

NOTICE  
OF  
MEETING



# SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

**TUESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 2016**

**At 2.30 pm**

in the

**COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL,**

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

Head Teacher Representatives: Isabel Cooke, Richard Pilgrim (Chairman), Heidi Swidenbank, Helen McHale, Gill Cocklin, Alison Penny, Nick Stevens (Vice-Chairman), Stuart Muir, Ania Hildrey, Heather Clapp, Mike Wallace and Martin Tinsley.

Governor Representatives: Hugh Boulter.

Non- School Representatives: Gina Kendall and Gillian May.

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Date Not Specified

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk) or contact the Panel Administrator

**Fire Alarm** - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

**Recording of Meetings** – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

## **AGENDA**

### **PART I**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>SUBJECT</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NO</u></b>
1.	<b><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></b>  To receive any apologies of absence.	
2.	<b><u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u></b>  To receive any declarations of interest.	5 - 6
3.	<b><u>MINUTES</u></b>  To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2016.	7 - 10
4.	<b><u>MEMBERSHIP</u></b>  To confirm the outcome of the latest recruitment to School Forum vacancies.	Verbal
5.	<b><u>DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT AND PLANNED EXPENDITURE 2016-17</u></b>  To consider 2016-17 DSG expenditure proposals and approve central expenditure budgets.	11 - 24
6.	<b><u>GROWTH FUND 2016-17</u></b>  To consider and agree changes to the growth fund 2016-17.	25 - 30
7.	<b><u>FALLING ROLLS FUND 2016-17</u></b>  To consider proposals for a falling rolls fund in 2016-17.	31 - 36
8.	<b><u>EXTENSION OF FREE ENTITLEMENT FOR 3 AND 4 YEAR OLDS</u></b>  To receive a verbal update on DfE plans to extend the entitlement to 30 hours per week.	Verbal
9.	<b><u>SEN FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS</u></b>  To receive a verbal update on work to align top-up funding with Education, Health and Care plans.	Verbal



This page is intentionally left blank

## MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

### DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

#### **DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)**

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
  - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
  - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

#### **PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

#### **DECLARING INTERESTS**

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3

## SCHOOLS FORUM

TUESDAY, 19 JANUARY 2016

Present: Head Teacher Representatives: Isabel Cooke, Richard Pilgrim (Chairman) Heidi Swidenbank, Alison Penny, Nick Stevens (Vice-Chairman), Stuart Muir, Ania Hildrey and Heather Clapp.

Non- School Representatives: Gina Kendall.

Also Present: Ms Hough (St Lukes) and Mr Tomes (Churchmead).

Officers: Edmund Bradley, Kevin McDaniel, Alison Alexander, Alison Crossick and David Cook.

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received by Hough Boulter.

The Chairman informed the Forum that following the recent bereavement of Dan Jacoby he wished to record his thanks for all the work and contribution Dan Jacoby made as a member of the Schools Forum.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declaration of interest.

### MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2015 were agreed as a true and correct record subject to Nick Stevens being added as in attendance.

The Chairman asked if there was any update on the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levey and was informed that RBWM was awaiting the inspector to review the rates, that the interim policy had been agreed by Cabinet and it was expected that the Local Plan would be approved by the end of the year.

### 2016-17 PRE 16 SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA

The Chairman informed the Forum that the report due for consideration provided details of the 2016-17 School funding formula for pupils aged between 4 to 16. The main funding formula remained largely unchanged from 2015-16 with the exception of an increase in the IDACI band and FSM6 funding rates, and the low prior attainment rates.

The Forum were asked to note the final funding formula set out in appendix A and the indicative individual school budget shares as set out in appendix B. Edmund Bradley informed the Forum that for calculating schools' budget shares LAs were required to use the October 2015 school census data provided by the EFA. One of the most significant changes in the dataset had been the use of the recently published 2015 IDACI values, instead of the 2010 IDACI values used previously. This had resulted in a significant degree of movement of pupils between bands at an individual school level.

This change had resulted in 953 fewer primary pupils and 935 fewer secondary pupils in IDACI bands who attract funding for deprivation than last year. There were also now no pupils at all in the highest three IDACI bands compared with 179 such pupils previously. This would have resulted in a significant loss of funding to schools. Deprivation rates had therefore been increased for 2016-17 to compensate for this.

It was noted that 17 schools would be protected through Minimum Funding Guarantee at a cost of £309k, this was an increase of 9 schools compared to last year. The Forum questioned if it was known out of the 17 schools using MFG how many had sizeable underspends carried forward and if so what they were being used for.

The maintained sector representatives were asked to vote by sector on each de-delegated service shown in table 3a and 3b of the report. Stuart Muir raised concern that under the new de-delegation arrangements, middle schools, deemed secondary, would have funding deducted for their primary pupils even though this was against their collective wish. The Chairman mentioned that Annex C did show that they would be paying more.

It has subsequently been clarified with the Education Funding Agency that an adjustment can be made to middle schools budgets to ensure no deduction is made for behaviour support or school contingency.

It was decided that for the vote on the de-delegated services the middle schools' vote would be taken and recorded separately. The following table shows how each sector voted on each de-delegated option for 2016-17:

<b>De-delegated service</b>	<b>First, junior, and primary schools</b>	<b>Middle and secondary schools</b>
Contingencies including schools in financial difficulties and deficits of closing schools	Approved	Not approved
Behaviour support services	Approved	Not approved
Licences/subscriptions	Approved	Approved
Staff costs supply cover (e.g. maternity, trade union duties, suspended staff reimbursement)	Approved	Approved

Members were reminded that where approval for 'de-delegated' services had been given, these will be provided to maintained schools at no extra charge in 2016-17. Academies and maintained schools which have not approved the de-delegation will receive the funding for these services will be expected to purchase services from their delegated budget.

### INDICATIVE 2016-17 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT SETTLEMENT

Kevin McDaniel introduced the report that informed about RBWM's 2016-17 indicative Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement announced on 17th December 2015. Overall there was an increase of £1.234m over the 3 funding blocks compared with the 2015-16 final settlement. This was mainly due to an increase of 201 pupils (4-16) , and £266k of additional high needs funding – RBWM's share of £92.5m extra funding being made available to all Las.

Ania Hildrey questioned if the increase of £266k in the high needs block would cover the increased demand for high needs places. The Forum were informed that a paper would be brought to the March meeting setting out proposals on how DSG funding would be allocated, and taking account of the estimated budget needed for high needs pupils in 2016-17.

The Chairman said that this would be major discussion item at the March 2016 meeting.

### GROWTH FUND AND FALLING ROLLS FUND

The Chairman informed the Forum that the report provided information about plans to postpone in-year adjustments to growth fund allocations that was agreed by the Forum at its October 2014 meeting and detailed at paragraph 3.4 of the report.



Financial modelling of potential clawback of funds showed that this would put undue financial pressure on certain schools' budgets; especially as staffing levels had already been set in schools. It was therefore proposed not to take any clawback action in respect of 2015-16 growth fund allocations until the new financial year.

The Chairman asked if this was a proposed change in policy or just for this year. Concern was also raised about giving schools money for growth where the expected increase in pupils did not happen.. The Forum were informed that funding schools in advance and then clawing it back made it difficult for schools to manage their budgets. In some cases, clawbacks would be as high as 3% of the school's budget. The chairman said that officers would look at the present mechanism for allocating growth funding and bring alternative proposals to the March meeting.

It was questioned what happened to schools with high mobility rates and the forum were informed that although there was a mobility funding factor, this was not currently used.; This could be revisited for future years.

It was mentioned that any future growth fund needed to be set at a correct level as to not be an incentive when not required, that if there was a change in policy then schools would be aware and make appropriate mitigating actions and any clawback could be mitigated by budgets carried forward.

The Forum agreed with the proposal not to clawback money given during 2015-16.

**Resolved that: an alternative model for allocating growth funding would brought back to the March 2016 Forum meeting,**

The Chairman mentioned that the second part of the report dealt with the Falling Rolls Fund; a fund given to support a school with a temporary fall in number pupils.

The Forum were informed that there was a number of areas that would impact RBWM schools that may require the use of this fund; there was a drop in demand for primary school places, increased capacity in Slough having an impact on Churchmead CE Secondary School and the boroughs policy to hold a 10% surplus in places to allow for parental support and future growth.

(Isabel Cook left the meeting)

It was questioned how did the MFG impact on the formula and the Forum were informed that it was outside the formula but some criteria did take into account MFG.

**Resolved that: the forum establish a working group to look at more detailed proposals and existing policies on 'falling rolls funds' used at other authorities.**

## MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman suggested to the Forum that as the 17 Forum membership places had not been filled it was proposed to reduce numbers by 1 or 2. The Forum agreed to keep membership figures at 17, appointed Chris Tomes and requested that officers contact academy trusts and MATS about Stuart Muir filling one of their vacancies and requesting any further nominations.

## **Note for Forum**

As Dedworth Middle has not yet converted to academy, Stuart Muir will continue to hold the secondary maintained post until the school converts. On conversion to academy, Chris Tomes of Churchmead will become the secondary maintained school representative, and Stuart Muir will take up one of the three vacant academy posts, subject to any expression of interest from other academies and MATS that would necessitate an election.

The meeting, which began at 2.40 pm, finished at 4.25 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

Date:	08 March 2016		AGENDA ITEM: 5	
Title:	Dedicated Schools Grant and Planned Expenditure for 2016-17			
Responsible officer:	Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Educational Services			
Contact officer:	Edmund Bradley, Finance Partner	Tel:	01628 796904	
		E-mail	Edmund.bradley@rbwm.gov.uk	

### 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper sets out RBWM's 2016-17 expenditure plans for services funded by the Schools, High Needs and Early Years blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and other grants<sup>1</sup>. It confirms that grant funded expenditure will increase by £0.670m in 2016-17 compared with 2015/16. It seeks Schools Forum (SF) approval for certain central expenditure budgets where this is required under the regulations, and it highlights the main budget changes and re-allocations to be made in 2016-17 within the funding envelope.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.2 That Schools Forum:
- agree the expenditure proposals outlined in the paper
  - formerly approve the planned schools and early years central expenditure budgets set out in tables 8, 9, and 10, (paras 4.3 and 4.6), as required under School Finance Regulations.

### 2 FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION IN 2016-17

- 2.1 On 17 December 2015, the Education Funding Agency (EFA) announced the 2016-17 schools revenue funding settlement (the December settlement) which included LAs' provisional DSG allocations. RBWM's settlement, reported to Schools Forum on 19 January 2016, confirmed that: RBWM's indicative DSG allocation for 2016-17, including funding for academies, is £104.842m, an increase of £1.234m on the final 2015-16 grant allocation of £103.608m, see table 1.

**Table 1: 2016-17 DSG funding blocks compared with 2015-16**

	<b>Total £m</b>	<b>Early Years £m</b>	<b>High Needs £m</b>	<b>Schools £m</b>
2016-17 DSG from table 1	<b>104.842</b>	7.263	15.321	82.258
2015-16 DSG	103.608	7.254	15.005	81.349
Change	<b>+1.234</b>	<b>+0.009</b>	<b>+0.316</b>	<b>+0.909</b>

- 2.2 The breakdown of the additional £1.234m allocated to RBWM education is :
- £909k generated by 201 more pre-16 pupils compared with last year.
  - £316k relating to adjustments to the high needs block allocation including additional funding of £0.266m (RBWM's share of £92.5m distributed to all LAs).
  - £9k relates to minor adjustments in the early years block (EY) allocation.

<sup>1</sup> i.e expenditure budgets delegated to schools and early years providers, and those held centrally as prescribed in the Schools Finance 2015 Regulations. This is known as the 'Schools Budget'.

- 2.3 There have been no further changes to the DSG funding settlement reported in January 2016 which is replicated in Table 2:

**Table 2: DSG Provisional Settlement 2016-17 (including academies)**

	2016-17 £m	Schools Block £m	Early Years Block £m	High Needs Block £m	2015-16 final grant £m	Change £m
Schools Block	<b>82.231</b>	82.231			81.322	+0.909
Additions for NQT Induction	<b>0.027</b>	0.027			0.027	0
Early Years Block 3&4 year olds	<b>6.707</b>		6.707		6.707	0
Early Years Block 2 year olds	<b>0.519</b>		0.519		0.474	+0.045
Early Years Pupil Premium	<b>0.036</b>		0.036		0.072	(0.036)
High Needs Block (before deductions)	<b>15.993</b>			15.993	16.016	(0.023)
High Needs Block deductions	<b>(0.672)</b>			(0.672)	(1.011)	+0.339
<b>Total indicative 2016-17 DSG settlement (17 Dec 2015)</b>	<b>104.842</b>	<b>82.258</b>	<b>7.263</b>	<b>15.321</b>	<b>103.608</b>	<b>+1.234</b>

- 2.4 £39.186m of the Schools Block total of £82.258m is delegated funding for academies as at January 2016. The EFA will topslice or 'recoup' this from the grant received by RBWM.
- 2.5 The Early Years block allocation for two, three and four year olds of £7.263m is indicative. It is based on 1,579 FTE 3&4 year olds as at January 2015, at a funding rate of £4,248 per FTE, and 100 FTE two year olds at a rate of £5,218 per FTE. The final allocation will be adjusted for children on the January 2016 census (\*5/12) and for January 2017 (\*7/12).
- 2.6 Total funding in support of the 2016-17 Schools Budget also includes post-16 grant. The EFA is responsible for calculating post-16 funding using the post 16 national funding formula, and will notify schools of their 2016/17 academic year allocations in March. In the absence of this information, we have used the a/y 2015/16 allocations of £8.937m, see table 3, which brings overall funding to £113.779m.

<b>Table 3: 2016-17 funding in support of Schools Budget</b>	<b>Total 2016-17 £m</b>	<b>Early Years £m</b>	<b>High Needs £m</b>	<b>Schools £m</b>	<b>Total 2015-16 £m</b>
2016-17 DSG from table 2	<b>104.842</b>	7.263	15.321	82.258	103.608
Post 16	<b>8.937</b>	-	0.243	8.694	9.501
<b>Total funding 2016-17</b>	<b>113.779</b>	<b>7.263</b>	<b>15.564</b>	<b>90.952</b>	<b>113.109</b>

- 2.7 Pupil premium allocations are only included for Early years, £72k. Based on indicative 2016-17 pupil premium allocations, reported to Schools Forum in January 2016, schools can expect a further £3.4m in pupil premium.

### 3 PLANNED 2016-17 EXPENDITURE

- 3.1 The plans for distributing funding across expenditure budgets take account of the funding required for schools' delegated budgets, as determined by the pre 16 mainstream funding formula submitted to the EFA in January 2016. Post-16 estimated grant funding is treated as fully allocated to schools. All funding allocations and planned expenditure figures quoted in this paper include academies and free schools, i.e. before recoupment by the EFA for academies.

### Changes in planned expenditure

- 3.2 **Table 4** summarises the allocation of the £113.779m across the services in 2016-17. A detailed breakdown across Section 251 expenditure budget lines is shown in **annex A**. There has been a small shift in the percentage of overall funding spent on high needs compared with 2015-16 from 14.2% to 14.8%. The percentage of funding spent on schools block budget lines has seen a corresponding reduction, from 79.4% to 78.9%.

<b>Table 4 Changes in planned expenditure</b>	<b>Total £m</b>	<b>Early Years £m</b>	<b>High Needs £m</b>	<b>Schools Block £m</b>
Baseline Expenditure 2015-16	<b>113.109</b>	7.225 6.4%	16.058 14.2%	89.826 79.4%
Change in pre 16 delegated budgets	<b>+ 0.932</b>	(0.15)	+0.180	+0.767
Change in central budgets	<b>+0.302</b>	+0.028	+0.550	(0.276)
<b>Sub total planned expenditure 2016-17</b>	<b>114.342</b>	<b>7.238</b> 6.3%	<b>16.788</b> 14.7%	<b>90.317</b> 79.0%
Change in post 16 delegated budget	<b>(0.563)</b>	-	-	(0.563)
<b>Planned expenditure 2016-17</b>	<b>113.779</b>	<b>7.238</b> 6.4%	<b>16.788</b> 14.8%	<b>89.754</b> 78.9%

- 3.3 The main budget changes are detailed in **Annex B**. In summary:

#### Early Years

- Planned expenditure on 3&4 year olds reflects a slight reduction spending levels last year, but is consistent with the current uptake of the free entitlement. The extension of the free entitlement for disadvantaged 2 year olds is expected to grow, and the budget has been increased by around 10% to take account of this. Overall the early years block is planned to spend £13k more than in 2015/16.

#### Schools Block

- Expenditure on pre 16 pupils through the funding formula has increased by £767k compared with 2015-16 due to more pupils on roll in the primary sector. Delegated budgets for post-16 pupils have been reduced by £563k, to reflect the reduction in EFA grant between academic year 2014/15 and academic year 2015/16. The EFA has not yet released 2016/17 post 16 grant allocations.
- Delegated post-16 budgets are exactly matched by the post 16 grant allocations, so any reduction or increase in the grant available will be offset by a corresponding reduction or increase in the post 16 delegated budget.
- Other central school block budgets mainly remain the same as in 2015-16, except for the growth fund which has seen a £278k reduction in budget from £628k to £350k. This relates to changes in the number of schools eligible for funding under the growth fund criteria. This is discussed separately under agenda item xx.

#### High Needs

- 3.4 Overall expenditure on high needs is planned to increase by a total of £730k compared with 2015-16. This will be funded from:
- £316k increase in high needs block allocated funding announced in the December 2015 settlement.
  - Reallocation of existing high needs budgets.
  - £414k transfer of funding from early years and schools funding block.

- 3.5 The main changes in expenditure relate to:

- Manor Green - further growth in the number of pupils on roll. An additional £180k is allocated to its 2016-17 delegated budget to reflect an increase of 18 (8%) funded places based on an estimate of 248 pupils from September 2016 (245 annualised

places). The additional top-up costs associated with these extra places is estimated to be around £205k. It is possible that numbers in September 2016 will exceed 248, and /or that the level of need of the pupils on roll will vary from the existing assumptions. Both of these could impact on final overall costs. A further 100k has been added to the centrally held top-up budget to help meet any additional costs should they arise.

- Place funding for high needs places at Forest Bridge School are directly funded by the EFA. RBWM remains responsible for funding the top-up costs of RBWM's 19 pupils at Forest Bridge School, expected to be around £390k in 2016-17. This is an increase of £215k compared with 2015-16, and mainly reflects the additional budget needed to cover three terms in 2016-17 rather than two terms last year, as well as provision for a small increase in the number of RBWM pupils. Part of this additional budget requirement (£60k) has been funded by an expected saving in the budget currently set aside for the Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA) programme which Forest Bridge now provides in its offer.
- £830k of high needs funding will be set aside for alternative provision in the Borough in 2016-17, the same as in 2015-16.

### Comparison of expenditure and funding by funding block

- 3.6 Local authorities (LAs), can move funding between the DSG blocks provided that they comply with requirements of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and have the agreement of Schools Forum or the Secretary of State on any increase in centrally held budgets where such approval is required under the regulations. (See section 4).
- 3.7 In 2015-16, £781k (0.9%) of schools block funding was used to support expenditure on high needs pupils (table 5). This is not unusual among LAs. Funding for high needs, which has been largely linked to historical spending levels rather than being pupil led, has not kept pace with pressures on high needs budgets resulting from demographic growth and increasing levels of need. This has meant that LAs have had to supplement high needs funding from schools and early years block allocations. Some LAs have seen it necessary to reduce delegated formula funding rates from the previous year's level to fund the increased high needs budget requirement.

<b>Table 5: 2015-16 expenditure vs funding</b>	<b>Total £000</b>	<b>Early Years £000</b>	<b>High Needs £000</b>	<b>Schools £000</b>
Planned expenditure (table 4)	113,109	7,225	16,058	89,826
Funding (table 3)	113,109	7,254	15,248	90,607
<b>Expenditure greater / (less) than funding</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(29)</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>(781)</b>

- 3.8 In 2016-17 the amount of schools block funding used to support high needs pupils will increase by £0.418m to £1.199m (1.3%).

<b>Table 6 2016-17 expenditure vs funding</b>	<b>Total £000</b>	<b>Early Years £000</b>	<b>High Needs £000</b>	<b>Schools £000</b>
Planned expenditure (table 4)	113,779	7,238	16,788	89,754
Funding (table 3)	113,779	7,263	15,564	90,953
<b>Expenditure greater / (less) than funding</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(25)</b>	<b>1,224</b>	<b>(1,199)</b>

- 3.9 High Needs expenditure covers a broad range of services. Over 25% of the funding set aside for high needs pupils is re-allocated back to mainstream schools in the form of top-up funding for named high needs pupils or, for example, as additional funding allocated through the 'targeted support above the notional SEN budget' mechanism.<sup>2</sup> Table 7

<sup>2</sup> Each Autumn, £150k of central high needs funding is distributed to those schools which attract insufficient SEN funding through the pre 16 formula or which have a high proportion of pupils with additional needs.

analyses the high needs budget<sup>3</sup> into its constituent components, and shows that over £4m is spent in mainstream schools to help support inclusion in the mainstream sector.

<b>Table 7 Analysis of high needs expenditure</b>	Early years £k	Main-stream £k	Special & Resource £k	<b>Total high needs £k</b>
<b>Delegated budgets</b>				
Place funding			2,775	<b>2,775</b>
<b>High needs top-up funding</b>				
Maintained, academies and free schools		1,825	3,817	<b>5,642</b>
Non maintained, independent special schools	38		5,044	<b>5,082</b>
<b>Targeted support above notional SEN budget</b>		150		<b>150</b>
<b>SEN support services</b>				
Autism outreach (FPS & MG)		259		<b>259</b>
Sensory Consortium		224	75	<b>299</b>
Therapies		299	100	<b>399</b>
<b>Hospital education</b>		33		<b>33</b>
<b>Alternative provision</b>		830		<b>830</b>
<b>Support for inclusion</b>				
Targeted intervention	22	262	153	<b>437</b>
Exceptional SEN needs			368	<b>368</b>
School Support - SEND (C&L)		231		<b>231</b>
Virtual school		123		<b>123</b>
Support for Education welfare		62		<b>62</b>
Other services	5	58	34	<b>97</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4,356</b>	<b>12,366</b>	<b>16,789</b>

## 4 CENTRALLY RETAINED SERVICES

- 4.1 Under School Finance regulations, each year Schools Forums must consider the purposes for which it holds funding centrally. This includes Schools block funding for specified services which may only be centrally retained with the agreement of the Schools Forum, and provided that budgets are made available to academies and free schools on the same basis as maintained schools. Some of these services are subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increases in expenditure from the previous year. Table 8 sets out which services can be retained centrally, what approval is required, and the proposed budget changes for 2016-17<sup>4</sup>: No formal approval is required for expenditure in the High Needs Block.

**Table 8: Schools Block central expenditure and required approvals**

(Line references refer to S251 budget lines shown in Annex A)

	15-16 £000	16-17 £000	Change	Reason for change
<b>No SF approval required</b>				
Central licenses negotiated by the DfE (line 1.4.13)	98	98	-	The cost for 2016-17 remains in line with 2015-16 costs. Therefore no additional budget needed.
<b>SF approval required, increases allowed</b>				
Places in independent schools or boarding fees at maintained schools for pupils without SEN (line 1.4.8)	110	110	-	No change .- Budget provides for additional two placements each year.
Funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth to meet basic need. "Growth fund" (Line 1.4.10)	628	350	(278)	Less budget needed because fewer schools eligible for funding in 2016-17 under proposed growth funding criteria. Budget released has been re-allocated.

<sup>3</sup> Budget figures include an element of corporate overheads.

<sup>4</sup> The table only includes budget lines which are relevant to RBWM.

<b>SF approval required, no increases in expenditure allowed</b>				
Admissions (line 1.4.2)	274	274	0	No change.
Schools Forum (line 1.4.3)	46	46	0	No change
<b>SF approval required, no increases in expenditure, no new commitments allowed</b>				
Contribution to combined budgets (line 1.4.1)	268	268	0	No change See paragraphs 4.2

#### **Combined budgets** (Annex A line 1.4.1)

- 4.2 'Combined services budgets' are services funded partly from Schools Block DSG and partly from other LA budgets. A combined service budget is one where the service has an educational benefit, but draws on other budgets which support functions and services which cannot normally be charged to the DSG grant under finance regulations. These services can be funded or part funded from Schools Block DSG where they have the approval of Schools Forum. Last year, as in previous years, Schools Forum approved the use of £268k of Schools Block funding to support expenditure on the services set out in table 9. There are no new commitments or increases in budget for 2016-17.

<b>Table 9: Combined services budgets (No new commitments or increases allowed)</b>			
<b>Service</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Contribution to discretionary education psychology services	£104	£104	Expenditure on non statutory psychology services to provide all schools with a link EP as a first point of contact, three Planning and Review meetings per year, availability for telephone consultations and email support as required.
Information, advice and support for parents	£60	£60	Expenditure on impartial information, advice and support services for children and young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities, and their parents. IASS provides access for local families to free, confidential and impartial support, from independently trained staff, in accordance with the SEND Code of Practice. (See <b>annex C</b> for more detailed information).
Early Help advisors in schools	£104	£104	Expenditure on early intervention social care support for pupils in school, to provide a link worker for telephone consultations and email support as required. In addition, support for families to access social care or other interventions when they do not meet social care thresholds. (See <b>annex C</b> for more detailed information).
<b>Total combined services</b>	<b>£268</b>	<b>£268</b>	

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.3 **That Schools Forum approves the planned central expenditure on the services set out in table 8 and 9.**

#### **Centrally held budgets in support of Early Years**

- 4.4 Schools Forum approval is required for central expenditure on Under 5s. Table 4 showed that planned total spend on early years is £7.238m in 2016-17. Of this amount, £7.096m is earmarked for the direct provision of the free entitlement for two, three and four year olds, and £142k is held centrally in support of early years functions, an increase of £28k compared with 2015-16.
- 4.5 The breakdown of the central expenditure budget for under 5s is shown in table 10. Around £65k of the high needs expenditure budget is spent on under 5s (see table 7 above).



<b>Table 10: Planned central expenditure on Early Years</b>	<b>2015-16 £000</b>	<b>2016-17 £000</b>
Administration and support for delivery of free entitlement	80	119
School milk – discretionary	21	11
Expenditure for 'de-delegated' services <sup>5</sup> (eg. Maternity cover, licenses, contingency)	13	13
<b>Total planned expenditure on early years</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>143</b>

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.6 That Schools Forum approve a budget of £143k for central expenditure on under 5s as shown in table 10.**

---

<sup>5</sup> Only maintained primary and secondary maintained schools can choose to de-delegate budget for prescribed services. A small budget is therefore held centrally on behalf of maintained nursery schools to ensure they are not financially disadvantaged.

# ANNEX A Indicative 2016-17 Schools Budget – Planned Expenditure and Funding

(Positive = budget increase, negative = budget decrease)

SCHOOLS BUDGET before Academy recoupment	Finalised 2015-16 S251 v2 Jul 15 adjusted for final 2015-16 settlement				% of 2014 15 spend
	Total 2015-16 £m	Early Years Block £m	High Needs Block £m	Schools Block £m	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>					
<b>Delegated budget</b>					
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget - Pri & Sec Pre 16	78,623			78,623	69.5%
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget - Sec Post 16	9,257			9,257	8.2%
1.0.1 Resource Unit Place funding Pri and Sec	320		320		0.3%
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget - Special Pre 16	2,032		2,032		1.8%
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget - Special Post 16	243		243		0.2%
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget - AP	0		0		0.0%
1.0.1 Free education on 3 & 4 year olds (Schools)	2,077	2,077			1.8%
1.0.1 Free education on 3 & 4 year olds (PVI's)	4,493	4,493			4.0%
1.0.1 Early Years pupil premium	72	72			0.1%
1.0.1 Spending on 2 year olds	468	468			0.4%
<b>De-delegated budget</b>					0.0%
1.1.1 Contingencies	86			86	0.1%
1.1.2 Behaviour support services	67			67	0.1%
1.1.7 Licences/subscriptions	17			17	0.0%
1.1.8 Staff costs - supply cover	244			244	0.2%
1.1.9 Staff costs - supply cover union duties	32			32	0.0%
<b>High Needs Budget</b>					0.0%
1.2.1 Top up funding - maintained providers	4,557		4,557		4.0%
1.2.2 Top up funding - academies and free schools	561		561		0.5%
1.2.3 Top up funding - independent providers	5,082		5,082		4.5%
1.2.4 Additional high needs targeted funding for mainstream schools and academies	150		150		0.1%
1.2.5 SEN support services	955		955		0.8%
1.2.6 Hospital education services	43		43		0.0%
1.2.7 Other alternative provision services	830		830		0.7%
1.2.8 Support for inclusion	1,285		1,285		1.1%
<b>Early Years central budgets</b>					0.0%
1.3.1 Central expenditure on children under 5	114	114			0.1%
1.3.1 Central expenditure - contingency	0	0			0.0%
<b>Central Provision within Schools Budget</b>					0.0%
1.4.1 Contribution to combined budgets	268			268	0.2%
1.4.2 School admissions	274			274	0.2%
1.4.3 Servicing of schools forums	46			46	0.0%
1.4.5 Carbon reduction commitment allowances	0			0	0.0%
1.4.6 Capital expenditure from revenue (CERA)	0			0	0.0%
1.4.8 Fees to independent schools without SEN	110			110	0.1%
1.4.10 Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes	628			628	0.6%
1.4.12 Other	0			0	0.0%
1.4.13 Exceptions agreed by Sec of State	173			173	0.2%
<b>1.6.1 TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET (before Academy recoupment)</b>	<b>113,109</b>	<b>7,225</b>	<b>16,058</b>	<b>89,826</b>	<b>100%</b>
	100%	6.4%	14.2%	79.4%	

## FUNDING

DSG Early Years Block	7,254	7,254		
DSG High Needs Block	16,016		16,016	
DSG High Needs Block - deductions	(1,011)		(1,011)	
DSG Schools Block	81,349			81,349
DSG Total before academy recoupment	103,608	7,254	15,005	81,349

EFA Post 16 funding - Secondary	9,258	0	0	9,257
EFA Post 16 funding - Special	243	0	243	0
Recoupment for academy growth		0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<b>113,109</b>	<b>7,254</b>	<b>15,248</b>	<b>90,607</b>
	100%	6.4%	13.5%	80.1%

Revised 2016-17 Budget as v1 S251			
2016-17 TOTAL Schools Budget £m	Early Years Block £m	High Needs Block £m	Schools Block £m
79,353	0	0	79,353
8,694	0	0	8,694
320	0	320	0
2,212	0	2,212	0
243	0	243	0
0	0	0	0
2,078	2,078	0	0
4,463	4,463	0	0
36	36	0	0
519	519	0	0
151	0	0	151
63	0	0	63
16	0	0	16
220	0	0	220
32	0	0	32
4,865	0	4,865	0
777	0	777	0
5,082	0	5,082	0
150	0	150	0
958	0	958	0
33	0	33	0
830	0	830	0
1,317	0	1,317	0
142	142	0	0
0	0	0	0
268	0	0	268
282	0	0	282
46	0	0	46
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
110	0	0	110
350	0	0	350
0	0	0	0
167	0	0	167
<b>113,779</b>	<b>7,238</b>	<b>16,788</b>	<b>89,754</b>
100%	6.4%	14.8%	78.9%

7,263	7,263		
15,993		15,993	
(672)		(672)	
82,258			82,258
104,842	7,263	15,321	82,258

8,694	0	0	8,694
243	0	243	0
0	0	0	0
<b>113,779</b>	<b>7,263</b>	<b>15,564</b>	<b>90,953</b>
100%	6.4%	13.7%	79.9%

Movement compared to 2015-16				% of 2015 16 spend
Movement compared to 2014-15 £m	Early Years Block £m	High Needs Block £m	Schools Block £m	
730	0	0	730	69.7%
(563)	0	0	(563)	7.6%
0	0	0	0	0.3%
180	0	180	0	1.9%
0	0	0	0	0.2%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
1	1	0	0	1.8%
(31)	(31)	0	0	3.9%
(36)	(36)	0	0	0.0%
51	51	0	0	0.5%
65	0	0	65	0.0%
(3)	0	0	(3)	0.1%
(1)	0	0	(1)	0.0%
(24)	0	0	(24)	0.2%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
308	0	308	0	0.0%
216	0	216	0	4.3%
0	0	0	0	0.7%
0	0	0	0	4.5%
0	0	0	0	0.1%
3	0	3	0	0.8%
(10)	0	(10)	0	0.0%
(0)	0	(0)	0	0.7%
32	0	32	0	1.2%
28	28	0	0	0.0%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
0	0	0	0	0.2%
7	0	0	7	0.2%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
0	0	0	0	0.1%
(278)	0	0	(278)	0.3%
0	0	0	0	0.0%
(6)	0	0	(6)	0.1%
<b>670</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>(72)</b>	<b>100%</b>

9	9		
(23)		(23)	
339		339	
909			909
1,234	9	316	909

(564)	0	0	(563)
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
<b>670</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>346</b>

## Budget changes in 2016-17 compared with 2015-16

## ANNEX B

Early Years Block	Delegated £000	Central £000	Total £000	Notes
<b>2015-16 Base (A1)</b>	<b>7,111</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>7,225</b>	
<u>Budget increase / (decrease)</u>				
a) Early Years pupil premium	(36)			Reduction based on revised number of eligible pupils in January 2016. Indicative only.
b) Two year olds	51			Based on expected 10% increase of pupils in 2016-17, from 91 to 100 FTE. Indicative only.
c) Three and four year olds	(30)			Adjustment to estimated 3 & 4 year old budget requirement. Indicative only. Funding will be adjusted to meet actual uptake.
d) Central support for early years		28		Net increase in budget required to fund central early years support functions
<b>Subtotal increase / (decrease) (B1)</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	
<b>2016-17 budget (A1) + (B1)</b>	<b>7,096</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>7,238</b>	

Schools Block	Delegated £000	Central £000	Total £000	Notes
<b>2015-16 Base (A2)</b>	<b>88,327</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>89,826</b>	
<u>Budget increase / (decrease)</u>				
a) Pre 16 funding formula	767			Additional delegated budget for schools arising from net increase in pre 16 pupils on roll and growing new free schools. Includes adjustments for de-delegated budgets.
b) Post 16 grant	(563)			Post 16 delegated budget has been reduced in line with a/y 2015/16 actual grant allocation by EFA. Indicative only.
c) Growth fund		(278)		Reduction in budget required for growth fund arising from changes in growth fund criteria and funding rates.
d) Other minor adjustments		2		
<b>Subtotal increase / (decrease) (B2)</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>(276)</b>	<b>(72)</b>	
<b>2016-17 budget (A2) + (B2)</b>	<b>88,530</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>89,754</b>	

<b>High Needs Block</b>	Delegated £000	Central £000	Total £000	Notes
<b>2015-16 Base (A3)</b>	<b>2,595</b>	<b>13,463</b>	<b>16,058</b>	
Budget increase / (decrease)				
a) Growth in maintained HN places	180			£180k for 18 additional places from Sep 2016. 245 annualised funded places for f/y 2016-17.
b) Top-up maintained		308		Additional centrally managed top-up budget for expected growth in pupils placed at Manor Green.
c) Top-up academies and free schools		216		Additional centrally managed top-up budget to reflect increased budget requirement at Forest Bridge from 2 to 3 terms, and small growth in pupils.
d) Support for inclusion		32		CYPDS staff undertake a range of Targeted Interventions to support children and young peoples learning. £92k has been allocated to address an increased need for a focus on those out of school or at risk of their school place breaking down. This is offset by an expected saving of £60k in ABA programmes budget to part-fund increase in Forest Bridge top-up budgets (included in c)).
e) Other minor adjustments		(7)		Including £10k reduction in hospital education, reallocated to other top-up budgets.
<b>Subtotal increase / (decrease) (B3)</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>730</b>	
<b>2016-17 budget (A3) + (B3)</b>	<b>2,775</b>	<b>14,013</b>	<b>16,788</b>	

<b>Total Early Years, Schools and High Needs Budgets</b>	Delegated £000	Central £000	Total £000
<b>2015-16 Base (A1-3)</b>	<b>98,032</b>	<b>15,077</b>	<b>113,109</b>
Budget increase / (decrease)	369	302	670
<b>2016-17 budget (A) + (B)</b>	<b>98,401</b>	<b>15,378</b>	<b>113,779</b>

## ANNEX C – INFORMATION ON ‘COMBINED SERVICES’

### 1. Information, Advice and Support (IAS) Service for Windsor and Maidenhead (formerly Parent Partnership Service)

Jean Hobson – Information, Advice and Support Service Manager

Expenditure on impartial information, advice and support services for children and young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities, and their parents. IASS provides access for local families to free, confidential and impartial support, from independently trained staff, in accordance with the SEND Code of Practice.

The demand for IAS services has increased substantially since the implementation of the CFA 2014 (145 cases open in the period Sept 2015 – Feb 2016). In addition to individual casework, IAS provides training, as well as information resources, to empower individuals and support local schools and other practitioners providing services for children and young people with SEND and their families.

The IAS Service aims to foster positive working relationships between families and schools and supports and encourages engagement and participation in order to achieve the best outcomes for children and young people with SEND.

IASS is a very small service. Any reduction in funding would directly impact on capacity within the service to respond to current local demand. The SEND Code of Practice makes clear that all children and young people with SEND, and their parents, must have access to impartial information, advice and support.

### 2. Early Help Advisory Service Impact Report

Ally Bradshaw – Family Support Manager (Early Help) Jan 2016

This report summarises the impact of the Early Help Advisory Service (EHAS) on schools and their pupils.

The combined service base budget contributes to three early help social workers. An additional £30,000 is supplemented from Early Years. The service now extends across the early years to 18 years offering early intervention in its truest sense ensuring concerns are managed at the earliest possible opportunity. Since the last schools forum briefing (October 2015) the service have conducted:

Category of support	Oct 15	Jan 16
School introductions and consultations	376	441
Named children discussed	196	222
Meetings e.g.: TAC, family meeting, home visit	331	382
General consultations - signposting to other services, advice, guidance	112	154

#### Schools Survey

In October 2015 a survey was sent to 62 schools and we had 44 responses. 86% had used the EHAS service.

- 100% of the responses were positive Please see appendix one for examples of comments from the schools.
- 97% have found the EHAS service helpful or very helpful.
- 100% said they would use the EHAS service again.

**What else can the EHAS service offer?**

- More CPD for staff and SENCo
- More direct contact with families
- Continuation of supporting staff training on attachment (attachment ambassadors)

**Impact Scaling**

The service has completed 87 impact score evaluations with headteachers and pastoral care staff.

- 85% of the impact scoring shows positive progress for the pupil/school.
- No evaluations show a deterioration in circumstance.
- The average impact score shows an increase of 3 increments from pre to post intervention.

See appendix 2 for case study examples demonstrating the valuable impact of the partnership of the Early Help Advisory Service and schools.

**Family Feedback**

A random selection of ten families were contacted to give evaluative feedback of the service. Seven parents were reached: See appendix 3 for parental feedback

- 100% of parents said they would recommend the service to others.
- 100% of parents said they understood who they were and the hopes from the brief intervention.
- 100% of parents said they felt listened to and were given time to talk

**New Developments**

The Early Advisory Help Advisory Service is going to be integrated into the MASH and Early Help Hub which goes 'live' on the 25 January 2016. Schools and Early Years settings are attending workshops that will explain the MASH/Early Help model and the new referral process. This is exciting progress in that we will offer schools one referral route for safeguarding and early help. The model will be robust in ensuring agencies work closely together and share information that will keep children safer and ensure a streamlined referral route for early years settings and schools.

**Appendix 1 Some examples of feedback from schools from Survey Monkey (October 2015):**

'I am impressed with the support received from EHAS. The children and families in my school have directly benefitted from the support and guidance offered by the service both to the school and families. The service provides a much needed opportunity to reflect on individual pupil's needs and helps to prevent children slipping through the net. The direct access to a social worker, who knows the school and the cases, is hugely beneficial. By developing this professional, informed relationship between school and EHAS, more families and children will get the support required. I would like to see this service continuing to support schools'.

'EHAS Service is a great service and it has helped us deal with some issues or concerns more efficiently and effectively, a lot of practical advice and ideas for the families and children concerned.'

'A very good support for schools. Clear informative information has been given to help me to make informed decisions.'

'Parents have engaged well when they feel they are being supported and not at risk of being referred to Social Care.'

'Extremely valuable to have access to the wide range of experience, expertise and support offered by the EHAS team.'

'It is an excellent and valuable service to support schools with regards to safeguarding issues, risky behaviour and how to best support students and their families.'

'Our EHAS advisor has been invaluable with assisting with specific children and offering guidance, without which processes may have taken much longer than they did. It's a very worthwhile service.'

'This has certainly been an invaluable addition to me as a Practitioner and I hope that this service remains for a long time.'

'Super provision - let's hope it stays!'

'Brilliant! Exactly what a school like ours has been crying out for!'

## **Appendix 2 Case Study examples demonstrating the valuable impact of the partnership of the Early Help Advisory Service and Schools**

### **Jennifer 8 year old girl (Not real name)**

#### **Presenting needs and concerns**

- Parents – extremely acrimonious divorce, difficult relationship
- No custody/contact arrangements in place at present
- Child not making academic progress, challenging in class
- Poor social skills – few friends
- Comes to school without right equipment, clothing too small
- Poor appetite – free school meals but doesn't eat them
- Mum's first language is not English
- Mum refused CAF – no progress on issues raised by school with parents
- Poor communication between Mum and school
- Inconsistent engagement with Dad and school
- Historic allegations of domestic abuse

#### **Early Help Advisor Actions:**

- Made contact with both parents
- Separate meeting with each parent to build trust and allow 'vent' before coming to the table
- Meeting with Mum and school –focus on improved communication between them
- Facilitate family meeting with parents – clear focus on child's needs
- Develop a family plan
- Parenting advice for both parents

#### **Outcome**

- Mother has sorted her benefits and she now has a fixed address
- School report Jennifer's social interactions have improved
- Jennifer's school attendance was 80% and it is now 90%

## **Appendix 3 Feedback from parents**

'Very thorough and efficient – listened to us. Gave us all the time we needed – was always on time'.

'Without the Early Help Advisors help we wouldn't have had the communication and cooperation we needed that's helping my child get the help that he needs'

'Was there when I needed someone to support me'

'Positive contact with the Early Help Advisor – not sure yet what the outcome will be yet'

'Supported my family during the summer'

'Was an advocate in school and this improved communication in school so issues could be addressed'

This page is intentionally left blank



Date:	08 March 2016		AGENDA ITEM:	6
Title:	Proposed changes to Growth fund 2016-17			
Responsible officer:	Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Educational Services			
Contact officer:	Edmund Bradley, Finance Partner	Email	Edmund.bradley@rbwm.gov.uk	
	Ben Wright, Education Planning Officer	E-mail	Ben.wright@rbwm.gov.uk	

## 1 REPORT SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper provides details on proposed changes to the growth fund for 2016-17 set out in section 4 of this paper, as requested by Schools Forum at the January 2016 meeting. The main features are:
- Under the new scheme there would be no maximum three year limit on funding and schools could expect to receive growth funding for every year there is a need for a new class, up to seven years in a primary school.
  - The proposals seek to make the scheme more affordable by bringing the amount allocated to schools more into line with the actual costs of providing a new class, based on relevant staffing costs and relevant AWPU rates.
  - The new scheme would mean that 8 more schools would receive funding in 2016-17 than would have been the case under the old formula, but individual amounts allocated under the new formula would be less.
  - The cost of the scheme over the next five years would be £343k less than what it would be under the existing formula.
  - There would be no claw-backs under the new scheme.
- 1.2 Schools Forum is also asked to comment on transition arrangements, set out in section 5, that seeks to address 'overfunding' in 2015-16 under the existing formula, by making an appropriate deduction to growth fund allocations in future years.

## 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To agree the proposed growth fund criteria and funding allocation methodology set out in section 4.
- 2.2 To comment on the transition arrangements outlined in section 5.

## 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Under school finance regulations, local authorities (LAs) can topslice the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in order to create a growth fund to support maintained and academy schools which are required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority. In principle, the growth fund is designed to support a school temporarily or permanently increasing their PAN on a planned basis to meet basic need demands in the area before the census process catches up with pupils in the school. This is typically seven months (September to March) for maintained schools and a year for Academy schools.
- 3.2 Regulations make clear that growth fund can only be used to:
- Support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers
  - Fund additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation

- To meet the start-up costs of new schools. Funding is intended to support growing schools to meet the cost of additional pupils admitted in the new academic year who would not be funded through the funding formula.<sup>1</sup>

3.3 It cannot be used to support schools in financial difficulty which for maintained schools would normally come from a de-delegated contingency budget.

3.4 Historically RBWM's formula has been over-generous, allocating more funding than is strictly needed to cover the additional costs of an extra class for seven months of the year. This has led to some schools appearing to gain unduly, which in turn has led to a new complex formula, which was updated in April 2015 with the following changes:

- Funding for permanent increases would only be allocated for the first three years.
- Funding would only be allocated for planned increases of ten or more school places.
- A lump sum of £4,000 per school would be allocated for increases of ten or more pupils, and £6,000 for twenty or more, pro rata-ed for part year, in addition to the per pupil funding.
- A clawback mechanism would take account of the difference between planned pupil numbers and actual pupils admitted in September.

3.5 2015-16 was the first year that growth fund allocations would have been subject to clawbacks. Initial modelling of the adjustments needed showed that clawbacks could be up to £30k or more, equivalent in some cases to 3% of budget. At a meeting on 19 January 2016 Schools Forum discussed the impact of such a clawback on a school's ability to plan ahead with certainty. Forum decided that no claw-backs would be made at least until 2016-17, and that the existing Growth Fund criteria would be reviewed for 2016-17. The review would consider:

- Removing the reclaim element entirely.
- Reducing the initial growth fund allocation to better reflect unavoidable costs.
- The impact of the three year limit.
- Overall affordability.

3.6 This paper proposes a new scheme for 2016-17 following that review.

## 4 PROPOSED NEW SCHEME FOR 2016-17

### Eligibility criteria

4.1 The eligibility criteria of the new scheme apply to maintained schools, academies and free schools alike. They are:

Eligibility criteria	Comments
1 The decision to provide an extra class or expansion in places must be agreed with RBWM and must be related to <u>basic need</u> , i.e. as part of RBWM's plans to ensure there are sufficient schools places in the Borough. The increase may be a temporary increase in pupil numbers, a bulge class or a permanent increase to the school's Planned Admission Number (PAN).	No allocations will be made for pupil increases which are not part of formally agreed basic need expansion plans.  No change.
2 Any increase in pupil numbers or extra class must be either at the request of the Lead Member for Education or Cabinet or supported by them, in conjunction with the DCS or Head of Schools.	No change
3 The school has to be prepared to maintain the	Previously there was no explicit

<sup>1</sup> Regulations require LAs to provide estimated numbers in the funding formula for new schools which have opened in the last seven years and do not yet have pupils in every year group. In RBWM this applies to Braywick Court and Holyport College and means that the additional pupils they expect in September 2016 will be funded through the formula and not through the growth fund.

	spaces for in year admissions as well as the normal admissions round.	requirement for this. This requires prior planning and financial commitment prior to any confirmed pupil numbers
4	There is no minimum increase in the number of places, but schools will be only be eligible for funding if the planned increase results in the requirement for a new class and a new teacher.	Previously the increase in pupil numbers had to be at least ten.
5	A school will be eligible for funding every year for which an extra class or part class is needed (i.e. up to 7 years in a primary, 3 years in an infant, 4 years in a junior, 6 years in a secondary etc.). There is no automatic assumption of funding every year.  Funding for a one-off bulge class would usually be for one year only.	If a school is expanding compared with last year, the question will be asked each year: does it require a teacher to support the increased pupil numbers?  Previously allocations were limited to 3 years.
6	Funding may be allocated from the growth fund where the request to expand results in the requirement for a new teacher under infant class size legislation.	Funding for infant class size was delegated to all primary schools in 2013-14. Growth funding will only be allocated for Infant Class Size therefore where schools have been requested to expand and they meet the above criteria.
6	Schools in receipt of growth funding which have previously operated mixed age classes or have a PAN in a multiple of 15 would be normally expected to operate some mixed-age classes.	No change. Schools cannot use growth funding simply to reduce class sizes. Depending on how classes are arranged This means that a school could be eligible for funding every other year, or for 50% of the funding each year,.
7	Support to cover pre-opening costs / initial equipping allowance for new maintained schools and recoupment academies where the school is opening in response to basic need.	To recognise start-up costs of new schools. Not yet applicable in RBWM. <sup>2</sup>

### Allocation methodology and funding rates

4.2 The new scheme proposes four main changes to the allocation methodology.

- a) Allocations from the growth fund will be a lump sum linked to the typical staffing costs needed to support an additional class (£51,553 per annum for primary and £39,500 per annum for secondary), and in turn linked to the relevant AWPU - equivalent to 17.9 primary AWPUs and 10.0 KS3 AWPUs. Middle schools will attract primary funding rates based on Y5 entry to school.

		Primary		Secondary	
SCP2 teacher at	£31,840 pa	1 fte	£31,840	1 fte	£31,840
Teaching assistant sc12 at	£19,715 pa	1 fte	£19,713	0.4 fte	£7,660
Total for 12 months			£51,553		£39,500
Equivalent no of primary AWPU at £2,880			17.9		
Equivalent no of KS3 AWPU at £3,950					10.0
Pro rated total for 7 months (Sep to Mar)			£30,073		£22,951

- b) As before, allocations will be pro-rated to the number of months missing – 7/12ths for maintained schools (September to March), 12/12ths (September to August) for academy schools<sup>3</sup>. The pro-rated funding, shown above, is £30,073 for primary, £22,951 for secondary.

<sup>2</sup> Holyport College and Braywick Park are new schools, but they have not specifically been set up to meet basic need. In this case, the EFA funds start-up costs directly.

<sup>3</sup> This is because academy schools operate on a academic year basis and are funded by pupils on roll the previous October. This means they need the additional growth funding for 12 months. The EFA reimburses LAs for the additional 5 months.

- c) There is no reclaim or claw-back, but schools on a multi-year programme will have to plan for the leadership changes that are required based on a pupil-led budget and the predictability of this model.
- d) The salary bands and AWPU units will be reviewed each year.

#### Comparison with existing formula

- 4.3 The existing growth fund formula allocates up to £53k for a primary and £73k for a secondary<sup>4</sup> based on a formula that multiplies the increase in places with the relevant AWPU rate, and adds a lump sum of £4,000 or £6,000 depending on the size of the increase. Table 2 shows that, for all types of school, the new scheme is more affordable than the old scheme except in the case of a 7 year group primary, and that allocations under the new formula are more in line with actual costs of providing an additional class. Note that the old formula below assumes no clawbacks.

**Table 2 Comparison of proposed growth funding (7/12ths) for different types of schools**

	Increase in Form of Entry	No of years for funding NEW Formula	No of years for funding OLD Formula	Cost for year 1			Cost for all years		
				New formula £	Old formula £	Change £	New formula £	Old formula £	Change £
First school	1	5	3	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	150,363	161,700	(11,337)
Infant	1	3	3	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	90,218	161,700	(71,482)
Junior school	1	4	3	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	120,291	161,700	(41,409)
Primary school	1	7	3	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	210,509	161,700	48,809
Primary school	0.5	7	3	15,036	27,533	(12,497)	52,627	82,600	(29,973)
Middle	1	4	3	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	120,291	161,700	(41,409)
Upper	1	3	3	22,951	72,625	(49,674)	68,852	217,875	(149,023)
Secondary school	1	5	3	22,951	72,625	(49,674)	114,753	217,875	(103,122)
Primary bulge class (YR)	1	1	1	30,073	53,900	(23,827)	30,073	53,900	(23,827)

#### Financial impact

- 4.4 A number of primary schools are already part way through an expansion programme and currently receive funding under the existing scheme. Other schools, including some secondaries, are about to start in the next year or two years. An analysis of the financial impact on these schools of the proposed new formula compared with the old formula is shown in table 3. Detailed school by school allocations are shown in annex A. These are indicative allocations, and should not be seen as confirmed allocations. Note that the figures are for the pro-rated amounts only. Academy schools can also expect an additional 5 months worth of funding. The EFA reimburses RBWM the cost of this additional funding requirement through an adjustment to the recoupment process.
- 4.5 The analysis confirms that:
- 14 schools would continue or start to receive growth funding in 2016-17 under the new formula compared with just six under the old. This is mainly because of the 3 year limit rule that excludes schools from receiving further funding after the first three years.
  - Some schools that would have received funding under the old formula in 2016-17, will receive less funding in 2016-17 under the new formula. For example, Riverside's allocation under the new formula would be £30k, compared with £53k under the old.
  - The cost of funding all eligible schools under the new scheme in 2016-17, even with the additional eight schools receiving funding, would be around the same as under the old scheme – £359k.
  - The cumulative expected cost of the growth fund over the next 5 years to 2021, (based on known school expansions), would be around £1.4m under the new proposed

<sup>4</sup> No secondary schools have yet been allocated growth funding

scheme, compared with £1.7m under the old scheme, a reduction of £343k. After 2021 the budget requirement reduces as the need for additional classes decreases.

<b>Table 3 Financial impact on schools</b>	<b>Old formula</b>	<b>New formula</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Growth fund allocations in 2016-17 £	£357k	£359k	+£2k
No of schools receiving growth funding 2016-17	6	14	+8 schools
Total growth fund allocations 2016-2021 £	£1,744k	£1,401k	-£343k

- 4.6 £350k is currently set aside for the growth fund budget for 2016-17, which is in line with the budget requirement for 2016-17.

## 5 TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS

- 5.1 Six schools that received funding in 2015-16 would have been subject to a clawback as a result of the difference in leavers and joiners in September 2015 or based on the difference between PAN and their admission number. Whilst no clawback will be actioned in 2015-16, Schools Forum members are asked to comment on a transition scheme in 2016-17 which would see those schools returning the amount 'overpaid' over the course of future years as a deduction from future growth fund payments. This has the benefit of providing some financial certainty for budget planning purposes, whilst addressing the potential unfairness of schools benefitting from overfunding. Schools converting to academy would be subject to the same rules.
- 5.2 The transition scheme would have the following features:
- It would only apply to schools expecting a growth fund allocation under the new formula.
  - Overpayment would be deducted from future growth fund payments equally over future new intake years.
  - If a school is due to pay back more than it receives in new allocations, there would be no allocation but no clawback.
  - No clawback will be made where a school is already at the end of the scheme.
- 5.3 Based on these criteria, the deductions from the allocations shown in annex A would be as shown in table 4:

<b>Table 4 – Transition deductions</b>	<b>Overpayment in 2015-16</b>	<b>No of future years funding</b>	<b>Deduction per annum</b>
All Saints Junior	£5,040	2	£2,520
Clewer Green First	£1,680	2	£840
Riverside Primary	£31,920	5	£6,384
Holyport Primary	£16,800	2	£8,400
Wraysbury Primary	£3,360	2	£1,680
St Edwards Middle	£1,680	1	£1,680

## Growth Funding – comparison of proposed (new) and existing (old) formula

Where schools need a new class teacher every other year, 50% of relevant funding is allocated each year.

	Increase	Start of expansion	FE Increase	Existing formula		New formula		Change	
				2016-17 £	Total 2016-2021 £	2016-17 £	Total 2016-2021 £	2016-17 £	Total 2016-2021 £
Knowl Hill (academy)	17	Sep-16	0.5	30,893	92,680	15,036	75,182	(15,857)	(17,498)
All Saints Junior	23	Sep-14	1	42,140	42,140	30,073	60,145	(12,067)	18,005
Riverside	30	Sep-14	1	53,900	53,900	30,073	150,363	(23,827)	96,463
Clewer Green	15	Sep-13	0.5	0	0	15,036	30,073	15,036	30,073
St Edwards First	15	Sep-13	0.5	0	0	15,036	30,073	15,036	30,073
St Edwards Middle	27	Sep-13	1	0	0	30,073	30,073	30,073	30,073
Furze Platt Junior	15	Sep-13	0.5	0	0	15,036	15,036	15,036	15,036
Oldfield	30	Sep-12	1	0	0	30,073	90,218	30,073	90,218
Holyport	15	Sep-11	0.5	0	0	15,036	30,073	15,036	30,073
St Edmund Campion	15	Sep-11	0.5	0	0	15,036	30,073	15,036	30,073
Waysbury	15	Sep-11	0.5	0	0	15,036	30,073	15,036	30,073
Homer bulge class 2	30	Sep-16	1	53,900	53,900	30,073	30,073	(23,827)	(23,827)
St Mary's bulge class 3	30	Sep-16	1	53,900	53,900	30,073	30,073	(23,827)	(23,827)
Dedworth Mid bulge class 1	30	Sep-17	1	0	53,900	0	30,073	0	(23,827)
Dedworth Middle bulge class 2	30	Sep-18	1	0	53,900	0	30,073	0	(23,827)
Furze Platt Senior	30	Sep-16	1	72,625	217,875	22,951	91,802	(49,674)	(126,073)
Charters	30	Sep-17	1	0	217,875	0	91,802	0	(126,073)
Cox Green	30	Sep-17	1	0	217,875	0	91,802	0	(126,073)
Windsor Boys	30	Sep-17	1	0	217,875	0	91,802	0	(126,073)
Windsor Girls	30	Sep-17	1	0	217,875	0	91,802	0	(126,073)
Contingency				50,000	250,000	50,000	250,000	0	0
					0		0	0	0
<b>Total</b>				<b>357,358</b>	<b>1,743,695</b>	<b>358,641</b>	<b>1,400,683</b>	<b>1,282</b>	<b>(343,012)</b>

Number of schools supported

6

14

Date:	08 March 2016		AGENDA ITEM: 7
Title:	Falling rolls fund 2016-17		
Responsible officer:	Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Educational Services		
Contact officer:	Edmund Bradley, Finance Partner	Email	Edmund.bradley@rbwm.gov.uk
	Ben Wright, Education Planning Officer	E-mail	Ben.wright@rbwm.gov.uk

### 1 REPORT SUMMARY

- 1.1 This discussion paper provides further details on the possible introduction of a 'falling rolls fund' for 2016-17 to support schools with a temporary shortfall or dip in pupil numbers, as requested by Schools Forum at the January 2016 meeting. It seeks Forum's views on some draft principles for a scheme and on the impacts of different factors that will be presented to the Forum at the meeting by way of an interactive model.

### 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To agree the criteria and funding methodology for a falling rolls fund for 2016-17.
- 2.2 To discuss and agree how such a scheme could be funded in 2016-17 and in future years.

### 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 On 19 January 2016 Schools Forum discussed a paper on the possible introduction of a 'falling rolls' fund, and requested more detailed proposals to be brought to the March 2016 meeting. In February, the head teacher of Churchmead School, the Head of Schools and Education Services and finance officers met to discuss how a falling rolls scheme might work in RBWM and to develop a funding model.
- 3.2 Under school finance regulations, local authorities (LAs) can topslice the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to create a central fund to *"support good schools with falling rolls, where local planning data show that the surplus places will be needed within the next three financial years. The schools forum should agree both the value of the top-slice and the criteria for allocation, and the local authority should regularly update the schools forum on the use of the funding."*<sup>1</sup>
- 3.3 The purpose of the fund, is to offset temporary reductions in school budgets caused by short-term reductions in pupil numbers. In this way, the fund can help avoid the need to make staff redundant, only to have to employ new staff within two or three years. The fund is not intended to address budgetary issues arising from longer term declining demand.
- 3.4 The Department for Education requires that a school be judged as Good or Outstanding to access the funding in order that it is not seen as a support to those schools whose numbers are declining due to parental choice.
- 3.5 Falling rolls have not, in the main, been an issue within RBWM in recent years and, indeed, the borough is now expecting a period of significant growth in demand for secondary, middle and upper schools. There are, however, some possible circumstances in which such a fund might be desirable:

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 78 of [Schools revenue funding 2016 to 2017 Operational guide version 2 \(December 2015\)](#).

**(a) Falling demand for primary school places.**

The birth rate in RBWM has fallen in 2012/13 and 2013/14<sup>2</sup>, with the result that the demand for Reception places in primary schools in the borough are set to fall in 2017 and 2018, see table 1. At this stage, it is not known whether underlying demand will pick-up again beyond 2018, or what the impact will be of new housing targets yet to be agreed through the Borough Local Plan process. It is potentially possible; therefore, that some good or outstanding primary or first schools will have surplus places in 2017 and/or 2018, that would then be needed in subsequent years. Of course, if the fall in demand is shown to be longer term, then it will be necessary to consider whether a reduction in the number of available places would be a more appropriate response than budget support.

**Table 1: Primary demand**

2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
1,649	1,690	1,677	1,726	1,586	1,536

**(b) Falling demand through the opening of new schools beyond the local “Basic Need” provision.**

Slough is experiencing significant population growth. Over the past five years, four secondary free schools have opened in Slough, providing 17 new forms of entry (FE) at Year 7. Some of these have opened ahead of need, leading to a surplus of around 7 FE (210 places) in September 2015. This has an impact on RBWM schools, with much lower demand for places at Churchmead than previously expected. Slough will need all of these places, and more, within the next few years, which will reverse the falling rolls at Churchmead. Similar issues could arise elsewhere if further new schools are opened in areas where there is no immediate need.

- 3.6 In considering a falling rolls fund, it is important to remember that RBWM’s Cabinet seeks a surplus of 10% school capacity in the years of entry while there is no allocation for this within the Dedicated Schools Grant. Any such scheme would, therefore, need to be calibrated with this in mind. The 10% surplus is to:
- Allow for the operation of parental preference.
  - Maintain places for families moving into the borough.
  - Provide headroom in case demand is higher than expected.

#### **4 OPTIONS FOR A FALLING ROLLS FUND IN 2016-17**

- 4.1 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) guidance suggests some criteria for allocating a falling rolls fund, noting that the trigger points should be clear and objective. These include:
- Surplus capacity exceeds x pupils or x% of the published admission number.
  - Local planning data shows a requirement for at least x% of the surplus places within the next three years.
  - Formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort.
  - The school will need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget.
- 4.2 There is one mandatory criteria. Support is available only for schools judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted.
- 4.3 Proposals for an RBWM scheme discussed in the working group focussed on the following principles:
- Funding would need to be linked to a demonstrable temporary shortfall in total pupil numbers compared to the number of pupils the school would expect to need in up to

---

<sup>2</sup> Information for 2014/15 is not yet available.



three years time, with the school committing to maintain the PAN for the next three years of planned admissions.

- RBWM's Education team would have a key role in providing information on future need for places in individual schools and areas, in order to assess whether a school is eligible for funding.
- Eligibility would need to take account of spare capacity in the school, whilst bearing in mind that a school does not need to be at full capacity to be 'viable'.
- Funding should be formula driven as far as possible, to ensure that funding allocations are fair and transparent and not be dictated by the specific approach to teaching or structure used by a given school.
- Eligibility for funding would need to be reviewed each year on a school by school basis. As circumstances change, there would be no automatic assumption of ongoing funding.

4.4 The working group were explicit that:

- Spare capacity in the school seeking funding *must* be of a temporary nature. A school would be expected to address long-term under capacity through restructuring and other cost reduction measures.
- Whilst avoiding staff redundancies would be one objective of the falling rolls fund, schools would not have to evidence the need for redundancies in order to access funding, provided they met with other relevant criteria.

4.5 A number of LAs already have a falling rolls fund in place, including Devon, Dorset, Havering, Hertfordshire and Portsmouth. These are summarised in Annex A and were shared with the Schools Forum in January 2016. The working group felt a version of the Hertfordshire model would best suit RBWM schools.

#### **Next steps**

4.6 An interactive model will be presented at the meeting on 8 March to enable members of the Schools Forum to view the possible impacts of a falling rolls fund with the following factors:

- A viability level – a percentage of the potential school capacity below which a school would become eligible for funding.
- A funding allocation methodology, based on AWPU, that takes account of the difference between actual numbers on roll compared with the 'viable' school population.
- A capping factor that limits the maximum funding available each year to a given school

4.7 The initial starting point for discussion is that Good or Outstanding schools will trigger consideration of the fund if the total school population falls below 70% (Viability Level). An estimate of the school population in three years based on the forecast intake will be extrapolated and additional funding calculated at 50% of AWPU with a maximum value capped at 20% of the original budget.

#### **How would a falling rolls fund be funded?**

4.7 There are no new DSG monies to fund a falling rolls scheme and no budget has been set aside in the proposed 2016-17 budget. If a scheme were introduced in 2016-17, it is likely that this would have to be funded by drawing on the unallocated DSG reserve.

4.8 In future years funding for the scheme would need to be built into the base budget, and funded by savings from existing expenditure budgets, perhaps by reducing formula funding rates for all schools.

## LAAs' Falling rolls criteria

Extract from DfE paper "Schools Revenue Funding 2016-17: Criteria for allocating Falling Rolls Funding"

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/445726/Schools\\_revenue\\_funding\\_2016\\_to\\_2017\\_Criteria\\_for\\_allocating\\_growth\\_fund\\_falling\\_rolls\\_fund\\_and\\_targeted\\_high\\_needs\\_funding1.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/445726/Schools_revenue_funding_2016_to_2017_Criteria_for_allocating_growth_fund_falling_rolls_fund_and_targeted_high_needs_funding1.pdf)

### Devon

55. The falling rolls criteria in Devon are listed below:

- Schools judged good or outstanding at last Ofsted inspection
- there is a reduction in numbers when comparing the October School census with the previous October census that results in substantial disruption to the provision of education in the school
- admissions demographic data evidences that the reduction is temporary
- the school's roll includes at least 80% of the pupils that live within its area
- the reduction in numbers due to pupil migration to other local schools is not eligible. Schools will be expected to cover the temporary funding shortfall from existing carry forward balances prior to application to the Falling Rolls Fund
- funding will be allocated up to the AWPU rate for the difference between the current year October number on roll and the lower of number on roll at the previous October census and the forecast number on roll using admissions data

### Dorset

56. School requesting support to mitigate the short-term financial impact of falling rolls must be graded Outstanding or Good by OFSTED on the date of approval.

57. Falling rolls will only be calculated on the normal year(s) of transfer (YR, Y3, Y5, Y7 and Y9 depending on whether Infant, First, Junior, Primary, Middle, Secondary or Upper School). Schools which normally have more than one age of transfer, due to differences in neighbouring schools transfer age, may have more than one calculation/payment.

58. Surplus capacity in affected year group(s) exceeds 24 pupils or 20% of the number of pupils expected (whichever is the lower), based on the average\* of the January census figures for the normal year of transfer for the previous 5 years. (\*The average will remove any anomalies such as bulge classes or managed changes in area provision).

59. Local planning data for the pyramid shows a requirement for at least 70% of the surplus places within the following 3 academic years. This is calculated as the 5yr average for the year group less the number on roll for the year group \* 70% added to NOR for the year group, must be the predicted NOR for the year group in the school within the next 3 years.

60. It must be demonstrated that formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the remaining cohort (e.g. evidence will need to be provided to show the impact on meeting basic curriculum requirements or on the pupils being unable to continue part completed examination courses).

61. Any MFG the school receives will be deducted from the grant amount (as with our policy on pupil growth).

62. In the first instance any shortfall in funding due to falling rolls should be made up from any school surplus above 1.7% for a secondary school, 2.7% for a primary of special school or £20,000 whichever is the higher, (as it is anticipated that the school will have been planning for this eventuality) and this will be taken into account when considering an application.

63. Schools will be funded at 100% of AWPU for the agreed number of pupils (through determining the difference between the average from the historic model and the actual level) beyond 24 pupils/20% in the relevant cohort.

64. Funding provided will be a one off payment and not a continuing payment as the cohort moves through the school.

### Payment

65. In the academic year when falling rolls occur, the school will receive 7/12ths of funding at the previous census level. The falling rolls payment will therefore be made in the later part of the academic year – the next financial year. (A falling roll intake in 2013 will be a claim in the financial year 2014-2015 and the surplus will be the carry forward into that financial year). Academies will be required to provide the LA with details of their financial position to demonstrate whether or not there is a surplus to take into account.

### Havering

66. Support is available only for schools judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (this is a mandatory requirement).

67. Surplus capacity as the October count date exceeds 15% of the published admission number in the following year groups:

**Table 2: Surplus capacity support in Havering**

Financial Year	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Year Group	7	7 & 8	7, 8 & 9	7, 8, 9 & 10	7, 8, 9, 10 & 11

68. Local planning data shows a requirement for at least 90% of the surplus places within the next 5 years.

69. Formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort.

70. The school will need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget.

71. Formula for distributing funding:

- 85% of the appropriate AWPU x per vacant place below 85% of the PAN. e.g.
- First Year of Funding - PAN: 192; 85%: 163
- Year 7 NOR October 2013: 70
- Difference between 85% of PAN and Yr7 NOR: 93
- $93 \times \text{KS3 AWPU} \times 85\%$  ( $\pounds 4,551.86 \times 85\% = \pounds 3,869$ ) =  $\pounds 359,824$
- Second Year of Funding - PAN: 192; 85%: 163
- Year 7 NOR October 2014: 120
- Year 8 NOR October 2014: 70
- Difference between 85% of PAN and Yr7 NOR: 72
- Difference between 85% of PAN and Yr8 NOR: 93
- Total difference = 165
- $165 \times \text{KS3 AWPU} \times 85\%$  ( $\pounds 4,551.86 \times 85\% = \pounds 3,869$ ) =  $\pounds 638,398$

### Hertfordshire

72. The Fund has the following eligibility criteria:

- The school/academy has fewer than 550 pupils (excluding sixth form) in the October census prior to the start of the financial year
- The number of places offered by the school across year groups 7 to 11, if full, is greater than 550

- The authority has forecast that at least 110 places will be required from the school in year 7 (year 9 for upper schools) by Autumn Term 2017, otherwise there will be an absolute shortfall of capacity in the relevant planning area
- The school is Good or Outstanding. The date at which Ofsted category data will be taken will be 31 August prior to the start of the financial year to which funding relates, except that a school which becomes Good or Outstanding during the subsequent Autumn term prior to the start of the financial year shall also be eligible

73. The allocation formula takes account of the size of the school but also incorporates a ceiling on allocations. It also takes into account any MFG protection funding the school receives in its budget share to avoid duplicating it.

74. The formula for determining an allocation to an eligible school is:

- KS3 calculation:  $330 - \text{actual number of KS3 pupils on roll} \times \text{KS3 AWPU} \times 50\%$
- KS4 calculation:  $220 - \text{actual number of KS4 pupils on roll} \times \text{KS4 AWPU} \times 50\%$
- sum of the result of above capped at £250,000
- deduct any MFG protection funded received by the school
- equals the allocation from the Fund

### **Portsmouth**

75. The fund is only available to Primary and Secondary maintained schools or Academies in Portsmouth.

76. Financial support will only be available for schools:

- Judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection
- The school or academy has seen a reduction in pupils between the October 2012 census and the October 2013 census of 30 or more pupils or has surplus capacity 20% of the published admission number
- Local planning data shows a requirement for at least 50% of the surplus places within the next 3 financial years
- 
- Formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort
- The school will need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget
- Where the school does not have a surplus revenue balance as at the 31st March 2014 in excess of 5%(secondary) or 8% (primary) of its school budget share for the previous funding period (or the relevant academic years in the case of academies)

77. Schools and academies who believe they meet the above criteria in 2014-15 must submit a request for financial support to the Finance Manager for Education and Children's Services by 15 April 2014.

78. Funding will be issued using the following formula:

- The decrease in the number on roll between October 2013 and October 2014 census
- Multiplied by the value of the 2014 to 2015 basic per pupil entitlement factor
- For secondary schools the basic per pupil entitlement factor for key stage 3 will be used.

79. The maximum allocation to a school or academy from the fund will be limited to £300,000.