will be used to off-set the in year budget shortfall of £49k.
- (4) For 2021/22, the initial grant allocation has reduced by £24k but costs have increased by £14k. The current shortfall on the budget is £87,056.

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

Central Schools' Services Block Budget 2021/22

Central Schools Services Block (CSSB)	2019/20 Budget	2020/21 Budget	2021/22 Budget Requirement	Increase/Decrease from 20/21	Change
	£	£	£	£	%
Total Budget Requirement	1,108,030	1,007,729	1,021,816	14,086	1%
Funding:					
Central Schools Services Block DSG	-976,226	-958,730	-934,760	- 23,970	-3%
Copyright underspend 18/19 & 17/18 cf	-53,155				
Capita 1 underspend 18/19	-15,000				
Release of ESG unutilised grant	-63,649	-49,000			
Total Funding	-1,108,030	-1,007,730	-934,760		
Balance	0	0	87,056		

6. Proposals for discussion

6.1 The table below shows the potential value of a Block transfer from the Early Years and High Needs Blocks. Cost reductions will also be investigated to reduce the value required as a transfer.

	TOTAL	Early Years Block	High Needs Block
Statutory & Regulatory Duties:			
Provision of Information	212,329		
Accountancy	81,071	8,107	8,107
Education Service Planning	99,900	9,990	9,990
Sub Total Stat Reg Duties	393,300		
Education Welfare Service	206,986		
Servicing the Schools Forum	52,640	5,264	5,264
Admissions	225,896		
National Copyright Licences	142,994	14,299	14,299
	1,021,816	37,660	37,660
Central School Services Block DSG	-934,757	initial allocation 2021/22	
Current shortfall	87,059		

Appendix A

Details and Costs of Central Schools' Services

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2021/22 £
School Admissions			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
Administration of admissions process for maintained schools and academies			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
Service Manager	1.00	10%	
Admissions and Transport Manager	1.00	80%	
Admissions Officers	2.50	80%	
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			142,540
Employee Expenses			18,700
Supplies and Services			5,850
Capita One recharge			22,055
Support Service Recharges			36,751
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR ADMISSIONS			225,896
Servicing the Schools Forum			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
Setting agendas, minute taking, co-ordination and distribution of papers for Schools Forum and its sub groups			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
Head of Education	1.00	10.00%	
Schools Finance Team	2.46	5% to 10%	
Schools Forum Clerk			
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			43,680
Room hire, consumables and members expenses			1,610
Support Service Recharges			7,350
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR SERVICING THE SCHOOLS FORUM			52,640

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2021/22 £
Education Welfare			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
Tracking of children who can be legally removed from the school roll.			
Monitoring of elective home education.			
Issuing and monitoring of child work permits and performance licences.			
Attendance at core group meetings for specific pupils			
Advice on keeping registers			
Progress cases to court where appropriate. Maintain up to date knowledge of legal processes and			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
Principal Education Welfare and Safeguarding Officer	1.00	45%	
Senior Education Welfare Officer	0.40	90%	
Education Welfare Officers	4.30	35%	
Assistant Education Welfare Officer	1.00	100%	
Administrative Assistant	0.40	100%	
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			154,903
Employee expenses/car allowances			6,150
Other non staffing costs			3,380
Income from fines			-11,350
Capita One Recharges			9,803
Support Service Recharges			44,101
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR EDUCATION WELFARE			206,987
	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2021/22 £
Provision of Education Data			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
Statutory returns to DfE			
Data analysis and reporting e.g. Exam results, performance			
School census administration and reports			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
Staffing	2.00	100%	
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			96,950
Capita One recharge			100,679
Support Service Recharges			14,700
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR PROVISION OF EDUCATION DATA			212,329

	Number of Posts	% Charged to CSSB	2021/22 £
Finance Support for the Education Service			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
DSG services budget preparation, monitoring, and year end			
Education services budget preparation, monitoring, and year end			
School funding formula and early years funding formula			
Administration of funding allocations to all schools for early years and high needs			
Statutory returns e.g. APT, S251, CFO deployment of DSG			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
DSG Accountant	1.00	5%	
Accountant - Education	0.50	75%	
Accountant - Education	1.00	50%	
Senior Accountant - Education	0.61	50%	
Education Finance Manager	0.81	15%	
Chief Accountant	1.00	5%	
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			59,020
Support Service Recharges			22,051
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR FINANCE SUPPORT			81,071
Strategic Planning of the Education Service			
<u>Description of Statutory Duties covered</u>			
Strategic planning and management of the Education service as a whole			
<u>Staffing Structure</u>			
Head of Education	1.00	80%	
Other staffing	1.00	42%	
<u>Breakdown of Costs</u>			
Staff salary costs			97,100
Other staff costs			2,800
Support Service Recharges			0
TOTAL ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURE FOR PLANNING OF EDUCATION SERVICE			99,900

High Needs Block Budget 2021/22			
Report being considered by:	Schools' Forum 7 th December 2020		
Report Author:	Ian Pearson, Jane Seymour, Michelle Sancho, Linda Curtis		
Item for:	Discussion	By:	All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report sets out the current financial position of the high needs budget for 2020/21 and the position known so far for 2021/22, including the likely shortfall.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note the predicted shortfall and request a further report on savings options.

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, in spite of the threshold for an EHCP remaining the same and being applied robustly.

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. The budget set for 2020/21 included a planned overspend of £1.18m.

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 2021-22 costs exceed 2020-21 budgets.

3.6 There will be an in year import / export adjustment to the HNB budget which is difficult to estimate at this stage. The current year import / export adjustment was £24,000

3.7 The net shortfall in the 2021-22 HNB budget, is **£3,946,115**. This includes a predicted 20/21 overspend of £1,296,067 and carried forward overspends of £1,279,122 in 19/20 and of £521,000 in 18/19. (Total carried forward overspend of £3,096,189). Without the carried forward overspends, the shortfall in 21-22 would be **£849,926**

3.8 The increase can be explained as follows:

- Overspend of £521,000 in 2018-19, carried forward
- Overspend of £1,279,122 in 2019-20, carried forward.
- Estimated overspend of £1,296,067 in 2020-21, carried forward
- Additional anticipated pressures in 21-22, over and above the deficit budget set in 2020-21, 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.

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 2020/21 and 2021/22 is set out in Table 1. This will continue to be refined over the next few months, particularly in relation to the largest variable element, which is top up funding.

The figures are based on all services continuing at current staffing levels and contract costs, with no change in the funding rates for top ups and the current/known number and funding level of pupils.

4.2 Most of the DSG allocation for the high needs block is now confirmed. Part of it is estimated and will be based on the actual number of pupils in special schools in the October 2020 census, and import/export adjustments based on the January 2020 census and February 2020 ILR.

TABLE 1	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Forecast £	2021/22 Estimate £
Place Funding	6,082,000	6,082,000	6,141,000
Top Up Funding	12,865,755	12,779,220	13,974,940
PRU Funding (top ups only)	1,375,920	1,389,850	1,389,860
Other Statutory Services	1,541,640	1,542,801	1,618,980
Non Statutory Services	1,063,270	1,007,170	1,111,530
Support Service Recharges	186,330	186,330	188,790
Total Expenditure	23,114,920	22,987,371	24,425,100

HNB DSG Allocation	-21,667,304	-21,691,304	-23,575,174
0.25% Schools Block Transfer	-263,285	-263,000	
In year overspend	1,184,331	1,296,067	849,926
HNB DSG Overspend from previous year	1,800,122	1,800,122	3,096,189
Total cumulative deficit	2,984,453	3,096,189	3,946,115

4.3 There is a forecast shortfall of **£849,926** in the 2021/22 HNB which may change as the budgets continue to be finalised.

4.4 Proposals for savings will be brought to the next meeting of the HFG / Schools' Forum. Any savings are likely to have to come from non statutory services, though the impact on statutory budgets will need to be taken in to consideration.

4.5 A consultation took place with schools in November 2020 on whether to transfer 0%, 0.25% or 0.5% from the Schools Block to the HNB. The results are to be discussed at the next Schools Forum, but are currently showing as in favour of a 0.25% transfer, which would amount to £287k.

4.6 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

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 2021-22; no additional funding is made available.
- 1.3 In total the allocated planned places in 2020-21 are 723 (see Table 1 below).
- 1.4 Requests have been made for an increase of 15 post 16 places in academies in 21-22, but this is offset by a reduction of 3 pre 16 places in academy resourced schools, so the net increase is 12. This net increase reflects an increase in placements in resourced provision in academies.
- 1.5 The increases and reductions in planned places for 21-22 are shown below by establishment.

Establishment	Current planned places	Proposed planned places	Change
Fir Tree ASD	7	8	+1
Trinity ASD/SpLD	49	54	-1 Pre 16 +6 Post 16 Net +5
Kennet PD/Hi	32	36	-2 Pre 16 +6 Post 16 Net +4
St. Bart's Post 16	3	5	+2
Total	93	105	+12

- 1.6 Planned places at establishments not listed above will remain the same for 2021-22.
- 1.7 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. There is a shortfall in planned places for children with EHCPs attending West Berkshire maintained special schools and PRUs, so this funding will need to be taken from the maintained special school and PRU EHCP top up budgets, creating additional pressure in those areas.

TABLE 1 - Place Funding Budget	2020/21 Budget			2021/22 Estimated Budget		
	No. of Places	£	Current No. of Pupils	Proposed No. of Places	£	Difference in number
Special Schools pre 16 (90540) –	286	2,860,000	409	286	2,860,000	0
Special Schools post 16 (90546) –	79	790,000		79	790,000	0
Resource Units Maintained pre 16 (90584) –	35	230,000	30	35	242,000	0
Resource Units Academies pre 16 (DSG top slice) –	103	684,000	101	101	634,000	-2
Mainstream Maintained post 16 –	5	25,000	6	5	38,000	0
Mainstream Academies post 16 (DSG top slice) –	16	96,000	19	30	180,000	+14
Further Education	133	737,000		133	737,000	-6
PRU Place Funding (90320)	66	660,000	72	66	660,000	0
TOTAL	723	6,082,000		735	6,141,000	+12

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 2020/21 and the estimate for 2021/22.

TABLE 2	2019/20 Budget		2020/21 Budget			2021/22	Difference 20/21 budget & 21/22 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Special Schools Maintained (90539)	3,463,450	3,749,817	3,986,360	4,122,320	135,960	4,295,110	+308,750
Non WBC special schools (90548)	1,065,960	920,557	1,194,300	980,560	-213,740	1,278,090	+83,790
Resource Units Maintained (90617)	270,350	312,583	313,650	291,220	-22,430	314,000	+350
Resource Units Academies (90026)	946,530	826,870	948,280	979,460	31,180	1,047,730	+99,450
Resource Units Non WBC (90618)	143,580	164,744	130,600	158,380	27,780	170,540	+39,940
Mainstream Maintained (90621)	667,330	822,349	779,450	796,680	17,230	814,450	+35,000

Mainstream Academies (90622)	267,460	360,616	389,600	398,340	8,740	400,000	+10,400
Mainstream Non WBC (90624)	73,030	79,555	70,590	138,450	67,860	160,510	+89,920
Non Maintained Special Schools (90575)	1,030,380	911,178	1,068,200	1,008,830	-59,370	1,028,040	-£40,160
Independent Special Schools (90579)	2,683,020	2,205,989	2,797,000	2,785,990	-11,010	3,338,740	+541,740
Further Education (90580)	1,408,870	1,141,252	1,087,730	1,087,730	0	1,087,730	0
Disproportionate HN Pupils (90627)	100,000	68,001	100,000	31,260	-68,740	40,000	-60,000
TOTAL	12,119,960	11,563,511	12,865,760	12,779,220	-86,540	13,974,940	+1,109,180

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

- Independent special schools
- Maintained special schools
- Resource units academies
- Mainstream non West Berkshire
- Non West Berkshire special schools
- Resource units non West Berkshire
- Mainstream maintained
- Mainstream academies

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

- Non maintained special schools
- Disproportionate high needs budget

2.4 The predictions of cost for 2021-22 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 2021-22. The figures assume a middle ground between the best case scenario and the worst case scenario (financially) in terms of Tribunal outcomes.

2.5 Independent special schools

This is by far the greatest pressure in the top up budgets. The pressure reflects a number of factors including the fact that some highly complex children have needed to be placed in very expensive placements in 20-21 and so have only incurred part year

costs this year, but will incur full year costs in 21-22. In addition there are a number of children with very complex SEMH (including ASD in some cases) who are very likely to need specialist places in 21-22. A number of these children would be suitable for the new planned SEMH/ASD provision but it is not possible for their current placements to be sustained until the new provision is available. Every effort is being made to avoid independent specialist school placements if it is possible to do so, but realistically the chances of doing so are low.

2.6 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. As there is no additional planned place funding for special schools, the extra planned place funding has been allowed for in this budget. Historically, special schools have only been paid £7,500 per extra place over and above the ESFA agreed planned places, which has placed an increasing strain on special schools as their numbers have increased. It is proposed that special schools from 2021-22 should be paid the full £10,000 for each additional place, which has been allowed for in the projected 2021-22 costs. *In addition, it should be noted that the special schools have put forward a case for further additional funding which will need to be considered. It is proposed that this should be the subject of a report to the next HFG / Schools Forum.*

2.7 Resource Units Academies

This pressure reflects a small number of young people with extremely complex physical disabilities attending our PD resourced provisions who would otherwise be in much more costly specialist placements. It also includes increased funding for several other children in our PD resources, as the needs of this cohort have become much more complex over time. In addition, the Fir Tree ASD Resource has been increasing its numbers up to the full capacity agreed when it was set up.

2.8 Mainstream top ups (non- West Berkshire schools)

This increase reflects a higher number of families opting for cross border secondary placements, including two high cost young people who might otherwise be in specialist provision.

2.9 Non West Berkshire special schools

This budget funds placements in special schools maintained by other Local Authorities and also special Free Schools. The increase is due to 4 students needing to move in to SEMH provision, including three currently in I-College and one currently in mainstream.

2.10 Resource units (non- West Berkshire)

This increase reflects one additional student requiring a place at The Rise ASD provision in Bracknell.

2.11 Mainstream top ups (maintained and academies)

This increase is due to a small increase in the number of EHCPs in mainstream schools, combined with an increase in the average cost of an EHCP.

2.12 FE Colleges

The figures above assume the same level of budget requirement for FE College placements in 21-22 as currently. More detailed work is being done on this and it is

possible that the budget requirement will be lower. An updated figure will be included in the next report to the HFG / Schools Forum on the HNB.

3. PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS (PRU) – STATUTORY

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

TABLE 3	2019/20 Budget		2020/21 Budget			2021/22	Difference 20/21 budget & 21/22 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
PRU Top Up Funding (90625)	757,700	871,370	818,400	818,400	0	818,400	0
PRU EHCP SEMH Placements (90628)	331,400	505,724	557,520	571,450	13,930	571,460	+13,940
Non WBC PRU Top Up Funding (90626)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,089,100	1,377,094	1,375,920	1,389,850	13,930	1,389,860	+13,940

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. Heads have requested that this contribution remains until a review in March 2022. 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 21/22 PRU Top Up Funding is based on the profile of pupils at I-College in the summer term.

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. 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	2019/20 Budget		2020/21 Budget			2021/22	Difference 19/20 budget & 20/21 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Applied Behaviour Analysis (90240)	119,120	136,178	136,580	160,970	24,390	148,190	+11,610

Sensory Impairment (90290)	236,000	228,079	227,590	245,633	18,043	247,860	+20,270
SEN Commissioned Provision (90577)	527,150	515,446	567,650	567,041	-609	584,480	+16,830
Equipment for SEN Pupils (90565)	15,000	8,429	15,000	22,480	7,480	15,000	0
Therapy Services (90295)	261,470	244,291	261,470	259,327	-2143	314,500	+53,030
Elective home Education Monitoring (90288)	28,240	21,603	28,240	28,240	0	28,240	0
Home Tuition Service (90315)	102,080	71,277	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Home Tuition (90282)	119,920	90,601	205,000	159,000	-46,000	172,730	-32,270
Hospital Tuition (90610)	36,000	16,345	39,050	39,050	0	39,280	+230
SEND Strategy (DSG) (90281)	56,200	33,015	61,060	61,060	0	68,700	+7,640
TOTAL	1,501,180	1,365,264	1,541,640	1,542,801	1161	1,618,980	77,340

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 an increase in Personal Budgets.

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 higher next year due to increased teachers' pay and pension costs.

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 the contract having been retendered in January 2020. The previous cost had remained fixed for several years under the

previous contract so an inflationary increase was necessary. There have also been increased 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 will overspend this year, mainly due to one exceptionally high need student in one of our PD resources. It is recommended that the budget stays the same for 2022-22 as although this is a budget which does come under pressure, we have successfully negotiated with Health to fund 50% of specialist seating in schools in future which should reduce pressure on this budget.

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. The service is commissioned from the Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust.

4.6.3 We are currently in the process of extending the contract for one year with a view to a potential joint commissioning arrangement with other neighbouring Local Authorities at the end of the 12 month period.

4.6.4 The costs for 2021-22 are the provider's estimated costs for next year and have not yet been agreed, so this figure may reduce. The contract price has been fixed since 2018 so some uplift for increased staffing costs will be reasonable. The provider has also requested an additional part time post due to the increasing volume of Tribunal cases which require involvement of a speech and language or occupational therapist. This is still under discussion.

4.7 Elective Home Education (EHE) Monitoring

4.7.1 There is a statutory duty for Local Authorities to monitor arrangements for EHE made by parents. The EHE monitoring sits within the Education Welfare and Safeguarding Service. The Elective Home Education Officer is 0.6fte and was a new post for September 2019. EHE numbers have been growing, both locally and nationally over recent years but September and October 2020 have seen a steep rise in numbers due to COVID-19. In September 2019, eleven students were deregistered from schools; September 2020 saw 34 students deregistered.

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 the following year's budget already agreed by Schools' Forum. £40K saving has been achieved as a result of transferring this service in house. Further savings have been proposed for 21/22

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 2021-22 budget remains the same as 2020-21. There is a small increase due to inflation increases in salaries for the proportion of staff time administering this service

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. Agreement was given by the Schools Forum in October 2020 that this post could be made permanent in order to attract and retain candidates of a suitable calibre.

5 NON STATUTORY Services

5.10 **Table 5** details the non-statutory service budgets for 2019-20, 2020-21, and estimates for 2021-22. 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.

5.11 The table shows the budget for these services in 2021/22 assuming that the services continue and there are no changes to staffing levels.

5.12 Table 5 also includes ongoing funding for the "invest to save" initiatives agreed in 2020-21; an increase in the Vulnerable Children Grant and investment in the Therapeutic Thinking initiative in order to ensure it is sustainable.

TABLE 5 Non Statutory Services	2019/20 Budget		2020/21 Budget			2021/22	Difference 20/21 budget & 21/22 prediction
	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	
Language and Literacy Centres LALs (90555)	98,400	81,595	116,200	116,200	0	122,000	+5,800
Specialist Inclusion Support Service (90585)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	0

TABLE 5	2019/20 Budget		2020/21 Budget			2021/22	
Non Statutory Services	Budget £	Outturn £	Budget £	Forecast £ (Month 7)	Over/ (under) £	Estimate £	Difference 20/21 budget & 21/22 prediction
PRU Outreach Service (90582)	61,200	61,200	61,200	61,200	0	61,200	0
Early Years Inclusion Fund (90238) moved to EY Block	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Needs Support Team (90280)	325,660	319,240	308,130	308,130	0	328,100	+19,970
ASD Advisory Service (90830)	146,210	153,307	208,390	157,240	-51,150	229,970	+21,580
Vulnerable Children (90961)	50,000	50,000	179,400	179,400	0	179,400	0
Early Development and Inclusion Team (90287)	40,000	40,000	51,950	53,000	1,050	56,560	+4,610
Dingley's Promise (90581)	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	30,000	0
Therapeutic Thinking (90372)	0	0	58,000	52,000	-6,000	54,300	-3,700
TOTAL	801,470	785,342	1,063,270	1,007,170	-56,100	1,111,530	+48,260

5.13 Language and Literacy Centres (LALs)

5.13.1 In September 2018, charges were introduced for placements at the Language and Literacy Centres at Theale and Winchcombe schools. Charges were based on 50% of the real cost of the place. These charges were introduced in order to alleviate pressure on the High Needs Block.

5.13.2 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.

5.13.3 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.

5.13.4 A survey of primary school head teachers clearly demonstrated that a large number of primary schools would have liked to refer pupils to LAL but could not 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.

5.13.5 There is some 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.

5.13.6 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.

5.13.7 It was therefore agreed in 2020-21 that the charges for LAL places would be 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.

5.13.8 The increase proposed to the LAL budgets relates to the budgets not currently meeting costs of the host schools. In previous years this has been covered off by carried forward amounts but these funds have now been exhausted.

5.14 Specialist Inclusion Support Service

5.14.1 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.

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

5.15 PRU Outreach

5.15.1 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.

5.16 Cognition and Learning Team

5.16.1 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.

5.16.2 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.

5.16.3 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.

5.16.4 The additional cost represents teachers' salary increases, pension and NI.

5.17 ASD Advisory Service

5.17.1 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.

5.17.2 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.

5.17.3 In 2020-21 it was agreed that there would be investment in the service to provide two HLTAs. Recruitment to these posts was delayed due to Covid 19, but both posts have now been filled successfully and staff will start in January.

5.17.4 The increase in cost represents teachers' salary increases, pension and NI, plus a vacancy being filled by a teacher on UPS (previous postholder not on UPS).

5.18 Vulnerable Children

5.18.1 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.

5.18.2 The budget was gradually reduced from £120K over a number of years. This has always been a well used resource that helps schools support vulnerable pupils with complex needs. It was agreed in 2020-21 that this budget would be increased, as an invest to save initiative, in order to support the roll out of Therapeutic Thinking in West Berkshire schools. It is proposed that the increase agreed in 2020-21 is maintained in 2021-22. This would be the equivalent of using one year's funding for three permanently excluded pupils to attend the PRU. This additional sum would have the potential to support approximately 20 pupils and help prevent exclusions for each of them.

5.19 Early Development and Inclusion Team

5.19.1 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.

5.19.2 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.

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

5.20 Dingley's Promise

5.20.1 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.

5.20.2 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.

5.21 Therapeutic Thinking Officer

5.21.1 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.

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

5.21.3 The Therapeutic Thinking Invest to Save Project have had a significant impact on staff skills and reported practice. In order to sustain change across West Berkshire It is recommend that HNB funds a 3year fixed term post of Therapeutic Thinking Officer 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.

5.21.4 The appointment of a dedicated lead has enabled the authority to start to embed this approach. Due to Covid restrictions it has been necessary to adapt the training to online modules. This has been well received by schools.

5.21.5 In order to ensure that therapeutic thinking can be moved forward in a timely way, it is proposed that the Therapeutic Thinking Officer post continues to be funded from the High Needs Block. In order to retain candidates of suitable calibre, and in order to maintain momentum on Therapeutic Thinking projects, it is suggested that the post be offered on permanent basis.

5.21.6 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.

5.21.7 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.

Heads Funding Group Recommendations:

Early Years Budget

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Avril Allenby and Lisa Potts

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To update the Schools' Forum on the forecast position for the Early Years Block for 2020/21.

2. Expenditure Forecast 2020/21

- 2.1 The current expenditure forecast is made up of the actual payments for the summer and autumn terms, with estimated hours for the spring 2021 term. The estimates have been based on prior year actual hours.
- 2.2 From the start of the autumn term 2020, the guidance was that local authorities should continue to fund providers which are open at broadly the levels they would have expected to see in the 2020 autumn term had there been no coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. They should also continue to fund providers which have been advised to close, or left with no option but to close, due to public health reasons. Local authorities should not fund providers which are closed, without public health reason, from the start of the autumn term.
- 2.3 The intention is to fund on the basis of 'as if autumn term 2020 were happening normally'. In order to do this, local authorities might, for example, use the numbers of children in places in the previous autumn to inform funding levels this autumn.
- 2.4 As the result of Covid-19, any providers who had fewer number of hours compared to autumn 2019 were issued with a top up amount as shown in table 1 below.
- 2.5 There are savings due to the reduced hours for Autumn 2020, but this is off-set against the top up payment, resulting in a net overspend on expenditure of £191,146.
- 2.6 There are currently no variances reported on any of the centrally managed funds.
- 2.7 The expectation is to return to the normal early years funding process and use the January 2021 census count to drive funding allocations for the 2021 spring term.
- 2.8 The DfE also expect local authorities' funding to providers to return to the normal approach (that is, 'funding following the child') for all providers from 1 January 2021.

3. Grant income

- 3.1 The original grant income allocated to the Early Years Block for 2020/21 was £9,651,877

Early Years Budget

- 3.2 Following the end of year adjustment for 2019/20, the revised grant income for 2020/21 is £10,229,324.
- 3.3 This is an increase in grant of £577,447, made up of two elements. £331,901 relates to the actual hours from September 2019 to March 2020 based on the January 2020 census. The balance of £245,546 relates to the increase in hours from the January 2020 census for expected hours between April & August 2020.

4. Net Forecast 2021/22

- 5.1 The net forecast on the Early Years block is currently £1,197,228 overspend, which is a £280k lower underspend than budgeted.

Early Years 2020/21 forecast

Table 1	2020/21 Budget Set £	2020/21 Forecast £	2020/21 Variance £
Funds Delegated to Early Years Providers			
PVI Providers (90036)	6,423,350	6,314,038	-109,312
Nursery classes in Mainstream Schools (90037)	1,650,420	1,651,967	1,547
Maintained Nursery Schools (90010)	938,110	892,123	-45,987
2 Year Old Funding (90018)	756,830	691,337	-65,493
Pupil Premium Grant (27%) and deprivation funding (73%) (90052)	188,380	208,386	20,006
Additional payment re Autumn 2020	0	390,384	390,384
Total Delegated Funds	9,957,090	10,148,236	191,146
Centrally Managed Funds			
Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (90017)	258,450	258,450	0
Early Development Intervention Team (EDIT) (90287)	51,950	51,950	0
SEN Inclusion Fund (90238)	90,000	90,000	0
Disability Access Fund (90053)	23,370	23,370	0
SSRs	66,152	66,152	0
Total Centrally Managed Funds	489,922	489,922	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	10,447,012	10,638,158	191,146
Early Years DSG Block Funding In Year (see below)	-9,651,877	-10,229,324	-577,447
In year overspend	795,135	408,834	-386,301
Early Years clawback from 2019/20	0	-86,554	-86,554
Early Years DSG Block Overspend from previous year	682,380	874,948	192,568
FORECAST CUMULATIVE DEFICIT AT YEAR END	1,477,515	1,197,228	-280,287

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 To date we have protected our local early education and childcare providers using the guidance from government to ensure that all providers are being funded at about the same level as in the autumn of 2019.

Early Years Budget

- 5.2 As can be seen in the report on the financial impact of COVID-19 the numbers of children accessing funded places and the hours they are attending has decreased.
- 5.3 There was an expectation that there would be a steady recovery with more children accessing their entitlements. However although there is some evidence that a small number of parents have taken up additional hours, recovery is slow. We will be monitoring this closely
- 5.4 As discussed previously we need to work to ensure that the in-year arrangements are managed within the available budget and where possible do not add to the already difficult deficit position.

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial Impact of COVID-19 on the Early Years Funding Block

Report being considered by: Schools' Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Avril Allenby

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To update the Schools' Forum on the financial impact of COVID-19 on the Early Years Funding Block.

2. Background

- 2.1 The majority of early year's settings, in common with schools, remained open throughout the lockdown providing childcare to key workers and vulnerable children. Since July those who work all year round have been completely open and since September all settings have re-opened offering provision in line with National guidance.
- 2.2 During this time early years providers have received funding based on those children who are or would have been attending and where providers have a proportion of their funding coming from private income they have been able to access the furlough scheme.

3. Impact on providers from Covid-19

- 3.1 Following a recent meeting of the Early Years Funding Group, it has become increasingly apparent that there are much longer term effects of Covid-19 on this sector. The Institute of Fiscal Studies found that 25% of private sector nurseries ran a "significant deficit" during lockdown, with less than £4 of income for every £5 in costs. Even though they reopened in June, demand for places was still 70% down in the summer holidays compared with pre-covid levels.
- 3.2 Vulnerable children have been impacted the most during this pandemic. This group needs where possible to be protected against any rate cuts. Currently EYPP is 53p per hours and West Berkshire make this up to £2:00 per hour. These children are a priority both nationally and locally and this has become even more of a focus during the pandemic.
- 3.3 More staff are required to manage bubbles of smaller than the normal sized groups. Also to provide cover for staff absence. Those accessing the furlough scheme have been rotating staff to gain maximum benefit from this vital business support.
- 3.4 30 hours entitlement is only available when both parents are working. There's been a decrease in the number of parents eligible for this funding, therefore hours have decreased. Or parents are uncertain of the job stability once the furlough scheme ends and are therefore being cautious about relying on childcare or the entitlement of additional hours.

- 3.5 Some families are still anxious about taking up their places and have delayed registration. The confidence in childcare providers is building but many families are not yet accessing their full entitlements. To address this the early years' service is taking a more flexible approach to eligibility cut off dates and the increase of hours mid-term is being funded.
- 3.6 Those providers who have to date been accessing furlough were only able to use the scheme against the income part of their business. For many small providers they couldn't access any funding as they don't income generate, operating using only the public funding and by fund raising. The Institute for Fiscal Studies recons the median furlough payment for nursery staff was worth just 55p for every £1 of lost fee income.
- 3.7 There has been a large reduction on private income for providers as parents are using less hours than previously and not wanting to pay for additional services or hours on top of their free entitlement. This income is an important part of the business model for many providers.
- 3.8 There has been no additional funding for PPE, cleaning or other related cost for any early years providers including our maintained nursery schools. The DfE potion on this is, Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS), along with the rest of the nursery sector, cannot claim for the same additional costs as primary and secondary schools (for additional cleaning, required due to confirmed or suspected coronavirus cases over and above the cost of existing cleaning arrangements; increased premises costs needed to keep schools open during school holidays).
- 3.9 This position should be viewed in the context of the overall support available, which includes the supplementary funding paid to LAs for maintained nursery schools, which, along with the funded entitlements, has continued to be paid to LAs throughout the pandemic.
- 3.10 All nurseries, including MNS, benefit from the continuation of early years entitlement funding during the coronavirus outbreak. Further, maintained nursery schools, like private nurseries, typically rely on private income for a significant proportion of their income, unlike most state-funded schools. Therefore, we ensured that access to the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme was also available to maintained nursery schools, in line with published guidance.

Total Funded Children				
	Autumn 2019	Autumn 2020	Difference	% Reduction
2YO	252	203	49	19
Universal 3& 4 YO	1903	1799	104	5
Extended 3&4 YO	848	797	51	6

Funded Hours			
Autumn 2019	Autumn 2020	Difference	% Reduction
53,680	40,565	13,115	24
377,368	362,707	14,662	4
149,527	141,464	8,062	5

- 3.11 The tables above provide a comparison of the numbers of funded children and the funded hours autumn 2019 and in this autumn 2020 period. Although there are always year on year fluctuations due to cohort size it is useful to see the differences in both numbers and hours. There is marked reduction in both children funded and the hours they are accessing. This raises a concern about the statutory requirement to secure provision for vulnerable 2 years old, the uptake of the universal offer for 3 and 4 year olds and also the number of parents eligible for the extended offer.
- 3.12 Current information from providers indicates that while parents have remained loyal to their providers they are not accessing the same level of hours as they were prior to COVID-19. Some of this is due to anxiety about the safety of their child, for others their childcare needs have changed. More parents working from home means that they are travelling less and not needing the wraparound care as their working day is shorter
- 3.13 Since lockdown there have been three closures and a fourth is planned for the end of December. These have in the main been settings that were already experiencing financial difficulties and the COVID-19 situation has compounded this. There has been one new setting open. We are aware of 5 further settings who are needing support and guidance as they are struggling financially and 8 others who have asked for on-going advice to manage their financial situations. All 13 are pre-school settings. These settings are facing a range of issues, redundancy costs, venue hire costs, additional cleaning and PPE costs. It should be noted that the majority of pre-schools are community committee run settings who are non-profit, so are not eligible for furlough or rate rebates.
- 3.14 In addition to the pre-schools there is a lot of additional advice and support going to childminders. Accurate figures for closures are just emerging as the deregistration process is managed by Ofsted and is behind due to COVID-19. They are also the group who are less likely to send in their weekly data returns. There could 10 plus who have closed during this time due to the restrictions and difficulties around the sharing of places for children.
- 3.15 The Institute of Fiscal Studies found that 25% of private sector nurseries ran a “significant deficit” during lockdown, with less than £4 of income for every £5 in costs. Even though they reopened in June, demand for places was still 70% down in the summer holidays compared with pre-covid levels. So with the end of furlough this month we will need to be aware of the potential impact on the private business.
- 3.16 The additional work that the impact of Covid-19 generates; increased contact with providers, information gathering, support to access and to follow government guidance, is putting considerable pressure on the small early year’s team. Coming at a time when the team are working with accountancy and the early years funding group to put in place a deficit recovery plan.

4. Conclusion – referenced to national

- 4.1 Nationally providers that rely mostly on public funding have seen their income largely protected. For providers with income from parent fees, support through the furlough scheme and self-employment grants was a significant help but provided far from full protection. The true picture of this locally is hard to determine.

- 4.2 Providers have been written to advising them of the planned cuts in rates and requesting that they provide information on the potential impact of this alongside their current financial position due to COVID-19.
- 4.3 Childminders, who are mostly self-employed, have also been badly hit by the crisis. Even if all childminders received self-employment grants, the total loss of parent fees could see an additional almost 30% of childminders now earning less than £4 of income for every £5 of costs (counting what they usually pay themselves in the costs). In practice, many childminders will see their earnings take a hit, which could jeopardise their ability or desire to stay in the market.
- 4.4 In our data, we find that smaller providers, those with more highly qualified staff or those from more deprived areas are no more likely to have run at a significant deficit during lockdown. These are also the providers who will be most affected by cuts to our local rates.
- 4.5 The key question in the medium term is how much demand for childcare recovers, and how quickly it returns. The Institute of fiscal Studies estimate that, for every 5 percentage point drop in fee income between 5% and 25% compared with pre-crisis levels, an additional 3–4 percentage points of providers are likely to face a significant deficit. These results are driven by childminders. If, in addition to low fee income, take-up of funded places is still below pre-crisis levels in January 2021, voluntary providers and nursery classes will be hardest hit.
- 4.6 The extent to which government support for the sector will be needed going forward depends on how the market adjusts to changing levels of demand. Before the pandemic, the childcare market featured significant turnover and there was some spare capacity at around 70% of providers, suggesting that the market is mature and could potentially adjust to rises and falls in demand (at least at the national level). But the current fall in demand is unprecedented and the blow to providers' finances could force some to close or shed places.
- 4.7 Although most of the providers who largely rely on free entitlement funding were financially cushioned from the impact of the lockdown, they could see their incomes hit in 2021 if demand remains low in January – when take-up of funded childcare is measured to determine future funding levels.

Scheme for Financing Schools

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

Item for: Information **By:** All Maintained schools representatives

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise of the consultation responses on the updated Scheme for Financing Schools.

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

2. Introduction

- 2.1 Local authorities are required to publish schemes for financing schools which set out the financial relationship between the local authority and the schools they maintain. The local authority has reviewed the current scheme to ensure that all sections are still appropriate and proposed a number of changes.
- 2.2 In making any changes to the scheme, a local authority must consult all maintained schools in their area and receive the approval of the members of their schools forum representing maintained schools.

3. Consultation

- 3.1 A three week consultation with maintained schools was undertaken between 21 October and 11 November 2020. There were no suggested changes.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The updated Scheme for Financing Schools will be adopted from 1 April 2021.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant Monitoring Report 2020/21 – Month Seven

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 7th December 2020

Report Author: Ian Pearson

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

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To report the forecast financial position of the services funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), highlighting any under or over spends, and to highlight the cumulative deficit on the DSG.

2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the report be noted.

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

3. Background

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

4. 2020/21 Budget Setting

- 4.1 The 2020/21 Dedicated Schools Grant allocation is £138m. This includes £41m which funds Academies and post-16 high needs places which is paid direct by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) to schools. The DSG budget for 2020/21 has been built utilising the remaining grant of £97m.
- 4.2 The schools block is ring fenced but the Local Authority can transfer up to 0.5% of the funding out of the schools block with Schools Forum agreement. The other blocks are not subject to this limitation on transfers. For the 2020/21 budget, Schools Forum agreed to transfer 0.25% of the Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block amounting to £263k.

4.3 The DSG expenditure budgets required for 2020/21 total £99m, which is £2m more than the funding available. As a result, a £2m in-year efficiency target has been set against this in order to balance the DSG budget. £1.2m of the target is allocated to the High Needs Block and £0.8m to the Early Years Block in accordance with the 2020/21 budget agreed by Schools Forum at the meeting held on 09/03/2020.

4.4 There is a brought forward deficit on the DSG of £1.691m.

5. Month Seven Forecast (30 October 2020)

5.1 The forecast position at the end of October is shown in Table 1. A more detailed position per cost centre is shown in Appendix A.

Table 1 - DSG Block forecast	Original Budget 2020/21	Budget Changes	Amended Budget 2020/21	Quarter 1 Forecast	Quarter 2 Forecast	Month 7 Forecast	Month 7 Forecast Outturn Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Schools Block (inc ISB)	65,221		65,221	65,221	65,221	65,221	0
Early Years Block	10,381		10,381	10,381	10,381	10,572	191
Early Years Block In-Year efficiency target	(795)		(795)	0	0	0	795
Central School Services Block	834		834	883	880	831	(3)
High Needs Block	21,387		21,387	21,343	21,566	21,259	(128)
High Needs Block In-Year efficiency target	(1,185)		(1,185)	0	0	0	1,185
Total Block Expenditure	95,843	0	95,843	97,828	98,049	97,883	2,040
Support Service Recharges	444	0	444	444	444	444	0
Total Expenditure	96,287	0	96,287	98,272	98,493	98,327	2,040
Funded by:							
DSG Grant	(96,287)		(96,287)	(96,287)	(96,287)	(97,037)	(749)
Net In-year Deficit	0	0	0	1,985	2,205	1,291	1,290
Deficit Balance in reserves	1,691		1,691	1,691	1,691	1,691	1,691
Cumulative Deficit	1,691	0	1,691	3,676	3,896	2,982	2,981

5.2 The Month Seven forecast shows an in-year forecast deficit of £1.3m. This comprises £60k against in-year expenditure and an unmet £1.9m efficiency target. Adjustments to the DSG funding in year has reduced the overall deficit to £1.3m in year. When added to the cumulative deficit of £1.691m, the forecast year end deficit on the DSG is £2.98m.

6. Schools Block

6.1 There are no forecast variances within the Schools block at Month Seven. 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).

6.2 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 2021/22 budget setting process as balances are only attributable to these specific services and cannot be allocated generally across the DSG. The de-delegated balances are detailed below:

Schools Block De-Delegated balances	31.3.2020	change in reserves	M7 position	31.3.2021 Est
	£k	£k	£k	£k
Schools in Financial Difficulty	(200)	0	28	(173)
School Improvement	(41)	0	0	(41)
EMTAS	(41)	0	10	(31)
Therapeutic Thinking	(2)	0	0	(2)
Total balance	(284)	0	38	(247)

7. Early Years Block

- 7.1 The Early Years Block is forecasting a £986k overspend at Month Seven; £191k against expenditure and £795k against the in-year efficiency target. Additional grant of £577k has been received relating to the Early Years Block, as shown against DSG grant in Table 1. This will be reflected in the block budgets for the next reporting period.
- 7.2 Due to the nature of the volatility in this block, it is difficult to forecast as the funding (the final grant allocation will be determined by the January 2021 census), and payments to providers (payments are made according to actual number of hours of provision each term) are unpredictable.

8. Central Schools Services Block

- 8.1 The Central School Services Block is forecasting an underspend of £3k at Month Seven. This comprises a £3k in-year underspend on staffing.

9. High Needs Block

- 9.1 The High Needs Block is forecasting an in-year underspend of £128k but the efficiency target of £1.2m remains unmet. The main variances against expenditure are as follows:
- £68k pressure relating to 13 new placements at Non WBC Mainstream schools
 - £124k pressure relating to an increase in use of Independent Special Schools and Special schools, which is a £162k reduction from the Q2 report.
 - £213k saving from 1 successful tribunal and children being placed in local mainstream and local specialist provision.
 - £114k savings have been achieved on the Disproportionate High Needs costs and the Medical Home Tuition service, which transferred in-house in Sept 2019.
 - 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.
 - Further work needs to be undertaken to ascertain which of the current year savings are ongoing or one off. This will help in compiling a recovery plan for 2021-22.

9.2 A breakdown of the PRU top up information for the autumn term has recently been received, information should be available for month 9 reporting. These codes are currently shown as reporting online, this is a risk which could have an impact on the block's forecast position.

10. Deficit Position

10.1 The DSG forecast is a £1.3m overspend in year.

10.2 When added to the prior year deficit, the total forecast deficit on the DSG amounts to £2.98m. The DfE recognises that some authorities still cannot afford to pay off the historic deficit from the DSG over the next few years. In these cases, the DfE expects to work together with LAs to agree a plan of action to pay off its deficit. The DfE expects to approach selected authorities to begin discussions during 2020 and expand discussions to other authorities during 2021/22 and subsequent years.

10.3 The deficit sits largely within the High Needs and Early Years blocks, and reports will be presented to Schools Forum on plans to address the deficits.

11. Conclusion

11.1 The total forecast deficit on the DSG amounts to £2.98m, comprising £1.7m from previous years and a further £1.3m forecast overspend in year. The forecast position will be kept under review and updates provided to Schools' Forum Appendices

Appendix A – DSG 2020-21 Budget Monitoring Report Month 7

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Month 7							
Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2020/21	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2020/21	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90020	Primary Schools (excluding nursery funding)	47,677,060		47,677,060	47,677,060	0	
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Primary	0		0	0	0	
90025	Secondary Schools (excluding 6th form funding)	16,115,140		16,115,140	16,115,140	0	
DSG top slice	Academy Schools Secondary	0		0	0	0	
90230	DD - Schools in Financial Difficulty (primary schools)	19,000		19,000	19,000	0	
90113	DD - Trade Union Costs	47,090		47,090	47,090	0	
90255	DD - Support to Ethnic minority & bilingual Learners	224,660		224,660	224,660	0	
90349	DD - Behaviour Support Services	216,390		216,390	216,390	0	
90424	DD - CLEAPSS	3,070		3,070	3,070	0	
90470	DD - School Improvement	0		0	0	0	
90423	DD - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	172,930		172,930	172,930	0	
90235	School Contingency - Growth Fund/Falling Rolls Fund	756,100		756,100	756,100	0	
90054	Efficiency Target	-10,070		-10,070	-10,070	0	
	Schools Block Total	65,221,370	0	65,221,370	65,221,370	0	
90583	National Copyright Licences	140,190		140,190	140,190	0	
90019	Servicing of Schools Forum	43,940		43,940	43,940	0	
90743	School Admissions	176,270		176,270	176,270	0	
90354	ESG - Education Welfare	170,790		170,790	167,790	-3,000	
90460	ESG - Statutory & Regulatory Duties	351,590		351,590	351,590	0	
90054	Efficiency Target	-49,000		-49,000	-49,000	0	
	Central School Services Block DSG	833,780	0	833,780	830,780	-3,000	

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Month 7

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2020/21	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2020/21	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90010	Early Years Funding - Nursery Schools	938,110		938,110	892,120	-45,990	
90037	Early Years Funding - Maintained Schools	1,650,420		1,650,420	1,651,970	1,550	
90036	Early Years Funding - PVI Sector	6,423,350		6,423,350	6,314,040	-109,310	
90052	Early Years PPG & Deprivation Funding	188,380		188,380	208,390	20,010	
90053	Disability Access Fund	23,370		23,370	23,370	0	
90018	2 year old funding	756,830		756,830	691,340	-65,490	
90017	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	258,450		258,450	258,450	0	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	51,950		51,950	51,950	0	
90238	Early Years Inclusion Fund	90,000		90,000	90,000	0	
various	Additional payment re Autumn term	0		0	390,380	390,380	
90054	Efficiency Target	-794,570		-794,570	0	794,570	
	Early Years Block Total	9,586,290	0	9,586,290	10,572,010	985,720	
90026	Academy Schools RU Top Ups	948,280		948,280	979,462	31,182	
90546	Special Schools - Place Funding Post 16	790,000		790,000	790,000	0	
90539	Special Schools - Top Up Funding	3,986,360		3,986,360	4,122,321	135,961	
90548	Non WBC Special Schools - Top Up Funding	1,194,300		1,194,300	980,560	-213,740	One tribunal saving; children placed in local special schools and local independent
90575	Non LEA Special School (OofA)	1,068,200		1,068,200	1,008,830	-59,370	
90579	Independent Special School Place & Top Up	2,797,000		2,797,000	2,785,990	-11,010	
90580	Further Education Colleges Top Up	1,087,730		1,087,730	1,087,730	0	
90617	Resourced Units top up Funding maintained	313,650		313,650	291,223	-22,427	
90618	Non WBC Resourced Units - Top Up Funding	130,600		130,600	158,380	27,780	
90621	Mainstream - Top Up Funding maintained	779,450		779,450	796,684	17,234	

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Month 7

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2020/21	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2020/21	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90622	Mainstream - Top Up Funding Academies	389,600		389,600	398,336	8,736	
90624	Non WBC Mainstream - Top Up Funding	70,590		70,590	138,450	67,860	13 new placements
90625	Pupil Referral Units - Top Up Funding	818,400		818,400	818,400	0	
90627	Disproportionate No: of HN Pupils NEW	100,000		100,000	31,260	-68,740	
90628	EHCP PRU Placement	557,520		557,520	571,455	13,935	
High Needs Block: Top Up Funding Total		15,031,680	0	15,031,680	14,959,081	-72,599	
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)	230,000		230,000	230,000	0	
High Needs Block: Place Funding Total		3,750,000	0	3,750,000	3,750,000	0	
90240	Applied Behaviour Analysis	136,580		136,580	160,970	24,390	
90280	Special Needs Support Team	308,130		308,130	308,130	0	
90281	SEND Strategy (DSG)	61,060		61,060	61,060	0	
90282	Medical Home Tuition	205,000		205,000	159,000	-46,000	
90287	Pre School Teacher Counselling	51,950		51,950	53,000	1,050	
90288	Elective Home Education Monitoring	28,240		28,240	28,240	0	
90290	Sensory Impairment	227,590		227,590	245,633	18,043	
90295	Therapy Services	261,470		261,470	259,327	-2,143	
90372	Therapeutic Thinking	58,000		58,000	52,000	-6,000	
90555	LAL Funding	116,200		116,200	116,200	0	
90565	Equipment For SEN Pupils	15,000		15,000	22,480	7,480	
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	567,650		567,650	567,041	-609	
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	39,050		39,050	39,050	0	

Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) 2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Month 7

Cost Centre	Description	Original Budget 2020/21	Net Virements in year	Amended Budget 2020/21	Forecast	Variance	Comments
90830	ASD Teachers	208,390		208,390	157,240	-51,150	Saving £43,350 as a result of two HLTAs ASD Support posts now running 1 Jan 21 - 31 Dec 21, so funds to be carried forward
90961	Vulnerable Children	179,400		179,400	179,400	0	
90581	Dingleys Promise	30,000		30,000	30,000	0	
High Needs Block: Non Top Up or Place Funding		2,604,910	0	2,604,910	2,549,971	-54,939	
90054	Efficiency Target	-1,184,910		-1,184,910	0	1,184,910	
High Needs Block Total		20,201,680	0	20,201,680	21,259,052	1,057,372	
Total Expenditure across funding blocks		95,843,120	0	95,843,120	97,883,212	2,040,092	
SUPPORT SERVICE RECHARGES		444,000	0	444,000	444,000	0	
TOTAL DSG EXPENDITURE		96,287,120	0	96,287,120	98,327,212	2,040,092	
90030	DSG Grant Account	-96,287,120	0	-96,287,120	-97,036,582	-749,462	
NET DSG EXPENDITURE		0	0	0	1,290,630	1,290,630	

Agenda Item 17

Schools Forum Work Programme 2020/21

	Item	HFG Deadline	Heads Funding Group	SF Deadline	Schools Forum	Action required	Author
Term 3	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
	iCollege Review	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Discussion	Michelle Sancho / Jacquie Davies
	High Needs Block - Resourced Units	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Special Schools - Additional Funding	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Discussion	Jane Seymour
	Early Years Block Budget - Deficit recovery plan	06/01/21	13/01/21	19/01/21	25/01/21	Decision	Avril Allenby
	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
	Deficit Schools (<i>standing item</i>)	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
	Deficit Schools (<i>standing item</i>)	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