

## Rotherham Schools' Forum

Venue: **Rockingham Professional Development Centre** Date: **Friday, 6 March 2015**

Time: **8.30 a.m.**

### A G E N D A

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of Interest.
3. Minutes and matters arising from the previous meeting held on 16th January, 2015. (Pages 1 - 10)
  - To note : - decision relating to the FS1 classroom at the new Central Primary School has been agreed outside of the meeting.
4. Note the letter of the Strategic Director, CYPS, letter to Schools and outline the implications of moving some budget decisions back to 1st July, 2015. (Pages 11 - 15)
5. Total Schools' Budget Monitoring Report as at 31st January, 2015. (Pages 16 - 21)
6. High Needs standing update. (Pages 22 - 25)
7. Proposed Total Schools' Budget - 2015/2016: -
  - Including setting High Needs' Block.
8. Date and time of next meetings: -
  - Friday 24<sup>th</sup> April;
  - Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June.

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

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM  
FRIDAY, 16TH JANUARY, 2015**

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

**Learning Community Representatives:** - K. Sherburn (Rawmarsh), L. Pepper (Clifton), J. Morrision (Swinton and representing St. Bernard's in voting), D. Silvester (Wath), D. Naisbitt and A. Abel (Oakwood – one vote), R. Burman (Winterhill), P. Dilasio and L. McCall (Wales – one vote), R. Fone (Brinsworth), T. Bishop (Saint Pius), J. Fearnley (Wingfield), C. Roberts (Wickersley), D. Ball (Aston).

**Other stakeholder representatives:** - G/ Gillard (Sheffield Diocese), S. Brooke (NASUWT, Teaching Trade Unions), M. Badger (Unison, Support Staff Unions), P. Gerard (Early Years), P. Bloor (PRUs), D. Ashmore (Teaching Schools – Learners First), S. Mallinder (Primary Governors).

**Officers in attendance:** - J. Robertson (Finance), V. Njelic (Finance), K. Borthwick (Interim Director for Schools and Learning), D. Rae (SEND Consultant), H. Etheridge (Committee Services).

**Observer:** - M. Young.

**Apologies for absence had been received from:** - S. Booth (Finance), S. Kent (Thryberh – voting intentions passed on), I. Thomas (Interim Strategic Director of CYPS), G. Alton and R. Williams (Colleges), N. Whittaker (Special Schools), S. Hustler (Business Managers), A. Richards (Secondary Governors), J. Gray (Early Years PVI), T. Mahon (Saint Bernard's – voting intentions passed on), Councillor C. Beaumont (Children and Education Services), H. McLaughlin (Saint Pius – representative attending), J. Henderson (Brinsworth – representative attending).

### **83. TRAINING SESSION.**

The Principal Schools' Accountant delivered a presentation that provided members of the Rotherham Schools' Forum with background and details on Funding Reforms, including the DSG for 2015/2016.

- 2012/2016 Dedicated Schools' Grant: -
  - Guaranteed Unit of Funding per pupil;
  - The Total Budget - £209million;
  - Comparison between Rotherham and statistical neighbours;
  - Section 251 – 2012/2013.
- How Section 251 expenditure had been mapped into the three Blocks;
- Amounts allocated to each Block in 2013/2014;
- 2013/2014 DSG allocations for statistical neighbours in the Schools' and Early Years' Guaranteed Unit of Funding;

- 2013/2014 High Needs' Block allocations amongst statistical neighbours;
- Fairer Funding in Schools, 2015/2016: -
  - Rotherham's Guaranteed Unit of Funding would remain unchanged.
- 2015/2016 provisional Block values: -
  - Schools' Block comparison to 2014/2015;
  - 2014/2015 primary, secondary and academy budgets make-up;
  - De-delegated budgets – maintained schools only – 2013/2014, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016;
  - Historical commitments;
  - Pupil Growth Fund and National Copyright licences;
  - Servicing of Schools' Forum.
- **Operational guidance for Local Authorities in 2015/2016: -**
  - **The LA will need to make strategic decision on how funding is distributed between the schools, early years and high needs blocks taking into account demographic and other pressures;**
  - **LAs are able to move funding between the blocks provided they comply with the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and have agreement of Schools' Forum on any increase in centrally held budgets.**

#### **84. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

Susan Brooke, Teaching Trade Unions' Representative, declared an interest as the funding for her post was received through the Schools' Block.

David Ashmore, Teaching Schools' Representative, declared an interest in decisions relating to the Schools' Block due to his representation of Learners First.

#### **85. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 28TH NOVEMBER, 2014.**

The minutes and meeting digest of the previous meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum held on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014, were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes be agreed as an accurate record.

#### **86. DEVOLVED CENTRAL BUDGET.**

The Interim Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning reported that the

centrally-held funding in relation to Learners First had been sent to all eligible Schools following a meeting with the Interim Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services Directorate. A communication had been sent out to Schools, along with further information for those schools that operated a bank account.

The Wingfield Learning Community Representative asked why there had been a delay. The Interim Director explained the reasons, including the significant changes within the Directorate Leadership Team of Children and Young People's Services Directorate and the use of delegated powers through the Interim Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services Directorate.

The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum had emphasised the need for a quick resolution and was pleased that this had been actioned.

Further discussion ensued on the requirement for some schools above the thresholds of Standing Orders to obtain quotations. It was noted that this requirement would be exempted centrally by the Local Authority.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

#### **87. CENTRALLY RETAINED SERVICES.**

The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum introduced this item; at the time of the meeting the Local Authority did not have a comprehensive offer to present relating to buy-back models for the services currently funded through centrally-retained resources.

Discussion followed on the principles and practicalities surround this issue: -

- It was very clear how some services could operate on a buy-back model, whereas others were not so clear. Could this represent a disadvantage to those services and service-users?;
- Voting principles – should this be considered on principle as a block, or on a service-by-service basis based on the value of each Service?;
- The role of the recent budget saving decision that had been applied to the City Learning Centres and how this might influence Representatives' decisions to vote;
- If some of the smaller contributions were devolved to Schools they would not add very much to Schools' budgets; what could Schools do with this?;
- Opportunity for Central Services – if they were well regarded and offered value for money, Schools were likely to passport the funds straight back;
- Potential redundancy situations;
- The Interim Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning described how the structure of the Children and Young People's Services

Directorate would be altering from two Directorates into four, meaning that some services would be located in different areas with different line management. She referred to hearsay that funding would be differently structured in the future and existing centrally-held funds would become protected and unable to be devolved to Schools. She had taken DfE advice on this and there were no plans to do this in the future. A General Election was due, potentially leading to a different policy direction;

- Any votes taken were to become effective on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015. This could lead to significant risks for the Local Authority, including significant redundancy costs;
- There was support amongst attendees that where there were highly regarded services, Schools would continue to buy them back. There were many examples of great Services that the Local Authority should be proud of, along with the shared vision between the Local Authority and Rotherham's Schools;
- The City Learning Centre Service had been working towards a stand-alone position for some time but was not yet ready to take this. Would assurances be available if Services' funding remained centrally held that no further savings would be taken?;
- The PRU Representative commented on his discomfort at being able to vote on matters within the Schools' Block given that PRUs were funded through the High Needs' Block. The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum pointed out that PRUs did use the Services being discussed and were stakeholders;
- Members of the Rotherham Schools' Forum undertook the vote on a positive note and felt that any decision to stop holding funds centrally would be an opportunity.

The Rotherham Schools' Forum voted on the proposal to delegate the funds within Table Three to eligible Schools with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015.

Resolved: - (1) The proposal to delegate the funds within Table Three to eligible Schools with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015, was supported on a majority basis with one abstention and no votes against.

(2) That the pro-forma return to the DfE due on 20<sup>th</sup> January, reflect this vote.

#### **88. UPDATE ON CENTRALLY HELD FUNDS.**

The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum referred to the decisions required relating to Tables Four and Five.

##### **Table Four: -**

The items within this Table could be centrally-retained and could be increased from the 2014/2015 allocations.

It was known that the charge for Copyright Licensing Agency, Education Recording Agency and Music Publishers' Association would increase by two thirds in 2015/2016. It was not possible to opt out of this and the cost was top-sliced by the Department for Education.

It was proposed that the 2015/2016 allocation to the Pupil Growth Fund be increased to £500k, an increase from £400k in the previous year, due to increasing pupil numbers within the Borough. It was requested that regular updates be provided by the Service Lead on the use of the Pupil Growth Funding.

**Table Five: -**

This amount related to the servicing of the Schools' Forum but there could be no increase in the allocation from 2014/2015.

Resolved: - (1) That the 2015/2-16 budget allocation to the Copyright Licensing Agency, Education Recording Agency and Music Publishers' Association increase by two thirds in 2015/2016 based on the 2014/2015 allocation be approved.

(2) That the 2015/2016 allocation to the Pupil Growth be centrally-retained and be £500k (an increase on the 2014/2015 allocation).

(3) That regular updates be provided by the Service Lead for School Planning, Admissions and Appeals on the use of the Pupil Growth Fund.

(4) That the 2015/2016 allocation to the servicing of the Rotherham Schools' Forum be centrally retained and be £3k (same as the 2014/2015 allocation).

**89. CLASSROOM START-UP FUNDING FOR NEW SCHOOLS.**

Further to Minute No. 80 (Eastwood Village Primary School – pre-opening funding allocation) of the previous meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum held on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2014, further information had been circulated relating to the start-up costs for Foundation Stage One and the Key Stages One and Two Classrooms for the new central primary school.

The Service Lead for School Planning, Admissions and Appeals had recommended that the start-up costs for the new central primary school be increased to £4k. This was an increase on the amount budgeted in the expansion formula of £3k.

It was reported that the amounts relating to the Foundation Stage One Classrooms should not be agreed at this meeting as further conversations had been requested by the Early Years and Childcare Service.

The Rotherham Schools' Forum voted on the proposal to allocate £3k for the Key Stage One and Two Classroom start-up costs to the new Central

Primary School, based on the detailed list of costings submitted.

Resolved: - (1) It was unanimously supported that the £3k allocation for the Key Stages One and Two Classrooms for the new Central Primary School, in-line with the school expansion formula, be approved.

(2) That a decision in relation to the Foundation Stage One Classroom/s be deferred to allow further conversations to take place.

**90. EDUCATED OTHER THAN AT SCHOOL (EOTAS) AND DE-DELEGATED BUDGETS.**

Consideration was given to this item relating to de-delegated funding and the report submitted by the Virtual Headteacher for Looked After Children and the Strategic Lead for Vulnerable Pupils.

The report noted the remit of the Educated Other Than At School team to inform the Rotherham Schools' Forum of the volume and nature of work that the team was involved in.

This included: -

- Managed Moves;
- Exclusions;
- Fixed Exclusion Occurrences;
- Fixed Exclusions;
- Permanent Exclusions;
- PRU numbers.

Consideration had been given to the development of a traded-model and it was felt that the EOTAS agenda did not support a traded model approach. This was supported by the Directorate Leadership Team of the Children and Young People's Services Directorate.

The Rotherham Schools' Forum noted this report, and also noted the decision made at the agenda items relating to centrally retained services, which had implications for the EOTAS Service funding structure.

The Wickersley Learning Community Representative asked why maintained schools were paying more when academy schools were buying back the Service?

In relation to all of the de-delegated budgets under consideration, Schools in Financial Difficulty, Behaviour Support (EOTAS), Free School Meal eligibility and Trade Union, discussion was held on the principles involved:

-

- The outcomes of consultation with maintained schools;
- Would the Schools in Financial Difficulty budget operate as a buy-back model? Would schools be willing to buy into this?;

- The constitution and voting rights of the Rotherham Schools' Forum – the vote would need to be taken separately between primary and secondary representatives of maintained schools only;
  - Potential need to reconstitute the Rotherham Schools' Forum.
- A decreasing number of maintained schools were taking on a greater share and this was an uncomfortable scenario for representatives. However, it was noted that these budgets could be reduced.

The options for voting were discussed.

Secondary Schools – maintained only – were asked whether to remove funding from maintained school budgets in respect of Behaviour Support (EOTAS), Free School Meal eligibility and Trade Union activity 2015/2016 financial year. (Schools in Financial Difficulty did not apply).

Primary Schools – maintained only – were asked whether to remove funding from maintained school budgets in respect of Schools in Financial Difficulty, Behaviour Support (EOTAS), Free School Meal eligibility and Trade Union activity 2015/2016 financial year. Primary School Representatives also voted on the amount of the allocation to Schools in Financial Difficulty.

Resolved: - (1) The Secondary School Representatives – maintained only – voted on a unanimous basis to return funding to maintained school budgets in 2015/2016 in respect of Behaviour Support (EOTAS), Free School Meal eligibility and Trade Union activity.

(2) The Primary School Representatives – maintained only – voted on a unanimous basis to return funding to maintained school budgets in 2015/2016 in respect of Behaviour Support (EOTAS), Free School Meal eligibility and Trade Union activity.

(3) The Primary School Representatives – maintained only – voted on a majority basis (one against) for Schools in Financial Difficulty to continue to be de-delegated in 2015/2016, with a decreased budget allocation of £75k for the year.

(4) That a report be presented to the April meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum on how the Schools in Financial Difficulty funding was spent.

## **91. HIGH NEEDS UPDATE.**

Consideration was given to the report tabled by the SEND Consultant that outlined the initial considerations that had taken place regarding SEND provision in Rotherham.

It was explained that the paper was still in an early draft form. Further



information was awaited from Further Education establishments and a data check was required on all other information presented.

The document covered: -

- Demographic changes in the Borough – a projected 10% overall increase in pupil numbers was expected, which would lead to an increase of 10% of children and young people with SEND. This was forecast due to the number of additional houses that would be built in the Borough over the next twenty years;
- There had been a 10% increase in Rotherham pupil numbers between 2009-2016;
- Specialist provision: -
  - The local context;
  - Current provision – specialist places in Rotherham's 6 Special Schools and 6 Mainstream units and Enhanced Resources;
  - Quality of provision.

The document outlined a proposal to consult widely upon strategic change, including the establishment of an enhanced role for special schools, including responsibility for satellite provision in mainstream schools. The report outlined the numbers of places that would be available across Rotherham.

Discussion on the issues raised followed and the following questions were asked: -

- Abbey School had been included in the plan but was currently under consultation to close. How had their places been included in the planning document? - Abbey had been included in the document which would be altered as necessary following the end of consultation period and the decision made on Abbey School;
- Would there be enough places if Abbey School closed? - The review was considering how many specialist places were needed and where in Rotherham;
- The High Needs' Block was already over-spent. Where would additional funding be received from in the case of additional places that were currently under consultation? - These would create additional pressures, but, overall, the system would be moving to a closer correlation between what the budget was and the outturn position;
- It had been hard for some stakeholders to understand what the causes of the over-spend had been – the SEND Consultant outlined the top-up funding and per-place funding;
- The number and type of external placements would be analysed. This could necessitate further local provision.

The Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum asked members to take the information tabled away from the meeting and absorb the content.

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

(2) That the next meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum receive an update on High Needs work.

## **92. BUDGET MONITORING UPDATE.**

Consideration was given to the report presented by the CYPS and Schools' Finance Manager that provided a budget monitoring report on the Total Schools budget for 2014/2015 based on expenditure to 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2014.

The current projected outturn was an over-spend of £1.268million, which represented an increase of 0.86% against the total budget.

The Total Schools' budget was calculated based on confirmation of the DSG allocation, the EFA post-16 SEN funding for 2014/2015 and the DSG carry-forward from 2013/2014. The total amount available was £145.764m, after deductions for Academy recoupment.

The submitted report outlined revisions to the Total Schools' Budget following academy recoupment.

Budget virements had taken place in the Schools' Block – the School Effectiveness Service and contingencies, High Needs' Block – Special Educational Needs (top-up funding) and the Early Years' Block (primary delegated budget).

The report outlined the main variances against the budget allocations leading to under-spends and over-spends for each service division.

Questions were asked for further information on: -

- Academy recoupment – clarification was requested on the figures recouped and the process;
- Schools of concern allocation and the partnership with Learners First and school-to-school support;
- Early Education places not being accessed.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and the revised Total Schools' Budget allocation for 2014/2015 be noted.

(2) That the current projected outturn position for 2014/2015 based on expenditure to the end of November, 2014, of an over-spend position of £1.258m be noted.

## **93. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETINGS: -**

Resolved: - (1) That the next meeting of the Rotherham Schools' Forum

take place on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> March, 2015, to start at 8.30 a.m. at the Rockingham Professional Development Centre.

(2) That future meetings take place on: -

- Friday 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2015 – annual meeting for the Election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson;
- Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

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

**Children & Young People's Services**

4th Floor, Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham S60 1AE  
 Tel: (01709) 822677 Fax: (01709) 372530

Email: [Ian.thomas@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Ian.thomas@rotherham.gov.uk)  
*Email the Council for **free** @ your local library!*

Reference: ITDSG0502/FR

Contact: Ian Thomas  
 Date: 9<sup>th</sup> February 2015

To: All Headteachers and Chairs of Governors

Dear Colleagues

**Re: Schools' Forum decision that the majority of centrally retained budgets from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will not be held by the Local Authority (LA)**

As promised in my letter to you dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2015, I am writing to set out the risk assessment to schools and next steps following the above decision.

The LA has carried out a thorough risk assessment (see table 1) based upon those services that face significant complex staffing implications when DSG funding is removed. As a result, the following risk rating has been applied, which highlights those services where funding can cease from 1<sup>st</sup> April with minimum risk (green) to those services that are rated red that I would urge schools to reconsider the funding decision via your Schools' Forum representative in time for the next Forum meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> March.

- Green (£925,143) – funding can go to schools from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 with little impact on LA budgets or service delivery this academic year.
- Amber (£125,649) – funding can go to schools from 1<sup>st</sup> July as work is required with budget holders to ensure continuity in service delivery until the end of the academic year and to develop Service Level Agreements for schools to buy back services for 2015/16 if they so wish.
- Amber/Red (£1,416,652) – service commitments in place with schools until the end of the academic year but funding could go to schools from 1 July. However, without firm financial commitments from all/significant majority of schools, these improvement services are likely to cease in 2015/16 due to limited capacity – other than the LA's statutory duties to intervene where there is failure or cause for concern.
- Red (£385,208) – this would result in significant cost to the LA in termination of staff contracts and pose significant challenge to those services catering for the needs of our most vulnerable children.

As a result of this assessment, the Council has identified £925,143 of 2014-15 budgets (rated as green in table 1 overleaf) that can be delegated to schools from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. This is in addition to the £261,999 that will also be delegated to schools as a result of the Maintained Sector Schools' Forum vote to cease funding for Educated Other Than At School (EOTAS) – formerly part of Behaviour Support – Free Schools Meals (FSMs) eligibility checks and Local Trade Union support and Voice & Influence from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.

A further £125,649 (pro-rata 1<sup>st</sup> April – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015) of those Services rated as Amber can also be delegated to schools from 1<sup>st</sup> July. In addition, I have asked the School Effectiveness Service



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

[www.rotherham.gov.uk](http://www.rotherham.gov.uk)



(SES) to radically review their costs and services so that a new affordable Rotherham School Improvement Service can be developed and presented to you for your consideration on how best to fund from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 – if funded through DSG, I expect to report back significant economies resulting in several hundred thousands of pounds in savings for 2015/16.

Table 1: DSG Retained Budgets Risk Assessment for 2014/15 Academic Year

Service	Function	2014/15 Budget	RAG Rating
Children in Public Care	Support to Designated Teachers for Looked After Children	£152,000	RED
Education Welfare	Funds posts to support school attendance and children missing in education	£31,000	RED
Learners First	School improvement with a focus on leadership and management support and development	£765,000	GREEN
Moving and Handling Account	Provides health & safety guidance and practical assistance to schools on manual handling for those children with mobility issues	£45,500	RED
Operational Safeguarding Unit	Funds posts to provide advice, guidance and support to Governors, Heads and School Safeguarding Leads	£66,000	RED
Outdoor Education Co-ordinator	Advice, guidance and support regarding all aspects of educational visits via EVOLVE	£24,649	AMBER
School Effectiveness	Advice, support, guidance and resources on a range of school improvement strategies and initiatives, including learning community development, support for schools of concern, Governor support, performance analysis and the sharing of good practice delivered by consultant head teachers and teaching & learning consultants.	£1,254,040	AMBER/RED
Sexual Exploitation Team	Direct support and training to schools to identify sexual exploitation as well as direct prevention and intervention work with children	£45,208	RED
Special Education Needs Transport	Contribution to travel assistance for children with special educational needs	£101,000	AMBER
Termination of Employment Costs	Financial support to schools for all HR related issues	£157,000	GREEN
Training for Children with Medical Needs	Support to schools staff to enable children with medical needs attend mainstream education	£45,500	RED
Voice & Influence	Facilitate the work and delivery of Youth Cabinet and UK Youth Parliament and their links with School Councils	£3,143	GREEN
Winterhill & Rawmarsh CLCs	Enhance teaching & learning in the use of digital technology and to access up-to-date cutting edge resources and facilities for their students.	£162,612	AMBER/RED

### Next Steps

- 1) LA Finance colleagues will write to you shortly after half-term setting out:
  - a) The additional funds each school will receive from 1 April as a result of funding withdrawal for those services to maintained schools and those services rated as green above; and
  - b) Potential total funding for each school from 1 July should you decide not to reverse any of the decisions made by Schools' Forum for those services rated as red and amber/red.

- 2) Regarding the removal of services for maintained schools, the following actions will be necessary:
- FSMs eligibility checks – administering the assessment of FSMs entitlement for maintained schools will cease from 1<sup>st</sup> April unless you choose to buy back this service (on the same cost basis and arrangements as is currently the situation for Academies – the charge for 2015-16 will be £5.12 per eligible FSM pupil according to your January 2015 census). A Service Level Agreement will be sent to every school shortly after half-term. Should maintained schools not wish to buy back this service, then you will have to make your own arrangements for assessing entitlement to FSM, including how parents can apply, collecting evidence, documentary proof there is entitlement, dealing with change in circumstances and possibly reviewing entitlements.
  - Trade Union duties – The LAs Strategic Human Resource Directorate will develop a Service Level Agreement and send to you before the end of term setting out how schools can buy-back this service should you wish.
  - EOTAS – The LA will fulfil its statutory responsibility for young people permanently excluded under Section 19 and fund this from its Revenue budget from 1 April. However, I recognise the need for more effective early help and prevention from both the LA and schools. As a result of my plans to restructure the Children & Young People's Service, I will be looking for schools to work in partnership with the newly emerging Universal and Targeted Service and the new Inclusion Service to support students at risk of fixed/permanent exclusion. Where exclusions do arise, I will be challenging school and LA leaders to demonstrate that all early help and prevention measures available have been exhausted – crucial for the LA and schools to demonstrate to any future Ofsted inspections that Section 19 has been used as a last resort.
  - Termination of employment costs – there is no impact or actions for schools from 1<sup>st</sup> April, as this a LA liability, which the Authority will put in place contingencies.
- 3) I am asking the Leads of those services rated Amber to work on Service Level Agreements and costs before the end of term to enable you to make decisions on whether to purchase these services from 1<sup>st</sup> July. They will also need to set out the implications of these new arrangements on service delivery.
- 4) Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to set out my plans for developing and delivering a new Rotherham School Improvement Service from 1 July 2015 as I believe significant improvements and savings can be made in this area of work. I have asked my colleagues in SES to develop a new look service that is:
- A schools-led offer based upon your requirements and purchasing power to achieve economies of scale and value for money– in other words, schools know what they are purchasing prior to allocating budgets;
  - Focussed on prevention rather than solely intervention and is able to both support and challenge to benefit all schools and children and achieve our school improvement mission;
  - Independent and 100% committed to Rotherham's school improvement mission, re-investing DSG resources into school improvement; and
  - Based upon robust analysis of data working in partnership with schools and Learners First – thereby avoiding creating a market place that would be costly and divisive.

It is crucial that these new arrangements are developed in partnership with you. I have therefore, set out a timeline below and welcome your input. I am very conscious that I have yet to meet with many of you and have asked my office to schedule a series of meetings with you and your groups to take this work forward following the half-term break.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ian Thomas', written in a cursive style.

Ian Thomas  
Strategic Director  
Children and Young People's Services.

### Annex A: Timeline for developing new Rotherham School Improvement Service (SIS) for 2015/16

Timeline	Action	Stakeholder	Outcome/Agreement
w/c 26/1/15	LA letter to schools following Forum's decision to cease DSG for retained services	Headteachers and Chair of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ian Thomas letter to schools 27/1/15</li> <li>Forum extend timescales for implementing decision until 1 July 2015</li> </ul>
By 13/2/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communicate risk assessment, timeline and proposals for developing a revised SIS offer to schools based upon above paper.</li> <li>Finance colleagues to write to schools with individual budget readjustments for 1 April and projections for 1 July</li> </ul>	Headteachers and Chair of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ian Thomas letter to schools 6/2/15</li> </ul>
6/3/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of risk assessment and next steps</li> <li>Decision required on whether services rated as Red will continue to be funded beyond 1 July</li> </ul>	Schools Forum	
w/c 9/3/15	Discussion and agreement following outcomes of School Forum decision on risk assessment and next steps	Lead Member SLT	
w/c 9/3/15	Consult focus group on SIS draft model prior to going out to all schools for comment	Headteachers focus group	
w/c 29/3/15	Draft SIS model circulated to schools for consultation and for them to take back to their LCs for discussion prior to going to Forum in summer term	Headteachers and Chair of Governors	
w/c 13/4/15	Final SIS model presented for approval	Lead Member SLT	
24/4/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service Leads SLAs arrangements presented for decision on how best to fund beyond 1 July</li> <li>Final SIS Model presented for decision on how best to fund beyond 1 July</li> </ul>	Schools Forum	
14/5/15	Presentation of final SIS model to Secondary Heads	Secondary Heads Meeting	
16/5/15	Presentation of final SIS model to Special Heads	Special Heads Meeting	
23/5/15	Presentation of final SIS model to Primary Heads	Primary Heads Meeting	
1/7/15	New agreed service contracting, funding and delivery arrangements commence		



1.	<b>Meeting:</b>	Rotherham Schools Forum
2.	<b>Date:</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> March 2015
3.	<b>Title:</b>	Total Schools Budget Monitoring Report as at 31st January 2015
4.	<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources – Financial Services Children and Young People’s Services

**5. Summary**

This report confirms the Total Schools budgeted allocation for 2014/15 and projected outturn against this budget based on expenditure up to the 31st January 2015.

The Total Schools budget available after confirmation of the Dedicated Schools Grant allocation, the EFA post 16 SEN funding for 2014/15 and the DSG Carry-forward from 2013/14 is £145.087m (after deductions for Academy recoupment).

The current projected outturn against the above budget based on expenditure up to the 31st January 2015 is an over spend of £476k (0.33% over budget), including the agreed carry-forward allocations from 2013/14 to 2014/15 financial year.

**6. Recommendations**

**That the Schools Forum receives and notes confirmation of the revised Total Schools Budget allocation for 2014/15.**

**That the Schools Forum notes the current projected outturn position for the year 2014/15.**

**7. Revision to Total Schools Budget 2014/15**

The total amount of grant funding available to Rotherham is now £145.087m which is a total reduction of £16.975m from the original Total Schools Budget set at the start of the financial year. Since the revised budget was reported to Forum in January there has been a further reduction to the Total Schools Budget of £677k.

This is due to a further reduction of DSG in the Schools Block as a result of additional recoupmnt following the academy conversion of Aston All Saints and Maltby Manor Primary Schools.

**8. Total Schools Budget Projected Outturn 2014/15**

The forecast outturn position is projected to be a £476k over spend based on the budget monitoring returns from budget holders for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> January 2015. Details are shown in Appendix 1.

**8.1.1 Budget Virements**

Details of the budget virements during the period from December 2014 to January 2015 for each funding block are outlined below:-

**Schools Block Virements**

School Effectiveness Service

Transfer of funding for Schools of Concern to Ferham £3k, Sitwell £800 and Milton School £400. Allocation of EYFS Profile Moderator funding £600 each to Sitwell, Broom, Thornhill, Thurcroft, Anston Hillcrest and Swinton and £200 to Herringthorpe School.

RoSIP

Funding of £445k devolved to maintained Schools from the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership Budget. (Further payments of £320k made to Academy Schools)

**High Needs Block Virements**

Special Educational Needs (Top up Funding)

Budget virements for element 3 top up funding for exceptional needs to Special School budgets £11k, Primary Schools £1k and Secondary Schools £1k for the month of December 2014.

Transfer of £25k for Flanderwell Resource Unit from Primary Delegated Budget following conversion to Academy status in January.

Learning Support Service and Autism Communication Team

Transfer of budget £7.5k for Business Support Officer post transferred from the Children and Families Disability Team for the period November 2014 to March 2015.

**Early Years Block Virements**

Primary Delegated Budget

Additional Early years funding allocated to Flanderwell £11k and Trinity Croft £9k in respect of maintained early years funding prior to Academy conversion. Reduction of £12k Early Years funding from maintained school budgets for Academy payments following latest conversions.

### **8.1.2 Delegated Schools Budgets**

For the purposes of this report the forecast outturn position on schools the DSG is estimated to be a balanced position. However, it should be noted that schools have reported a £2.318m under spend based on monitoring returns received by the 13<sup>th</sup> February, (based on returns from 72% of Schools).

### **8.1.3 The main variances against Revised Budget allocations are as follows:**

#### **Schools Block (£759k under spend)**

##### **Rates**

Forecast under spend of £748k against revised rates budgets. Main variance due to secondary schools converting to Academy status and 2 schools granted Corporate Trust status £556k. Carry forward of Schools Block under spend from 2013/14 £414k not utilised in year. Offset by an over spend of £222k on primary school rates due to re-valuation of new build school premises backdated 3 years.

##### **Behaviour Support Service (EOTAS)**

Under spend of £22k due to staff slippage of £14k (staff restructure and not filling vacant posts), under spend on premises costs £4k and supplies £5k offset by £1k over spend on transport costs.

##### **Children in Public Care**

Under spend of £26k due to staff slippage as a result of not filling a vacant post pending restructure of service.

##### **Contingency**

Over spend on Pupil Growth Fund allocations to Primary Schools of £22k. Overspend of £57k due to termination of employment and pension costs and under spend of £24k on copyright licences due to actual costs being lower than estimated.

##### **Trade Union Activities**

Under spend of £6k forecast due to additional income from Academies £9k offset by additional staffing costs of £3k for increase in staff time on Academy work.

##### **Free School Meals Assessment**

Underspend of £6k due to additional income from Academies.

#### **High Needs Block (£1,743m over spend)**

##### **Special Educational Needs**

Forecast over spend of £863k due to educational equipment £75k, support packages £13k, out of authority independent non maintained school placements £849k (42 current placements and 3 pending, based on an

average weekly cost of £929 per week the current budget can only fund 21 placements), Speech and Language Therapy £34k, Mind Contract £60k. Over spend offset by forecast under spend of £72k on exceptional needs payments to Special and mainstream schools (13 additional individual assigned resource payments to 5 Comprehensive and 64 payments to 34 Primary Schools, additional 31 payments to 6 Special Schools) offset by additional income of £96k from Schools for 30 permanently excluded pupils.

### **Post 16 to 24 Provision**

Forecast over spend of £741k on post 16 SEN element 3 top up funding to Further Education Providers based on current placements for 221 students. (Average weekly cost of mainstream and local provision is £85 with average cost of independent specialist provision for high needs students at £664. Based on an overall average cost of £156 the current budget can only fund 155 placements).

### **SEN Complex Needs**

Forecast over spend of £75k on out of authority placements in independent non maintained special schools for pupils with statements of SEN based on 25 current placements and 5 potential places. (Based on the average weekly cost of £1,705 the current budget can only fund 18 placements)

### **SEN Extra District Placements**

An under spend of £98k has been projected and this is due to lower than expected top up funding for placements in other Local authority maintained schools £76k (based on 41 placements through the year) and additional income of £21k recouped from other Local authorities. (Based on the average weekly cost of £127 the current budget is sufficient to fund a total of 53 placements)

### **Hearing Impaired Service**

Over spend of £82k due to staffing costs of £38k. Temporary staff appointed to meet the needs of an increase in the number of pupils at the resource units at Bramley and Wickersley and insufficient funding for increments and pay awards. Over spend of £6k on specialist equipment, £3k interpretation costs, £4k training costs, additional transport costs £1k, Bramley Grange Premises contribution £15k and a £15k income shortfall.

(Forecast is based on 12 places at Bramley, 12 places at Wickersley and 269 pupils receiving support from the peripatetic Team).

### **Visually Impaired Service**

Over spend of £31k due to staffing costs of £27k due to insufficient funding for increments and pay awards, advertising £1k, specialist equipment £4k and supplies £2k offset by additional income of £3k. (Forecast is based on an active caseload of 233 pupils in the autumn of 2014-15 academic year and 26 new referrals in the first school term).

### **Learning Support and Autism Communication Team**

Forecast under spend of £10k due to staff slippage of £32k (appointments to vacant posts), offset by £4k over spend on training costs and advertising of vacant posts, transport £1k and shortfall of income target £17k.

**Portage Service**

Forecast over spend of £19k due to £14k staffing costs as a result of insufficient funding for increments and pay awards and premises costs £5k.

**EOTAS Transport**

Forecast over spend of £8k as a result of over spend on bus passes £14k offset by under spend of £6k on taxi provision.

**Home Tuition Service**

Forecast over spend of £33k due to additional tutor hours based on 14 current students accessing the service and 7 referrals. (Historic budget used to fund an average of 11 students).

**Early Years Block (£508k under spend)**

**Private, Voluntary and Independent Nursery Funding for 3 & 4 Year Olds**

Forecast under spend of £62k based on anticipated take up of places. However the grant is likely to be clawed back in 2015/16 due to an anticipated reduction in places at the next census.

**Early Education Funding for 2 Year Olds**

Forecast under spend of £446k due to lack of take up of places in September term. 2 Year old numbers are significantly lower than expected in the original budget forecast.

**9 Finance**

The financial issues are discussed in section 8 above and included in Appendix 1.

**10 Risks and Uncertainties**

Principal risks and uncertainties relate to the 'needs led' nature of budgets in relation to Special Educational Needs pupils.

**11 Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

**12 Background Papers and Consultation**

This report has been discussed with the Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Service, the Interim Director of Schools and Lifelong Learning and the Strategic Director of Finance.

**Contact Name:** Andrea Baldwin – Principal Finance Officer (Children and Young People's Services), *Financial Services ext: 22012, email [andrea.baldwin@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:andrea.baldwin@rotherham.gov.uk)*

APPENDIX 1

Total Schools Budget Monitoring 2014/15 as at 31st January 2015

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Description	Original Budget Allocation	Academy Recoupment	Revision to Initial Estimate	Budget Virements	Estimated C/Fwd Balances from 2013/14 inc in original Budget	Add Actual C/Fwd Balances from 2013/14	Total Adjustments	Revised Budget Allocation 2014/15	Actual Spend 1st April to 31st January	Projected Outturn Position	Current Projected Year End Variance (over spend +/under spend - )
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Delegated Schools Budgets</b>	123,287	-19,257		1,154			-18,103	105,184	87,653	105,184	0
<b>School Rates</b>	2,182	0		-76	-47	462	339	2,521	1,773	1,773	-748
<b>RSIP</b>	768			-445		402	-43	725	722	725	0
<b>Centrally Managed Services for Schools</b>											
Behaviour Support (Eotas)	170						0	170	126	148	-22
Children in Public Care	152						0	152	115	126	-26
Education Welfare Central Attendance Team	54						0	54	45	54	0
Operational Safeguarding - CYPS Standards and Development	43						0	43	36	43	0
Sexual Exploitation Team	45						0	45	38	45	0
Free School Meals Assessment	36						0	36	30	30	-6
School Effectiveness Service	1,254			-127			-127	1,127	912	1,126	-2
Training for Children with Medical Needs	46						0	46	38	43	-3
Moving and Handling	46						0	46	38	43	-2
Schools Contingency: Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty	100			-50			-50	50	0	50	0
Schools Contingency: Redundancy	157			-74			-74	83	112	140	57
Schools Contingency: Pupil Growth Fund	400			-382			-382	18	40	40	22
Schools Contingency: CLA Licences	144		-120				-120	24	0	0	-24
SEN Transport to Extra District Schools	101						0	101	84	101	0
Trade Union Activities	56						0	56	46	50	-6
Young People's Service	28						0	28	23	28	0
City Learning Zones	163						0	163	136	163	0
<b>TOTAL SCHOOLS BLOCK</b>	<b>129,231</b>	<b>-19,257</b>	<b>-120</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-47</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>-18,561</b>	<b>110,670</b>	<b>91,967</b>	<b>109,911</b>	<b>-759</b>
Special Schools Delegated Budget	5,851			4,483			4,483	10,334	8,611	10,334	0
Special Educational Needs (Top up funding for Special Schools and independent non maintained Special School placements)	5,473		-6	-4,347			-4,353	1,120	1,841	1,983	863
Primary Delegated - Exceptional Needs Top up Funding and Specialist Resource Units	1,328			-177			-177	1,151	959	1,151	0
Secondary Delegated - Exceptional Needs Top Up Funding and Specialist Resource Unit	415			-1			-1	414	345	414	0
Post 16-24 Provision	920						0	920	1,388	1,661	741
Special Educational Complex Needs - Statemented Placements - Out of Authority - Independent and non maintained Schools	745		264	-140	1,632	-888	868	1,614	1,724	1,688	75
SEN Extra District Placements	350						0	350	133	252	-98
SEN Assessment Team	51						0	51	48	53	2
Commissioning Team (SEND Placements)	34						0	34	28	34	0
Early Years ASD Support	92						0	92	83	88	-4
Hearing Impaired Service	550		-55				-55	495	542	577	82
Visual Impaired Service	413						0	413	399	444	31
Learning Support Service and Autism Communication Team (Inc READ Service)	570			8		25	33	602	514	593	-10
Portage	201						0	201	196	220	19
Pupil Referral Units - Delegated Budget	1,981			42			42	2,023	1,686	2,023	0
Educated Other than at School - Transport	40						0	40	49	48	8
Home Tuition Service	73						0	73	92	106	33
Children and Families Disability	28			133			133	161	112	161	0
<b>TOTAL HIGH NEEDS BLOCK</b>	<b>19,114</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,632</b>	<b>-863</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>20,086</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>21,829</b>	<b>1,743</b>
Nursery Delegated Budget	1,729		0	-15			-15	1,714	1,428	1,714	0
Primary Delegated Budget	4,628		0	-1,143			-1,143	3,485	2,904	3,485	0
Private, Voluntary and Independent Nursery Education (3 & 4 Year Olds Funding)	2,883		453	-13			440	3,323	3,188	3,261	-62
2 Year Old Funding	3,832		0				0	3,832	3,038	3,386	-446
Early Years Academy Payments and Adjustments	1		0	1,171			1,171	1,172	1,053	1,172	0
<b>TOTAL EARLY YEARS BLOCK</b>	<b>13,073</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>13,526</b>	<b>11,612</b>	<b>13,018</b>	<b>-508</b>
<b>TOTAL DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT</b>	<b>161,418</b>	<b>-19,257</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,585</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-17,136</b>	<b>144,282</b>	<b>122,328</b>	<b>144,758</b>	<b>476</b>
<b>EFA Post 16 Special Education</b>	<b>644</b>		<b>161</b>				<b>161</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET</b>	<b>162,062</b>	<b>-19,257</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,585</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-16,975</b>	<b>145,087</b>	<b>122,999</b>	<b>145,564</b>	<b>476</b>

**Rotherham Schools' Forum****Finance Sub Committee****Friday February 13 2015****High Needs Update****Membership of the High Needs Sub Group.**

Anne Lindley from Wales High School has agreed to represent the voice of secondary schools. It has been suggested that PRUs should be involved and Lorraine Lichfield from RMBC has agreed to join the group and Paul Bloor has also been invited to join.

**SEND Place Planning**

At the Forum meeting on January 19th, the forum discussed a paper that has been produced by John Coleman (with some help from Dean Fenton). This draft paper seeks to identify the number of specialist places needed in Rotherham - that is, places in special schools (of all types) and what we are describing as specialist units which are attached to mainstream schools. This shows a total of 707 places. The paper also includes data that the DfE has produced which allows us to compare Rotherham's provision with other local authorities. This paper is being updated to include post 16 provision in FE colleges.

A similar paper has also been produced to describe the number of planned places in PRUs and alternative provision.

**High Needs Budget 2015/16**

Meetings have been held with finance colleagues about how best to develop the high needs budget for 2015/16 and how this is presented to the Schools' Forum. It is suggested that the information needs to be more transparent and show how individual institution and service budgets come together to create the high needs block. Work is underway to develop this, using the attached spreadsheet as the base. This has two pages.

The first page - the standard finance monitoring sheet - should list high needs budgets and spending as follows :

- High Needs summary as part of the DSG (as is, but would it be helpful to show what percentage the High Needs Block is of the DSG?).
- Specialist Places in special schools, specialist units in mainstream schools, (listed by institution).
- Specialist places in non maintained special schools and independent specialist colleges (each aggregated). These all need to be shown as funding for places and then expected actual numbers, shown by bands.

- Top up funding shown by primary, secondary and FE colleges. We need to take care not to be able to identify individual learners in how we present the information, and will aggregate these institutions.
- Funding for PRUs : this should follow the same model as for specialist places, i.e. place funding and top up funding by institution.
- Other alternative provision including home tuition, showing the expected numbers of learners and funding.
- Other complex needs services : list each service with expected numbers.
- 

The second page aims to provide the detailed calculations on how the information on the front page is created. This shows the number of specialist places in each institution and calculates both the place top up funding. Place funding is easy - £10,000 per head for 2015/16, but showing the top up funding is more complex. Top up funding is allocated in line with the specific bands which apply to special schools and mainstream schools. The information about each school is already available through John Coleman's team and he has been asked to populate the spreadsheet from his database. The attached spreadsheet is a draft and a model to help the discussion. The cells for Hilltop have been completed just to show how the data works : these are **not** real figures. It may be that second page is too complicated (for example, showing pre and post 16 learners in schools) and it may need some simplification.

The development of a separate sheet with the detail of PRUs is underway.

Updated versions of this information will be provided at the meeting on Friday 13<sup>th</sup>.

Donald Rae



2014-15 HIGH NEEDS BUDGET		Original Budget	Revised Budget	Forecast outturn	Projected Variance (October)
Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) before adjustments		20,125,593	20,125,593		
High Needs Place Review Adjustment		263,982	417,982		
Funding of High Needs places		-1,062,414	-1,222,414		
<b>FINAL DSG FUNDING BEFORE RECOUPMENT</b>		<b>19,327,161</b>	<b>19,321,161</b>		
Education Funding Agency Grant (EFA)		644,667	804,673		
Carry Forward deficit from 2013/14		-1,632,000	-1,347,832		
Transfers from Schools Block and Early Years		1,418,472	2,167,838		
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED FUNDING AVAILABLE 2014/15</b>		<b>19,758,300</b>	<b>20,945,840</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL BUDGETS</b>					
	Places Filled % Fill Rate Place Funding Top Up Funding Average Top Up				
funding) Hilltop 2-16 95 95 100% £ 950,000 £ 512,115 £ 5,391 Hilltop 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Kelford 2-16 100 100 100% £ 1,000,000 £ - #DIV/0! Kelford 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Abbey 2-16 105 87 83% £ 1,050,000 £ - #DIV/0! Abbey 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Milton 2-16 100 90 90% £ 1,000,000 £ - #DIV/0! Milton 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Willow 2-16 100 100 100% £ 1,000,000 £ - #DIV/0! Willows 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Newman 2-16 90 90 100% £ 900,000 £ - #DIV/0! Newman 16+ - - - £ - £ - #DIV/0! Newman Unit 30 11 37% £ 300,000 £ - #DIV/0! <b>Total Special Schools 2-16 620 573 92.4% £ 6,200,000 £ 5,362,179 £ 9,358</b> <b>Total Special Schools 16+</b> <b>Total Special Schools</b>					
		11,240,000	11,562,179	11,521,883	-40,296
<b>Primary School SEND Units</b>					
Hillcrest 20		£ 200,000			
Kinhurst 10		£ 100,000			
Thorogate 15		£ 150,000			
Flanderwell 11		£ 110,000			
<b>Total Primary School SEND Units 56</b>		<b>£ 560,000</b>	<b>£ 60,000</b>	<b>£ 1,071</b>	<b>620,000</b>
<b>Secondary SEND Units</b>					
Swinton 20		£ 200,000	£ 87,000	£ 4,350	287,000
Wickersley 11		£ 110,000			287,000
<b>Total Secondary SEND Units 31</b>		<b>310,000</b>			
<b>Grand Total SEND Specialist Places 707</b>		<b>£ 7,070,000</b>			
<b>Mainstream Schools SEND Top Up Funding</b>					
Primary ?			708,000	#VALUE!	708,000
Secondary ?			128,000	#VALUE!	506,120
<b>Total Mainstream Schools SEND Top Up Funding -</b>	<b>#VALUE!</b>		<b>836,000</b>	<b>#VALUE!</b>	<b>119,399</b>
		12,983,000	13,094,698	13,054,402	-40,296
<b>SPECIALIST RESOURCE PROVISION</b>					
Rotherham Enhanced Action for Dyslexia provision (READ)		80,000	80,000	80,000	0
		80,000	80,000	80,000	0
<b>ALTERNATIVE PROVISION</b>					
St Mary's		1,535,500	1,563,208	1,563,208	0
Rowan Centre		445,500	460,100	460,100	0
Home Tuition		72,890	72,890	95,853	22,963
Education Other than at School - Transport		40,000	40,000	40,000	0
		2,093,890	2,136,198	2,159,161	22,963
<b>COMPLEX NEEDS SUPPORT SERVICES</b>					
Specialist Resource)		550,000	550,000	608,865	58,865
Visual Impaired Service		413,000	413,000	447,643	34,643
The Autism Communication Service		167,450	167,450	167,450	0
The Learning Support Service		322,095	347,292	336,584	-10,708
Early Years ASD Support		92,000	92,000	88,551	-3,449
Disability Team		28,000	168,000	168,000	0
Portage Service		201,000	201,000	218,916	17,916
		1,773,545	1,938,742	2,036,009	97,267
<b>Schools</b>	<b>Places Filled % Fill Rate Place Funding Top Up Funding Average Top Up</b>	745,280	1,613,617	1,907,371	293,754
<b>Independent/Non Maintained Special Schools (NMSS)</b>	<b>Places Filled % Fill Rate Place Funding Top Up Funding Average Top Up</b>	728,000	728,000	1,618,216	890,216
<b>SEN Equipment/S&amp;L Therapy and support packages</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>290,672</b>	<b>290,672</b>
<b>Post 16-24 SEN Provision</b>	<b>Places Filled % Fill Rate Place Funding Top Up Funding Average Top Up</b>	920,000	920,000	1,405,356	485,356
<b>Rotherham Children attending other LA maintained Special and Mainstream Schools</b>		<b>350,000</b>	<b>350,000</b>	<b>258,042</b>	<b>-91,958</b>
<b>School Organisation and Assessment Team</b>		<b>51,000</b>	<b>51,000</b>	<b>52,022</b>	<b>1,022</b>
<b>Commissioning Team - SEND Commissioning posts</b>		<b>33,585</b>	<b>33,585</b>	<b>33,585</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL ALLOCATED INCLUDING ACADEMIES</b>		<b>19,758,300</b>	<b>20,945,840</b>	<b>22,894,836</b>	<b>1,948,996</b>

Specialist Places	Places	Filled	% Fill Rate	Place Funding	Top Up Funding										Total Top Up	Average T/U
					Band A		Band B		Band C		Band D					
Special School (Including post 16 SEN Funding/top up funding)				£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£		
Hilltop 2-16	95	95	100%	£ 10,000	10	£ 9,140	10	£ 27,430	40	£ 219,520	35	£ 256,025	95	£ 512,115	£	5,391
Hilltop 16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Kelford 2-16	100	100	100%	£ 1,000,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Kelford 16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Abbey 2-16	105	87	83%	£ 870,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Abbey 16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Milton 2-16	100	90	90%	£ 900,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Milton16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Willow 2-16	100	100	100%	£ 1,000,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Willows 16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Newman 2-16	90	90	100%	£ 900,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Newman 16+				£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Newman Unit	30	11	37%	£ 110,000	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
<b>Total Special Schools</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	<b>£ 5,730,000</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£ 9,140</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£ 27,430</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>£ 219,520</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>£ 256,025</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>£ 512,115</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>5,391</b>
<b>Total Special Schools 16+</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>£ -</b>		<b>#DIV/0!</b>
<b>Total Special Schools</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	<b>£ 5,730,000</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£ 9,140</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£ 27,430</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>£ 219,520</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>£ 256,025</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>£ 512,115</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>5,391</b>

  

Primary School SEND Units	Places	Filled	% Fill Rate	Place Funding	Top Up Funding										Total T/U	Average T/U
					Band A		Band B		Band C		Band D					
				£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£		
Hillcrest	20	20	100%	£ 10,000	5	£ 4,570	5	£ 13,715	5	£ 27,440	5	£ 36,575	20	£ 82,300	£	4,115
Kinhurst	10	10	100%	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	0	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Thorogate	15	15	100%	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	0	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
Flanderwell	11	11	100%	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	-	£ -	0	£ -	-	£ -		#DIV/0!
<b>Total Primary School SEND Units</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>£ 10,000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>£ 4,570</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>£ 13,715</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>£ 27,440</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>£ 36,575</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>£ 82,300</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>4,115</b>

  

Secondary SEND Units	Places	Filled	% Fill Rate	Place Funding	Top Up Funding										Total T/U	Average T/U
					Band A		Band B		Band C		Band D					
				£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£		
Swinton	20	20	100%	£ -	5	£ 4,570	6	£ 16,458	4	£ 21,952	5	£ 36,575	20	£ 79,555.00	£	3,978
Wickersley	11	11	100%	£ -	3	£ 2,742	4	£ 10,972	2	£ 10,976	2	£ 14,630	11	£ 39,320.00	£	3,575
<b>Total Secondary SEND Units</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>£ 7,312</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£ 27,430</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>£ 32,928</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>£ 51,205</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>£ 118,875</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>3,835</b>