

Rotherham Schools' Forum

Venue: Rockingham Professional Development Centre

Date: Friday, 28 November 2014

Time: 8.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Minutes and matters arising from the previous meeting held on Friday 3rd October, 2014. (Pages 1 - 8)
3. SEND report. (Pages 9 - 15)
 - Donald Rae.
4. Virtual School proposal.
 - Deferred from the previous meeting;
 - Lorraine Lichfield.
5. Educated Other Than At School (ETOAS) update.
 - Lorraine Lichfield.
6. Learners First - proposal from Learners First regarding funding for 2014-2015 and service offer.
 - David Ashmore and Headteachers.
7. Learners First - devolvement of money to schools for 2014-2015 - update.
 - Dorothy Smith.
8. Outcomes from the formula consultation with schools. (Pages 16 - 20)
 - Vera Njegic;
 - Please note the consultation responses from schools shown within the body of the report.
9. Verbal report from the Rotherham Schools' Forum Finance Sub-Committee on the letter that has been sent to the Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning regarding centrally funded services.

- Paul Blackwell (Chair of the RSF Finance Sub-Committee), along with RSF Finance Sub-Committee members.
10. Eastwood Village Primary School - pre opening funding allocation. (Pages 21 - 23)
- Dean Fenton.
11. School expansions: transitional funding. (Pages 24 - 27)
- Dean Fenton.
12. Date and time of the next meetings: -
- **Friday 16th January, 2015 (was 30th – changed due to DfE deadline);**
 - Friday 6th March, 2015;
 - Friday 24th April, 2015;
 - Friday 26th June, 2015.

All to start at 8.30 a.m. at the Rockingham Professional Development Centre.

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM
FRIDAY, 3RD OCTOBER, 2014**

Present:- P. Blackwell (Dinnington) (in the Chair).

Learning Community Representatives: - H. McLaughlin (Saint Pius), J. Henderson (Brinsworth), L. Pepper (Clifton; Infant Schools), D. Silvester (Wath), J. Fearnley (Wingfield), A. Kitchen (Swinton), A. Abel (Oakwood), T. Mahon (Saint Bernard's), P. Di'iasio (Wales), D. Sutton (Maltby), D. Ball (Aston), R. Colquhoun (Wickersley).

Other stakeholder groups: - G. Gillard (Sheffield Diocese), P. Gerard (Early Years), R. Williams (RCAT; post-16), S. Brook (NASUWT; Teaching Trade Unions), M. Badger (Unison; Support Staff Trade Unions), A. Richards (Secondary Governors), J. Gray (Early Years PVI), D. Ashmore (Teaching Schools), P. Bloor (PRUs), N. Whittaker (Special Schools).

Also in attendance: - P. Marshall (Learners First Partnership), A. Baldwin (Financial Services), D. Rae (SEND), D. Smith (Director for Children and Young People's Services Directorate), V. Njelic (Financial Services), H. Etheridge (Committee Services).

Apologies for absence were received from: - R. Burman (Winterhill), S. Mallinder (Primary Governors), C. Roberts (Wickersley; R. Colquhoun representing), Cllr C. Beaumont (Cabinet Member for Children and Education Services), S. Hustler (Secondary Business Managers), J. Robertson (Financial Services; A. Baldwin representing).

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

50. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 27TH JUNE, 2014 AND MATTERS ARISING.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum held on 27th June, 2014, were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

51. REPORT ON THE FINANCE SUB-GROUP.

The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum reported on the outcomes of the first meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum Finance Sub-Committee.

The main areas that had been considered were: -

- 1) Potential to introduce a **mobility factor** in the formula that recognised when schools admitted 10% of their pupils in-year.

This had particular relevance for Rotherham's central schools. Consultation on creating a new mobility factor would be sent out to all schools shortly. If it was successful, it would mean that schools that did admit more than 10% of their pupils in-year would receive additional funding to support this, whilst other schools would lose slightly.

- 2) Consultation would also be undertaken with all schools on the creation of a formula factor in response to infant and junior schools merging.
- 3) The principle for the remaining **Schools' Block funding** to be devolved to schools, the creation of traded arrangements with services was also initially considered at the Sub-committee meeting. There were three cases where this could not be the case:
 - copy rights, pupil growth and child sexual exploitation.

Discussion ensued on this and it was clear that the full meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum wished to discuss the principle further and the potential implications to the Services that would become traded, including whether they would be viable if they were not universally bought-back.

There was a good representation of all school phases on the Finance Sub-Committee, including maintained and academy schools, although further representation from the primary sector would be useful; membership could be from either the full membership of the Rotherham Schools' Forum or from the wider school community via co-option of members.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That consultation and be undertaken with schools on potential changes/additions to the formula factors.

(3) That further consideration be given to the potential to devolve the remaining Schools' Block funding.

52. TRAINING FOR ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM.

Resolved: - That training be arranged for the Rotherham Schools' Forum.

53. HIGH NEEDS BLOCK - UPDATE.

Donald Rae, Strategic Lead for the Special Educational Needs and Disability Service (SEND) was welcomed to the meeting to provide an update on his work around the High Needs Block.

Since 1st September, 2014, a local offer website had been in place and all schools had contributed to this. The content encompassed the new

system for assessment for Education, Health and Social Care Plans.

The High Needs Block would be the single source of funding for all children and young people to the age of 25 who had special educational needs and disabilities. When the DSG figure was set by the Central Government, no consideration was given to local demographics or levels of need.

Local authorities were being asked to report back on the numbers of children and young people who had needs met through the High Needs Block. However, it was likely that the amount of funding for the High Needs Block would only be changed if there were exceptional circumstances.

SEN Statements: -

- 2012/2013 there were 77 new Statements. Bringing the total to 1,200;
- 2013/2014 there were 110 new Statements;
- 2014/2015 that had been 55 new Statements since September.

A High Needs Sub-group had been created and representation from all school sectors was required from the early years, primary and further education sectors.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That a High Needs Block update be placed on future Rotherham Schools' Forum agendas as a standing item.

(3) That wider representation be encouraged for the High Needs Sub-group.

54. VIRTUAL SCHOOL PROPOSAL.

Resolved: - That this item be deferred to a future agenda.

55. LEARNERS FIRST PARTNERSHIP - IMPACT UPDATE.

Phil Marshall, Learners First, attended the meeting and spoke through the tabled documents: -

- Learners First – Impact Summary, 2013-2014;
- Learners First – Schools partnership model of provision and costs;
- The document showing the participation of schools and learning communities in Learners First Core Activities, the status of Rotherham's schools' participation – leading or receiving, and whether there had been an improvement in Ofsted category.

Learners First was a schools-based company. Phil explained how it

worked in partnership with the School Effectiveness Service. Both provisions had aligned their activities and aimed to compliment one another. Both received funding from the DSG.

Access to the provision was free at point of entry (was funded by the DSG) for Rotherham participants. Participants from other Local Authorities were charged.

The contribution rate from each Rotherham School had been calculated; an average-sized primary school would pay around £1,750, with larger schools paying more. If Learners First ceased to exist it was envisaged that any surpluses would be distributed back to Rotherham's schools. Income generated by Learners First from other Local Authorities was in the region of £450k.

Dorothy Smith commended the model that Learners First were facilitating as school-to-school support was important.

Discussion ensued on the requirement this year to tender the contract before the transfer of DSG funding could take place to satisfy European contract legislation based on how the funding had been devolved and because the overall amount met the higher threshold. Learners First were Rotherham's preferred partner as they were based in Rotherham and were partners in delivering the 'Rotherham Mission'.

Rotherham Schools' Forum agreed by majority vote that the Local Authority should be urged to devolve the money to all Schools who could opt to buy-into Learners First.

Resolved: - That the Local Authority be urged to devolve the money held centrally to all Schools.

56. SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS SERVICE UPDATE.

Karen Borthwick, Head of the School Effectiveness Service, was welcomed to the meeting to provide an update Rotherham's 2013/2014 exam performance and the current picture of Ofsted judgements.

Early Years' outcomes were showing significant progress and were reducing the inequality gap. These were a significant strength in the Borough. Rotherham's performance at phonics was showing a significant gap to national performance. A letter had been received from Nick Gibb, MP that stated that progress in reading was insufficiently strong and asked how the Local Authority was addressing this. The School Effectiveness Service would approach this and answer the question based on a partnership approach.

Performance at Key Stage One was more concerning, including the gap to national performance.

Key Stage Two performance had been very positive and was above the national average performance. Improvement had been enabled through the work of Local Leaders of Education, National Leaders of Education and the School Effectiveness Service. Analysis of the factors that had enabled progress was underway.

Key Stage Four outcomes were still subject to validation. A communication to all stakeholders had been issued stating that their achievements were valued.

Overall, 60% of pupils were achieving 5 A*-C including Maths and English, which put Rotherham 4th in Yorkshire and Humber.

A data dashboard was being developed for Key Stage Five outcomes at post-16.

78.8% of Rotherham's schools had been rated as Good or Outstanding by Ofsted, against a national average of 76.5%.

The focus for the School Effectiveness Service, in conjunction with partners including Learners First, was Key Stage One and phonics.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

57. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ROTHERHAM FAIR FUNDING SCHEME FOR SCHOOLS.

Vera Njelic, Principal Schools Accountant, introduced a report that provided a summary of the consultation that had been undertaken on the Rotherham Fair Funding Scheme. Minute No. 26 of the meeting held on 27th June, 2014, refers.

The report detailed the numbers of individual schools that the consultation had been sent to, and the responses that had been received. Of the 29 returns to the consultation, 26 were in agreement with the proposed changes and 3 had disagreed.

The consultation had been informed by the Department for Education's guidance note on 'Treatment of Surplus and Deficit Balances when maintained schools become academies'. The guidance and resulting consultation covered what would happen to surplus and deficit balances when schools ceased to be maintained by the local authority and became academies. This had implications for potential negative impact on the Children and Young People's Service's Directorate revenue budget and the continuity of service experienced by all young people in Rotherham. The document also included the submission of budget plans and the treatment of bank and building society accounts.

A member of the Rotherham Schools' Forum asked whether the consultation document had been circulated to existing academy schools?

It had not because the implications only applied to maintained schools.

The Rotherham Schools' Forum agreed by majority vote to support the consultation outcome.

Resolved: - That the proposed changes to the Rotherham Fair Funding Scheme be agreed.

58. ROTHERHAM TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT FOR 31ST MARCH 2014.

Andrea Baldwin, Principal Finance Officer, presented a report that outlined the Rotherham Total Schools Budget Outturn as at 31st March, 2014 based on actual income and expenditure to 31st March, 2014.

The overall outturn was an under-spend of £1,000.

The outturn of each Block (excluding individual schools delegated balanced): -

- Schools' Block - £0.864 million under-spend;
- High Needs Block - £1.348 million over-spend;
- Early Years Block - £0.485 million under-spend.

Commentary was provided in relation to the variances against the Blocks:
-

- The Schools' Block was reporting under-spends in relation to the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership and school rates due to academy conversions and re-evaluations;
- The High Needs Block was over-spent due to SEN placements and top-up funding, Post-16-24 SEN provision, SEN Complex needs placements, and SEN extra district placements;
- The Early Years Block was over-spent due to private voluntary and independent nursery education (3 and 4 year olds), which indicated increased take-up.

The submitted report outlined carry-forwards which related to: -

- £401.5k from the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership and £461.9k on the Rates budget;
- The Learning Support Service was carrying forward £25k due to additional staffing income;
- The Early Years Block's underspend of £485.2k would be transferred to the High Needs Block to alleviate the pressures in 2014-2015.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- The ROSIP money was not an under-spend – it should be treated as unallocated income;
- What was the impact of not appointing to Heads of Service roles?;
- The fluctuating nature of the take-up of early years places and the difficulties of forecasting;
- Staff increments;
- Start of joint commissioning with health and social care.

Resolved: - That the Schools budget outturn position based on actual income and expenditure to 31st March, 2014, be noted.

59. TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET MONITORING REPORT AS AT 31ST AUGUST 2014.

Andrea Baldwin, Principal Finance Officer, presented a report that outlined the Rotherham Total Schools budget monitoring report forecast outturn at the end of the 2014/2015 school year, based on actual income and expenditure to 31st August, 2014.

The Total Schools budget available after confirmation of the Dedicated Schools' Grant Allocation, the EFA post-16 SEN funding and the DSG carry-forward from 2013/2014 was **£151.705 millions** after academy recoupment. This equated to a decrease in available funding compared to the estimation of grant funding.

The overall forecast outturn was an over-spend of £1.34 millions, which was 0.89% above total budget and included the agreed carry-forward allocations from the 2013/2014 financial year.

The report outlined the reasons why the total amount of grant funding had been estimated as higher than the amount actually received. The variations were due to academy recoupment, reduction from the EFA to pay for copyright licences, direct funding of High Needs placements, correction of the numbers of post-16 places submitted to the EFA and an increase in early years pupil numbers.

The report provided commentary on the virements that had taken place and the main areas of variance for each of the three DSG Blocks.

In relation to the High Needs Block, the report contained a statement of the Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning: -

The demands on the High Needs Budget continue to grow, not least because of a significant increase in the number of young children with complex needs being referred for Education, Health and Care plan assessments. The Schools Forum has agreed to establish a High Needs sub group to better understand these pressures and how the High Needs funding is determined. As part of the Special Educational Needs and Disability transformation, work is underway to develop new ways of working and structures

which meet the demands of the new duties whilst reducing administrative costs, not least to meet the Council's target of saving £1.2m from the special needs budget between 2014 and 2016. The DfE has recently commissioned an external review of how funding provided to schools and local councils for those children and young people with special educational needs and a disability is calculated, which will contribute to future education funding reforms. Until then however, the mainstream DSG provides the main source of funding to deal with any growth in the number of children and young people with high levels of need.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- Were cost pressures as a result of insufficient funding received for pay awards and increments?
 - Budgets had never been increased. Staff slippage may be able to address this.
- Ways in which the over-spend within the High Needs Block could be addressed, including the statutory aspects/services, commissioning work, traded service models and the potential ways for the new assessment pathway for the Health, Education and Social Care Plans.

Resolved: - That the Total Schools budget forecast outturn position at 2014/2015 year end, based on actual income and expenditure to 31st August, 2014, be noted.

60. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETINGS: -

Resolved: - (1) That the next meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum take place on Friday 28th November, 2014, to start at 8.30 a.m. at Rockingham Professional Development Centre.

(2) That future meeting dates take place on: -

- Friday 16th January, 2015 (was 30th January – changed due to DfE return deadline);
- Friday 6th March, 2015;
- Friday 24th April, 2015;
- Friday 26th June, 2015.

Rotherham Schools' Forum

November 28th 2014

High Needs Sub Group

1. Earlier this year the Forum agreed to establish a high needs sub group. This briefing aims to provide an update on establishing the group, its membership, terms of reference and to provide some initial information. The group has already held its first meeting and plans to meet termly. Forum members will receive briefings on the work of the group at each Forum meeting and the contribution of forum members to the discussion is invited.

2. Membership and Terms of Reference. Members of the group include:

Early Years : Carole Johnson, Aughton Early Years Centre
 Primary : Louise Greenwood, Herringthorpe Junior School
 Secondary : Vacant
 Special Schools : Nick Whittaker, Hilltop / Kelford
 Further Education : Ann Hardy, RCAT
 RMBC Finance : Andrea Baldwin
 RMBC SEN Assessment : John Coleman
 RMBC/ CCG/ Learners' First : Donald Rae

High needs funding covers a range of services, not just special educational needs, including alternative provision / pupil referral units. Consideration should be given to how the AP/PRU voice is heard. Terms of reference for the group have been agreed and its purpose aims to ensure that members of the group :

- Are aware of how funding for high needs is provided to the LA by the Department for Education
- Are informed by and provide advice to the Council on how expenditure is allocated to the High Needs Block, following the School and Early Years Finance (England) 2014 Regulations
- Keep abreast of the number and complexity of children and young people with special educational needs and disability aged 0-25
- Keep abreast of the number and complexity of children and young people supported through Alternative Provision
- Take account of the plans of the council and partners to transform the outcomes for children and young people with special educational needs and disability as well as those in alternative provision and the impact of these on the high needs budget
- Are informed by and provide advice to the council about measures to ensure best value regarding High Needs Block expenditure.
- Are aware of best practice in the sector and are collectively working towards providing outstanding learning opportunities for all.

3. The sub group is focussing its attention on high needs funding as described in the School and Early Years Finance Regulations. A briefing paper for the sub group outlining these and the high needs funding model for early years, schools and colleges is attached. Whilst the group will be provided with previous years' data showing Rotherham expenditure against the headings in the regulations, the focus will be on the planned expenditure for 2015/16 so that the amount of the DSG required for the High Needs Block is transparent and understood.
4. Whilst the high needs funding system has been in place since 2013, creating a greater degree of coherence across schools and colleges, the funding provided to local authorities for high needs by the DfE varies considerably. The DfE has issued a call for evidence about how it should address this, especially in light of the development of a national funding formula. The consultation runs until February 27th 2015. It can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/funding-for-children-and-young-people-with-send>. Very helpfully, the DfE has provided a large amount of data about high needs funding which allows LA comparisons to be made. Some of this data will be presented at the meeting on November 28th, but the headline information about Rotherham indicates that
 - In Rotherham, the percentage of school pupils with SEN (but without a statement) achieving 5+A*-C including English and maths has increased from 11% in 2009 to 24% in 2013, compared with national figures of 19% and 27%.
 - The percentage of school pupils with a SEN statement achieving 5+A*-C including English and maths has increased from 7% in 2009 to 11% in 2013, compared with national figures of 6% in 2009 and 10% in 2013.
 - The percentage of 16/17 year olds with learning difficulties and/ or disabilities in learning is 90.4% compared with a national average of 85.8%
 - Higher than national average of children and young people whose day to day activities are limited
 - The number of Rotherham pupils with SEN is declining – from 24.5% in 2009 to 19.5% in 2014 – this is faster than the national decline
 - The number of pupils with a SEN Statement has fallen from 2.7% in 2009 to 2.3% in 2014. The latter is 21% below the national average of 2.8%. In practice this means that fewer children in Rotherham with less complex needs have a SEN statement.
 - Of those with a statement, 40.14% are provided with support in mainstream settings compared with 52.14% nationally, with 58.1% in special settings compared with 45.4% nationally. However this hides that Rotherham has 21% fewer children with statements than the national average, all of whom will be in mainstream schools. If Rotherham had the national average statement rate of 2.8% the proportion of children with statements in mainstream schools would increase to 49% and the percentage in special schools reduce to 45.3%. Additionally, the proportion of High Needs spend in Rotherham on specialist placements is the same as that nationally.

- In Rotherham the high needs block expenditure is 9.4% of the DSG, compared to a national average of 13.4%.
- High needs funding per pupil in Rotherham has risen from £1,954 in 2012/13 to £2,408 in 2014/15 compared to national figures of £2,924 to £3,470.

Work is being undertaken to develop comparisons with Rotherham's statistical and geographic neighbours.

Rotherham Schools' Forum

High Needs Sub Group

Background Briefing Paper

November 2014

1 School and Early Years Finance Regulations

These regulations describe how DfE funding is provided to local authorities, early years providers, schools and, for some learners with high needs, to FE colleges. It is available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341924/The_School_and_Early_Years_Finance_England_Regulations_2014.pdf.

Funding for services which support children and young people with special educational needs and/or disability is provided through these budgets :

a) Non Schools Education Budget

- *Educational psychologists*
- *SEN Assessment staff (Statements, Learning Difficulty Assessments and Education Health and Care Plans)*
- *Monitoring and improving SEND provision including school improvement*
- *Collaborative work with other agencies and councils regarding SEND*
- *Parent Partnership Services*
- *Mediation and dispute resolution services*
- *Child protection*
- *Special medical support where it is not provided by the NHS*
- *School and college place planning for those with SEND*

The Non Schools Education budget also covers a wide range of other education functions including school improvement and strategic management .

b) Central Schools Budget (which is deducted from the Dedicated Schools Grant before individual school budgets are determined)

SEN transport costs

Children and Young People With High Needs

(NB not all special needs in mainstream settings – not where it would be reasonable to expect such expenditure to be met from a setting's core budget. In Rotherham High Needs funding is primarily used for those with statements / learning difficulty assessments or education health and care plans – see High Needs funding below)

- pupils with special educational needs in primary, secondary schools and relevant early years providers,
- Pupils with special educational needs at special schools and special Academies

- Learners in further education who are—
 - (a) aged under 19 and have special educational needs; or
 - (b) aged over 18 but under 25 and are subject to a learning difficulty assessment or an EHC plan
 - *Support services for children with special educational needs*
 - *SEND Collaboration between settings*
(where the local authority considers it would be unreasonable for such costs to be met from a setting's budget share) :
 - a) collaboration between special schools and primary and secondary schools to enable children with special educational needs to engage in activities at primary and secondary schools;
 - b) the education of children with special educational needs at primary and secondary schools; and
 - c) the engagement of children with special educational needs at primary and secondary schools in activities at the school with children who do not have special educational needs,
 - *Expenditure incurred in relation to education otherwise than at school or in relation to a pupil referral unit, where the expenditure cannot be met from a PRU's budget*
 - *Fees in respect of children with special educational needs at independent schools including non maintained special schools or learners at independent specialist colleges*
 - *Expenditure on hospital education services,*
 - *Expenditure on special schools and pupil referral units in financial difficulty.*
 - *Expenditure on costs in connection with private finance initiatives at special schools, special Academies, pupil referral units and alternative provision Academies(*
 - *Expenditure on the purchase of CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme allowances operated by the Environment Agency for pupil referral units.*
- Other items which may be removed from Maintained Schools' Budget shares includes
- *Services for children with behavioural difficulties*

Nationally around 10% of the DSG is spent on special educational needs, although there are wide variations for example:

Rotherham : 8.3% ; Doncaster : 7.6%; Barnsley 11.9%; Sheffield 15.5%; Derbyshire 14.0% ; Nottinghamshire : 4.3%.

The variations reflect the extent to which funding has been delegated to schools.

2 Funding for SEND in early years, schools and colleges

The new funding model for learners with special educational needs and for those in alternative provision was implemented in 2013. The system for schools and FE colleges is similar, but not identical.

Schools receive their core funding based on the number of pupils in the school. In Rotherham this is currently around £4,800 per pupil (also known as element 1). Each school, as part of this budget, is allocated a 'notional SEN budget' which takes into account the number of pupils with SEN and general factors such as literacy achievement rates. Schools are expected to meet the first £6,000 (element 2) of any additional SEND costs, over the core funding rate, giving a total of c £10,000. Any costs above this figure (element 3) are covered by the high needs budget which is allocated for each pupil following an assessment. Virtually all of the pupils in Rotherham who attract high needs funding have a SEN statement or EHC Plan.

Special Schools are funded in a similar way to mainstream schools but the system allows some elbow room by providing funding for places in the school, as well as for every child who actually attends. Each special school is provided with £10,000 for every place in the school and the school receives high needs 'top up funding' (element 3) from the home local authority of the child.

FE Colleges receive their core allocation per learner based on the FE funding methodology. As with schools they are expected to meet the needs of learners with lower levels of special need from their core budgets. However rather than a 'notional SEN budget' the EFA provides colleges with £6,000 for every high needs learner, as agreed with the local authority. As with schools, colleges receive high needs 'top up funding' (element 3) from the learner's home local authority.

Non maintained special schools and independent colleges receive funding in similar ways to special schools : they receive £10,000 per place from the EFA and 'top up funding' (element 3) from the learner's home local authority.

Pupil referral units are funded in a similar way to special schools, although for 2013-2015 at £8,000 per place. The DfE has proposed increasing that to £10,000 from April 2015.

This system has now been in place for two years and in time it should allow for increased choice and create greater flexibility. It has meant that local authorities now have to plan the number of high cost special needs places and to provide evidence to the DfE if it wishes to argue for more high needs funding. As part of the annual funding discussion, the EFA asks LAs to update its expected number of high needs learners in schools and colleges. This will happen for the last time for the 2015/16 academic year – thereafter we expect the numbers to follow a lagged funding model.

How the DfE allocates High Needs Funding is under review, not least because of the large differences between local authority allocations. The DfE issued a consultation on this issue on November 13th. The consultation runs until February 27th 2015. And can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/funding-for-children-and-young-people-with-send>.

Donald Rae
November 17 2014

School Funding 2015-16 Consultation Responses

1. On 13th October 2014 a consultation paper was issued to all maintained schools and academies. Under the Scheme for Financing Schools the Local Authority is required to consult all schools on proposed changes to the formula: this paper feeds back to Forum the results of the consultation.
2. All maintained schools and academies were asked two questions regarding proposed changes to Rotherham's 2015-16 formula and also for comments regarding centrally retained budgets. All maintained schools were asked whether to continue with the current de-delegation of budgets.
3. Thirty one schools responded to the consultation (28% of Rotherham schools); following review of these responses the LA is recommending that Forum agree the amendments in respect of Rotherham's 2015/16 Fair Funding Formula.

Table 1 - Number of returns

Phase	No. of schools	No. of responses	% of schools
Primary (Maintained)	73	17	23%
Primary (Academy)	20	3	15%
Secondary (Maintained)	6	2	33%
Secondary (Academy)	10	9	90%
TOTAL	109	31	28%

Questions and comments

Q1 Do you agree with the introduction of a mobility factor?

83% agreed

- With regards to the pupil mobility we have concerns as to who is to manage the movement of students between and if this is the LA will there be a cost applied for this service? It's not easy to make a decision based on the information contained in the letter as we are unable to say if Thrybergh has gained or lost historically through pupil movement. Having said this we have decided to argue against the proposal.
- On reflection we don't support the introduction of a mobility factor mainly because it does not start from student 1, instead it starts at students over and above 10% of NOR. Another consideration was that Clifton would not be entitled to this based on them being in special measures

Q2 Lump sum - Do you agree that a further allowance should be allocated to amalgamated schools in the second year after amalgamating?

66% agreed

- In terms of the lump sum then we would strongly argue against the proposal going forward as there is considerable financial loss to the school. Even though we have amalgamated with Foljambe the operations of the school remain the same and therefore we are unsure as to the reason behind why the funding should be reduced especially in the absence of a split site formula.

- I spoke with the Head and he feels that schools that amalgamate do so with the knowledge that their funding arrangements will change and as a result we do not support any transitional arrangements either

Q3. *Should sums continue to be de-delegated from maintained school budgets in 2015-16?*

Table 2

De-delegated budgets	% of schools in agreement
Schools in Financial Difficulty	93%
Behaviour support (EOTAS)	81%
FSM eligibility	94%
Trade union	94%

- These services could potentially cease to exist. Many schools will think that because they aren't using them now, they may never need them.
- As a school we would like to know why schools end up in financial difficulty. If it is because of poor management of budget then this should not come out of de-delegated maintained school budgets. If it is for reasons which are out of a schools control such as asbestos being found etc then we would have answered differently but it is not clear as to what we are being asked to base our decision on.
- We would like further information before making a comment and would appreciate a meeting before any decisions are made.
- FSM Eligibility_– This needs renaming for KS1 due to UIFSM making it difficult for parents to see the point.
- EOTAS – Would need to know the cost of a school doing this for themselves. EG How much to complete a managed move for 1 child

Additional comments on the funding formula

- It is noted that the potential loss of funding to Thrybergh as outlined in the last page of your letter is set around £89k. The loss of funding from the lump sum is only around £30k so we are not sure how the other £60k has been calculated. We have assumed that the 2015/16 figures are based on 2014/15 numbers. Are you able to provide further information as to how this amount was derived at.
- Thrybergh has taken a number of financial hits in recent years. If a further hit in 2015/16 of £90k is expected plus around £26k hit from the EFA through drop in the ESG then we have serious problems to address.

- 4 All maintained schools and academies were asked to provide comments for consideration by Schools Forum on the central services (tables below) and the funding levels for 2015-16. Schools Forum approval is required each year to confirm the amounts on each line.

Table 3 – Can be centrally retained before allocating formula but **no new commitments or increases in expenditure** from 2014-15.

Service	2014-15
Winterhill & Rawmarsh CLC's	£162,612
School Effectiveness	£1,254,040
Learners First	£765,000
Children in Public Care	£152,000
Voice and Influence	£3,143
Education Welfare	£31,000
Outdoor Education Co-ordinator	£24,649
Training for Children with Medical Needs	£45,500
Moving and Handling Account	£45,500
Sexual Exploitation Team	£45,208
Operational Safeguarding Unit	£66,000
Termination of employment costs	£157,000
SEN Transport	£101,000
TOTAL	£2,852,652

Table 4 – Can be centrally retained before allocating formula and **can be increased**.

Service	2014-15
Pupil Growth Fund	£400,000
Copyright Licensing Agency, Education Recording Agency & Music Publishers Association	£144,412
TOTAL	£544,412

Table 5 – Can be centrally retained before allocating formula but **no increases in expenditure** from 2014-15.

Service	2014-15
Servicing of Schools Forum	£3,000
TOTAL	£3,000

Comments regarding Table 3

- CLC's – Are potentially not promoting what services they offer and therefore Value for money could be questioned. This should therefore become a traded service.
- I am very happy to support the CLC's (an outstanding resource centre),
- Transparency of how the SES funding is spent should be looked at by schools.
- I would really appreciate a little more information about: the school effectiveness service (as an outstanding setting perhaps an SLA would provide me with a guarantee of access to support/provision).
- The cost of SES (44%) and Learners First (27%) amounts to 71% of Table 3. Indeed these two headings account for 60% of the £3.5m in Tables 3, 4 & 5 combined. I think schools need to engage in how this money is being spent and how it is benefitting their schools – these are large sums of money.
- Isn't Learners First self-fundable now due to levels of income generated?
- I find it difficult to evaluate how much monetary value our school has attracted. I know we have, even down to the support that has been brokered through Learners First for EOS to be involved in our school. But I have no idea of the monetary value this constitutes. Whilst I am happy with the work done with EOS, as I have no idea of the cost, so I find it difficult to judge if it is value for money.
- Could areas such as Learners First not be best served as a traded service rather than directly funded from the DSG?
- Learners First – Doing some great work but should be a traded service as some schools are not accessing because of "issues" as to how it was set up initially.
- Happy with Learners First
- Children in public care - Is this not an overall LA responsibility (?)
- Happy with children in public care
- Voice & Influence – I have no idea what this is or what they do.
- Outdoor Education Coordinator – As the evolve system seems to put the responsibility on the Headteacher, I am not sure what OE Coordinator does
- Some of these services do have the potential to become traded services, eg outdoor education services because schools would buy into EVOLVE. Some less well used services are more vulnerable.
- Training for Children with Medical Needs – Should be funded via health or down to schools to choose a provider.
- Happy with safeguarding etc ...
- I would really appreciate a little more information on :The termination of employment costs and SEN transport
- SEN Transport – Should be funded by special schools which have sizable per pupil budgets.

Comments regarding Table 4

- Table 4: Is a total mystery to me – in particular the Pupil growth fund (?).

Comments regarding Table 5

- Table 5: No problem at all. Thank you

General comments

- Schools do not have enough information to make an informed decision regarding centrally retained funding. This needs to be an open transparent debate at the Head Teachers meeting.
- We would like further information before making a comment and would appreciate a meeting before any decisions are made.
- The governors cannot agree to any funding formulas which would take money away from our budget. Governor meeting held on 22.10.14
- If services to be retained centrally they need to be able to demonstrate value for money. If they are to become traded then proposed service costs / sample SLAs should be shared prior to any decision by Forum
- As much of the services that can be should be delegated to schools with a SLA put in place to allow schools to buy-back into the service. This will ensure accountability for the service and budget being paid to the service being provided.
- As a new Head teacher within the Rotherham area, I do not feel I am able to comment on the centrally retained services and the funding levels for 15/16 until I have further information on each individual service and how this currently benefits St Bernard's or could potentially benefit St Bernard's in the future. Could you please arrange for this information to be sent to me before the end of the consultation period, to enable me to make an informed comment.
- Clarity is required on what services the LA is funded for through the Education Services Grant, how much it receives and how much it spends.
- It should be clear on where any overlaps exist between services that the LA receives funding for from the ESG and funding allocated from the centrally retained elements of the DSG.
- All schools and academies should be reminded that the ESG allocations in 2015/16 are to be reduced and this will impact upon all Academy budgets.
- Per pupil amounts should be indicated for centrally retained elements similar to the de-delegated items
- The impact upon schools budgets of any increases to the High Needs Block needs to be clearly articulated i.e. what does a £1m increase to the High Needs Block translate to when applying a corresponding reduction to schools budgets (i.e. an indicative per pupil amount)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

1.	Meeting:	SCHOOLS FORUM
2.	Date:	28th November 2014
3.	Title:	Eastwood Village Primary School – pre opening funding allocation
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary

This report outlines proposals for the pre - opening funding allocation to Eastwood Village Primary School.

6. Recommendation:

- **It is recommended that the allocations specified be considered and approved by Schools Forum and funding be allocated from the Pupil Growth element within the Schools Block.**

7. Proposals and Details

Pre- opening funding allocation to Eastwood Village Primary School:

The School will open in September 2015 with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 30 to pupils in statutory year groups FS2 to Y4. Using previously agreed funding formulas and salary levels it is proposed to allocate the funding indicated below as a pre start up allocation.

Based on the school expansions funding formula with a presumption that recruitment will occur in the term proceeding opening - April to August (5/12) of start - up year staffing:

5/12 x Teacher

5/12 x Teaching Assistant

£3,000 allocation per classroom

Financial Year – 2014/15	Expenditure
Leadership funding based on L10 leadership salary as previously agreed by Schools Forum (Sept 14 to Mar 15)	£34,289
<i>Currently allocated funding to expanding schools</i>	<i>£411,358</i>
TOTAL for 2014/15	£445,647
Financial Year – 2015/16	Expenditure
Leadership funding based on L10 leadership salary as previously agreed by Schools Forum (Apr 15 to Aug 15 – 5/12)	£24,492
FS2 to Y4 = 5 classrooms using suggested formula above	£65,731 Teachers £22,985 T/As £15,000 Classroom TOTAL = £103,716
Total	£128,208
<i>Reported funding to expanding schools</i>	<i>£253,417</i>
TOTAL for 2015/16 (to date)	£381,625

Funding allocation from September 2015 (Financial year 2015/16)

The new school will receive a formula budget for the September 2015 to March 2016 period. The Local Authority will estimate the pupil numbers expected to join the school in September and fund accordingly, explaining the rationale underpinning the estimates.

NB: Once the formula for new schools is agreed the formula can be used for the proposed new Waverley and Bassingthorpe Farm primary Schools in due course.

8. Finance

The Education Funding Agency has produced guidance on funding arrangements (appendix 1, 2014/15 Revenue funding arrangements (additional information for Local Authorities guidance) included within the guidance (page 20) is a table indicating the responsibilities for 'start up' new school funding. Any new school / Academy that is open for basic need purposes is the responsibility of the Local Authority to fund. This includes both post revenue opening costs and pre start development costs.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the forward planning and provision of school places is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Reports to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Family Services and Cabinet in relation to:

Annual Admissions Consultations

Proposals to increase admission numbers temporarily

Prescribed alterations to schools

12. Contact Name

Dean Fenton – Principal Officer School Organisation

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

Tel: 01709 254821

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

1.	Meeting:	SCHOOLS FORUM
2.	Date:	28th November 2014
3.	Title:	School expansions: transitional funding
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary

Pupil numbers are increasing within the Borough creating a shortage of available places in certain areas. This increasing pressure on school places means it is necessary to increase the number of school places available to meet current and projected demand. This report outlines the transitional 7/12 funding required to support the creation of additional school places in the Borough until school census funding generates the income for new pupils.

6. Recommendation:

- **It is recommended that the 2015/16 allocations specified be approved and funded from the Pupil Growth element within the Schools Block. A further report will be submitted in due course to confirm requests for transitional funding for 2016/17 and beyond once the outcome of future proposals and consultations are known.**

7. Proposals and Details

Pupil numbers are increasing in the Borough and there is increasing pressure on school places, particularly in Key Stage 1, making it necessary to increase the number of primary school places available in certain areas of the Borough. The impact on children and families can be significant where siblings are separated across more than one school; parents are reluctant to take up offers of a school place due to logistical and financial constraints around travel; and a potentially negative impact on one or more children's attendance, participation and achievement of wider educational outcomes.

Agreed formula to be used to determine allocation amounts:

- 7/12 of an M6 Teacher - £31,552 = (£18,405)
- 7/12 of a Band D TA - £15,725 = (£9,173) – (6,436) Based on 30 hours per week term time only.
- 7/12 of a Level 3 SMSA - £12,787. (£7,459) – (£1,090) Based on 6hrs.15mins per week term time only.
- Plus £252 x the number of additional anticipated pupils
- Plus a fixed amount of £3000.

2015/16 allocations scheduled to date:

<i>School</i>		<i>Amount</i>	<i>Pupils anticipated</i>
Wath C of E	(2)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Listerdale	(2)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Thurcroft Infants	(2)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Wales Primary	(2)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Flanderwell	(3)	£24,400	remainder from CFWD
Flanderwell	(4)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Brinsworth Howarth	(2)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
Aston Hall	(3)	£32,711	based on 15 pupils
TOTAL:		£253,417	

8. Finance

Where schools are expanded, it is necessary to provide interim financial support to bridge the gap between 1st September and 31st March. Funding is allocated to schools each financial year based upon numbers on roll on Census day in October of the preceding year. Additional pupils commencing at the start of a new academic

year will not be on roll at that time in order to generate sufficient funding to meet additional staffing and other agreed expenditure.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the forward planning and provision of school places is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. The expansion of schools would enable more parents to access their first preference school for their child and, therefore, increase that performance indicator.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Reports to the Decision Maker in relation to:

Annual Admissions Consultations

Proposals to increase admission numbers temporarily, and to make prescribed alterations to schools

2014/15 allocations:

School Expansion Allocations:

<i>Aston Hall</i>	= £32,711
<i>Broom Valley</i>	= £72,982
<i>Listerdale</i>	= £32,711
<i>Wath C of E</i>	= £36,491
<i>Herringthorpe Jun</i>	= £32,711
<i>Wales Primary</i>	= £32,711
<i>Brampton Ellis Jnr</i>	= £32,711
<i>Thurcroft Infant</i>	= £32,711
<i>Treeton C of E</i>	= £32,711
TOTAL	= £338,450

Fair Access Allocations:

<i>St Ann's</i>	= £10,944
<i>Coleridge</i>	= £ 4,864
<i>East Dene</i>	= £ 9,728
<i>Badsley Primary</i>	= £ 3,648
<i>High Greave</i>	= £ 2,432
<i>Ferham</i>	= £ 3,648
<i>Kimberworth</i>	= £ 3,648
<i>Thornhill</i>	= £ 1,216

TOTAL **= £40,128**

Schools requested to go 'over PAN' due to catchment / local area pressure

<i>Fullerton</i>	= £ 6,021
<i>Sandhill</i>	= £14,596

TOTAL **= £20,617**

Request for advance on scheduled 2015/16 allocation of £32,711

<i>Flanderwell</i>	= £12,163
--------------------	------------------

GRAND TOTAL **= £411,358**

12 Contact Name

Dean Fenton (Principal Officer – School Organisation)

dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

Telephone number: 01709 254821