



GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 16 February 2023 at 2.00pm via Microsoft Teams

From the Chief Executive, Sheena Ramsey

Item	Business
1	Apologies
2	Minutes (Pages 3 - 8) The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 12 January 2023
3	Mainstream School Funding (Pages 9 - 12) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
4	Early Years Single Funding Formula Consultation (Pages 13 - 22) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
5	Early Years Single Funding Formula (Pages 23 - 26) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
6	Special Schools Funding Formula 2023/24 (Pages 27 - 30) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
7	Any Other Business To discuss proposed meeting dates for 2023/24; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 14 September 2023• 9 November 2023• 14 December 2023• 11 January 2024• 15 February 2024• 14 March 2024• 16 May 2024• 4 July 2024
8	Date and Time of Next Meeting Thursday 16 March 2023 at 2.00pm

Contact: Rosalyn Patterson - email: rosalynpatterson@gateshead.gov.uk,
Tel: 0191 433 2088, Date: Thursday, 9 February 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 12 January 2023

PRESENT:	Peter Largue (Chair)	Trade Union Representative
	Sarah Diggle	Secondary Maintained Governors
	Jacqui Ridley	Primary Governors
	Andrew Fowler	Secondary Academies
	Brendan Robson	Secondary Faith Academies
	Alison Hall	Primary Maintained Schools
	Paul Harris	Primary Maintained Schools
	Denise Kilner	Nursery Sector Representative
	Julie Goodfellow	Primary Academy Headteachers
	Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
	Mustafaa Malik	Primary Headteachers
	Ethel Mills	PVI Sector Representative
	Michelle Richards	Special School Headteachers
	Domenic Volpe	Maintained Secondary Headteachers
Christina Jones	Pupil Referral Unit	
IN ATTENDANCE:	Carole Smith	Gateshead Council
	Cllr Gary Haley	Gateshead Council
	Suzanne Dunn	Gateshead Council
	Terence Appleby	Gateshead Council
	Julie McDowell	Gateshead Council
	Naomi Mellor	Gateshead Council
	Rachel Pizzey	Gateshead Council
	Barry Grenfell	Gateshead Council

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Sheila Gallagher.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

3 ETHNIC MINORITY AND TRAVELLER ACHIEVEMENT SERVICE DE-DELEGATION

The Forum received a report on the work delivered by EMTAS and was asked to consider de-delegation for the financial year 2023-24.

The Forum was advised of the current staffing model of the team and the key areas

of work going forward. It was noted that de-delegation levels would not change from previous years.

It was questioned whether the caseload was expected to be higher than the current year. It was noted that the service would usually anticipate more referrals than had been received this year and therefore further communication work would be required. It was acknowledged that there was some confusion amongst schools between the role of officers funded by the official Home Office programmes for asylum seekers and the refugee and EMTAS role. It was noted that this would need greater clarity. It was also identified that some of the cases are the team working with groups of children so the figure may not be a true reflection of the actual number of children being worked with.

The point was made that it is not always the teacher that is the expert in some cases. Therefore would there be more value in employing other professionals on the team rather than another teacher. It was acknowledged that alternative models for the team can be looked at taking into consideration feedback from service users. The Forum was asked to contact Julie McDowell on this issue so further discussions could be held outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the work undertaken by EMTAS to support the educational achievement of all EM and GRT pupils in Gateshead schools and settings and approved the de-delegation of funding for EMTAS at the rates of £3 for every maintained mainstream pupil and £250 for each primary maintained mainstream EAL pupil.

4 PRIMARY FAIR ACCESS EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST DE-DELEGATION

The Forum received a report requesting funding be de-delegated from maintained primary schools to fund the post of the Fair Access Panel (FAP) Education Psychologist (EP).

During the academic year 2021-22, there were 35 active cases. As all primary schools have contributed funding but not all may access individual referral time, a training package is available online. This year's training package is now live and it is hoped that this will allow primary schools to be better able to meet the needs of all children.

RESOLVED - That Schools Forum approved the de-delegation of funds for the Primary Fair Access Educational Psychologist.

5 GROWTH FUNDING APPLICATION

The Forum received a Growth Fund application from Thorp Academy following an increase of 140 pupils in one year.

It was acknowledged that when the procedure was developed this level of growth was not anticipated and a funding cap of £111,400 is stipulated within the criteria. It was therefore proposed that the cap be multiplied by three to provide additional

growth funding to Thorp Academy of £334,200.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the allocation of £334,200 of growth funding for the additional 140 children from October 2022 at Thorp Academy and that funding above the £39,614 held centrally growth fund be funded from DSG reserves.

6 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT SETTLEMENT

The Forum received a report confirming the 2023/24 DSG funding settlement.

The DfE issued the funding settlement on 19 December 2022, Gateshead will receive £185.980m, before recoupage and deductions. This is an increase of £11.501m from last financial year.

The Early Years Block will see a 16p per hour increase for 3 and 4 year olds, however 11p per hour increase is the result of mainstreaming the former teachers pay and pension grants (TPPG).

The Central Schools Block historic commitments element is reduced by 20%.

In terms of the Schools Block, all elements have increased except growth funding. There is an increase in funding due to the mainstreaming of the additional grant.

The High Needs Block has increased by £2.878m.

Increases in Pupil Premium was noted and it was confirmed that Service Children would receive £335 not £3335 as was written in the report.

Since the report was written, additional grant has been announced for mainstream schools of £5m, the allocation process has been published. A further £1m has been allocated to the HNB and some will be allocated to alternative provision and special schools. It was confirmed that not all information is known about these additions and further information will be made available once known.

The point was made that School Led Tuition funding only lasts until this academic year and schools will have to contribute 75% for the next academic year.

RESOLVED - That Schools Forum noted;

- The estimated Early Years Block
- The Central Schools Services Block
- The Schools Block
- The High Needs Block allocation
- The other grant information

7 MAINSTREAM SCHOOL FUNDING

The Forum received the proposed Authority Proforma Tool (APT) following modelling work to enable the calculation of mainstream schools' individual budgets for 2023/24.

A number of funding pressures were outlined, including; increases to KS3 and KS4 and a decrease in primary pupils, an increase in IDACI numbers and increases in EAL pupils. In addition, premises funding received is less than the calculated premises factors. The increase in the minimum per pupil funding for primary schools has led to £579,000 to primary schools but has allocated no funding to secondary schools. It was reported that XP continues to be a pressure as pupil numbers have to be adjusted within the APT to reflect that it is a new and growing school. It was also noted that the PUFs and SUFs are calculated using October 2021 census data so does not reflect the changes in data for October 2022. Another funding pressure is the transfer of £85,000 from the schools block to the central services schools block to support admission processes for all schools.

A number of different models were tried and it was proposed that model 5 be approved. This model is based on MFG at 0.5%, primary, KS3 and KS4 base rates reduced by 0.75%, without capping and scaling and using £537,000 of the £623,000 growth fund.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the factor values, MFG and growth fund in appendix 1 and noted the information in appendix 2 and 3 of the report.

8 FORMER EDUCATION SERVICES GRANT

The Forum received a report requesting approval to centrally retain the former retained duties element of the Education Services Grant which was mainstreamed into the DSG.

The DSG allocation received in December 2022 was based on 23,885 pupils and the retained duties element is calculated as £15 x 23,885 which equals £358,275.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the central retention of funding allocated for retained duties.

9 EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

The Forum received the consultation document on the proposed changes to the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF).

It was reported that to ensure Gateshead received at least a 1% increase, protection funding of 12p per hour has been allocated under the new EYNFF. DfE allowed an increase to 12% for the amount that can be allocated via supplements.

Further guidance has been requested from the DfE but this has not yet been received. Therefore it was proposed to still consult, however if further guidance is received this may need to be updated.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the proposed updates to Gateshead's EYSFF for consultation with all funded settings as per appendix 1 of the report, but may have to change the

formula and the consultation depending on the response from the DfE. The proposed consultation period is 13 to 27 January 2023 and the consultation outcomes will be brought back to Schools Forum for consideration in the February 2023 meeting of Schools Forum.

10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was requested that the use of DSG reserves be considered at a future face to face meeting. It was suggested that this would be looked at for June or July's meeting to give time to establish what the DSG reserves are.

11 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 16 February 2023 at 2.00pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: Mainstream Schools Funding

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring to Schools Forum the amended Authority Proforma Tool (APT) for approval following the submission of Gateshead's Schools funding factors and values to the Department for Education (DfE) for approval of mainstream schools' individual school budgets for 2023/24.

Background

2. This report builds on reports to Schools Forum in January 2023.
3. Following the submission of the APT to the DfE several queries were raised. Many of these queries required confirmations of data in the APT. However, the rates adjustment on the APT (the difference between 2022/23 funding and the actual amount of rates paid by schools) had been added to the funding allocation when the DfE include this in a different part of the APT reconciliation. The result of this action is that funding was overstated by £61,908.72.
4. To rectify this error without amending any approved formula factors the Growth Fund in the APT has been reduced from £86,901.83 to £23,993.11. The updated APT Proforma is in appendix 1.

Proposal

5. It is proposed that Schools Forum approves the updated APT Proforma and the reduction of the Growth Fund to £23,993.11 as shown in appendix 1.

Recommendations

6. That Schools Forum approves the reduction of the Growth Fund to £23,993.11 to balance the APT to the funding available for mainstream schools.

For the following reasons: -

- To enable Gateshead mainstream schools funding to be calculated for 2023/24
- To enable the APT to be approved by the DfE

CONTACT: Carole Smith Ext. 2747

Appendix 1

Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

LA Name:	Gateshead
LA Number:	390

Primary minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary (KS3 only) minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary (KS4 only) minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary minimum per pupil funding level
£4,405.00	£5,503.00	£6,033.00	£5,715.00

Disapplication number where alternative MPPF values are used

Pupil Led Factors

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Reception uplift	No	Pupil Units		0.00						
	Description	Amount per pupil	Pupil Units		Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)			
	Primary (Years R-6)	£3,369.00	14,428.00		£48,607,932	£95,842,895	35.88%	5.00%			
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£4,749.00	5,877.16		£27,910,633		20.60%	5.00%			
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£5,353.00	3,610.00		£19,324,330		14.26%	5.00%			
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	FSM	£480.00	£480.00	4,233.00	2,727.22	£3,340,905	£15,578,502	11.50%	23.00%	19.00%	
	FSM6	£705.00	£1,030.00	4,358.00	3,036.82	£6,200,311			23.00%	19.00%	
	IDACI Band F	£230.00	£335.00	1,621.86	1,079.09	£734,524			0.00%	0.00%	
	IDACI Band E	£280.00	£445.00	2,654.63	1,682.50	£1,492,007			0.00%	0.00%	
	IDACI Band D	£440.00	£620.00	1,214.57	800.18	£1,030,524			0.00%	0.00%	
	IDACI Band C	£480.00	£680.00	850.59	609.76	£822,923			0.00%	0.00%	
	IDACI Band B	£510.00	£730.00	912.06	579.41	£888,122			23.00%	19.00%	
IDACI Band A	£670.00	£930.00	867.86	524.43	£1,069,186	23.00%			19.00%		
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description	Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	EAL 3 Primary	£580.00		986.52		£572,181	£956,373	0.61%	0.00%		
EAL 3 Secondary		£1,565.00			162.81	£254,797			0.00%		
5) Mobility	Pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£945.00	£1,360.00	136.93	0.00	£129,395		0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	
6) Low prior attainment	Description	Weighting	Amount per pupil (primary or secondary respectively)	Percentage of eligible pupils	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	Primary low prior attainment		£1,155.00	28.22%	4,072.19	£4,703,379	£8,024,421	5.92%	100.00%		
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 7)	54.47%		21.25%							
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 8)	64.53%		20.46%							
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 9)	64.53%	£1,750.00	20.02%	1,897.74	£3,321,042					100.00%
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 10)	64.53%		20.39%							
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 11)	63.59%		17.70%							

Other Factors

Factor	Lump Sum per Primary School (£)	Lump Sum per Secondary School (£)	Lump Sum per Middle School (£)	Lump Sum per All-through School (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)		
7) Lump Sum	£128,000.00	£128,000.00			£9,728,000	7.18%	0.00%	0.00%	
8) Sparsity factor	£56,300.00	£81,900.00	£81,900.00	£81,900.00	£8,870	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	
Rows 45 to 48 are populated with the NFF methodology, please leave this as is if you wish to follow the NFF. As per the Operational Guidance, the distance thresholds can be increased or the year group size thresholds decreased and the distance threshold taper is optional. An alternative method of allocation to the NFF's average year group size taper can be chosen: the continuous taper (Tapered) or fixed sum (Fixed). Examples of each are provided in the Operational Guidance.									
Primary distance threshold (miles)	2.00	Primary pupil number average year group threshold	21.40	Apply primary distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity primary lump sum?	NFF		
Secondary distance threshold (miles)	3.00	Secondary pupil number average year group threshold	120.00	Apply secondary distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity secondary lump sum?	NFF		
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)	2.00	Middle school pupil number average year group threshold	69.20	Apply middle school distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity middle school lump sum?	NFF		
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)	2.00	All-through pupil number average year group threshold	62.50	Apply all-through distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity all-through lump sum?	NFF		
9) Fringe Payments					£0	0.00%			
10) Split Sites					£0	0.00%	0.00%		
11) Rates					£1,579,150	1.17%	0.00%		
12) PFI funding					£3,178,475	2.35%	0.00%		
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of ESFA)									
Circumstance	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)						
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY22-23	£0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%					
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools	£0	0.00%	0.00%						
Exceptional Circumstance3	£0	0.00%	0.00%						
Exceptional Circumstance4	£0	0.00%	0.00%						
Exceptional Circumstance5	£0	0.00%	0.00%						
Exceptional Circumstance6	£0	0.00%	0.00%						
Exceptional Circumstance7	£0	0.00%	0.00%						

Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding minimum per pupil funding level and MFG Funding Total)	£134,896,686	99.57%	
14) Additional funding to meet minimum per pupil funding level	£579,420	0.43%	0.00%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total)	£135,476,105	100.00%	

15) Minimum Funding Guarantee	0.50%	£314,328	
Where a value less than 0% or greater than 0.5% has been entered please provide the disapplication reference number authorising the value			
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)			
No			
Capping Factor (%)		Scaling Factor (%)	
Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied			
£0			
Total (£)	Proportion of Total funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling)	£314,328	0.23%	0.00%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula	£135,790,434	£15,247,319	
High Needs threshold (only fill in if, exceptionally, a high needs threshold different from £6,000 has been approved)			
£0.00			
Additional funding from the high needs budget			
£0.00			
Growth fund (if applicable)			
£23,993.11			
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)			
£0.00			
Other Adjustment to 22-23 Budget Shares			
£0			
Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding)	£135,814,427		
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement	70.75%		
% Pupil Led Funding	88.87%		
Primary: Secondary Ratio	1 :	1.28	

23-24 NFF NNDR allocation	£1,641,059	
Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding) after deduction of 23-24 NFF NNDR allocation	£134,173,368	

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: Early Years Single Funding Formula

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is update Schools Forum on the outcome of the Early Years Single Funding Formula Consultation that took place in January 2023.

Background

2. In January 2023 Schools Forum approved the consultation document to be sent out to all early years settings on the integration of the Teachers Pay and Pension Grant (TPPG) into Gateshead's Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF).
3. 30 responses were received, 16 from school and 14 from the private, voluntary, and independent (PVI) sector with the below results.

Consultation Questions	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q1. Do you accept the proposal to allocate 88% of the funding available for the EYSFF to the universal base rate?	17	12	1
Q2. Do you accept the proposal to keep the deprivation supplement at 5% of funding available?	27	2	1
Q3. Do you accept the proposal to keep the quality (qualification) supplement at 5% of available funding?	27	2	1
Q4. Do you accept the proposal to create a second quality supplement to distribute the former TPPG set at 2% of available funding?	16	13	1

4. There were several comments on individual questions and general comments that can be found in appendix 1.

Proposal

5. It is proposed to update Gateshead's EYSFF to:-
 - 88% of funding allocated to the universal base rate
 - 5% of funding for the deprivation supplement
 - 5% of funding for the quality supplement based on qualification level
 - 2% of funding for an additional quality supplement for nursery classes in mainstream schools on a flat hourly rate

Recommendations

6. That Schools Forum approves the proposed updates to Gateshead's EYSFF that will allocate the former TPPG to nursery classes in mainstream schools.

For the following reasons:

To enable Gateshead's EYSFF to be updated to allocate the former TPPG to mainstream nursery classes and to enable early years budgets to be calculated and disseminated to all settings.

CONTACT: Carole Smith Ext. 2747

Appendix 1

Q1. Do you accept the proposal to allocate 88% of the funding available for the EYSFF to the universal base rate?

Setting Comments

S9 The consultation paper is misleading and over-complicated.

S10 The increase for the PVI looks to be about 0.05p which is not sustainable or acceptable going forward.

S12 We need extra funding to support us to remain open.

S14 Consultation Paper is misleading

S16 Reducing the percentage allocation to 88% from the current 90% for the Universal base rate will make it impossible for us to afford to pay our staff and running costs. Rising rent, heating, electricity, water and resources costs as well as other consumables combined with the proposed increase in the minimum wage coming into force in April will make our setting unsustainable. The suggestion of a cut in the percentage for the Universal base rate is simply impossible to comprehend and will cripple PVI settings to an extent they will have no alternative but to close their doors.

We cannot take anymore reductions in funding and as I understand it the 2% reduction is to then to be reallocated to school nurseries under creating a second quality supplement to distribute the former TPPG, how are PVI settings to continue if our funding is reallocated to school nurse settings?

Q2. Do you accept the proposal to keep the deprivation supplement at 5% of funding available?

Setting Comments

S9 Deprivation needs to be supplemented

S14 Happy to supplement deprivation

S16 I do want to see deprived areas supported in every way necessary.

Q3. Do you accept the proposal to keep the quality (qualification) supplement at 5% of available funding?

Setting Comments

S9 Quality and Qualifications are very important in Early Years

S14 Happy to supplement quality and qualifications

S16 High quality staffing makes an enormous difference to the learning that children receive in a setting. Teachers who work in the PVI settings are paid far less than Teachers in School Nursery settings, although this is unfair, at least there is something to recognise that high quality education is rewarded. Any reduction in this may result in highly qualified and experienced staff leaving the sector at a time when recruitment into Early Years is struggling.

Q4. Do you accept the proposal to create a second quality supplement to distribute the former TPPG set at 2% of available funding?

Setting Comments

S2 This money is for ALL settings not just maintained and the formula should ensure it reflects this

S5 This will not benefit the PVI sector at all.

S9 PVI Nurseries have to pay wages and pensions. Our wages have increased by 38% since 2017 by enforced National Living Wage increases. But funding has NOT increased to cover this.

S10 This will not benefit the PVI sector at all.

S12 This money should be available for all not just maintained nursery classes

S14 PVI have wages to pay & pensions. We need to increase our wages to ensure they are in line with rises in living wage from April.

S15 Teachers pension contribution should not be supplemented/paid from the Early Years funding money. I always thought teachers salary would be covered by the government.

Early Years PVI settings also have staff pensions and wages to pay, yet this seems to be disregarded in preference of school based staff. The PVI settings do not have a dedicated union, however this does not mean we should be treated with such disregard in terms of the budget restraints we are barely surviving under, with all our rising bills and running costs.

S16 Sadly, I find myself questioning if this is a means of satisfying the Teacher's Unions at the expense of PVI settings, resulting in PVI settings unable to afford to run and driving many to close their doors.

I understand that Schools have stretched budgets, as do we, but to take from PVI's to prop up the schools nurseries will only result in PVI's closing. This seems to be a quick fix sweetener to stop schools taking strike action within days of this consultation results form closing date. Is this why this document has been pushed through just before the Christmas break and pushed out quickly to PVI's with a January deadline?

General Comments

Setting Comments

S1 During such difficult times, funding is key to ensuring quality provision for our youngest children. Thank you for ensuring that this is done fairly.

The document is very difficult to understand but it seems that money is being clawed back from PVI settings to give to maintained settings which is simply wrong. To quote your document

- S2 “If the formula is not changed and targeted at nursery classes most PVI settings funding would increase by £0.10 per hour,”
We desperately need this money to remain viable and feel strongly that we should not have it taken from us to give to nursery classes in schools where there is a far bigger budget to absorb it and where the staff are getting a fair wage, unlike the PVI sector where we can barely afford to pay minimum wage. The funding formula was supposed to remove discrepancies and these proposals appear to introduce them again which is unacceptable
- S3 Looking at the proposed allocation of funds for 2023/2024 it seems there is only a 1% increase over last year’s funding. However, this does not seem to be in line with the rising costs of living and the National Minimum Wage which has increased by 10%. We would appreciate if you could take this into consideration for the coming financial year by increasing the overall funding allocation for our setting.
- S4 Looking at the proposed allocation of funds for 2023/2024 it seems there is only a 1% increase over last year’s funding. However, this does not seem to be in line with the rising costs of living and the National Minimum Wage which has increased by 10%. We would appreciate if you could take this into consideration for the coming financial year by increasing the overall funding allocation for our setting.
- S5 Due to increase in cost of living, higher utility bill, food costs and the national minimum wage for PVI providers there should be a higher increase in the funding rates than 0.01p and 0.06p, or should be more in line with last year which was overall 0.16p for 3 & 4 Year olds and 0.21p for 2 year olds. As providers it is becoming unsustainable to provide care and education for funded children and we may be forced to cap our funded places that we offer. Many of our funded 2, 3 & 4 years come and are vulnerable, with some having additional and safeguarding needs which requires a higher demand on staff and administration. We offer full day funded childcare with flexible sessions which can be stretched all year round – this allows parents to go to work. Your proposal is very complicated to understand and as you have not finalised what you are giving us how can you expect us to agree it – your proposal is not realistic for PVI providers and yet again seems to be directed towards school nurseries.
- S6 I feel all of these are essential to maintain high quality provision in Gateshead.
- S7 No after sitting in the forum meeting last week, it would appear you have gone to every length to support this and make this fair for all Carole so thanks!

S8 Due to increase in cost of living, higher utility bill, food costs and the national minimum wage for PVI providers there should be a higher increase in the funding rates than 0.01p and 0.06p, or should be more in line with last year which was overall 0.16p for 3 & 4 Year olds and 0.21p for 2 year olds. As providers it is becoming unsustainable to provide care and education for funded children and we may be forced to cap our funded places that we offer. Many of our funded 2, 3 & 4 years come and are vulnerable, with some having additional and safeguarding needs which requires a higher demand on staff and administration. We offer full day funded childcare with flexible sessions which can be stretched all year round – this allows parents to go to work. Your proposal is very complicated to understand and as you have not finalised what you are giving us how can you expect us to agree it – your proposal is not realistic for PVI providers and yet again seems to be directed towards school nurseries.

S9 The consultation paper has been cut and pasted from the DFE document on funding. It is misleading and difficult to understand. There is a section in bold implying a figure of £5.00, which is very misleading. From calculations it appears that our current funding will increase by only 4pence per child. If our calculations are correct, this is not nearly enough to cover current increases in costs and it is insulting. We are obliged to increase the National Living wage paid to our staff by almost 10% in April 2023. Combined with the increased cost in heat and light, resources and food, this increase will have a huge impact on our running costs. Our staff deserve more than the living wage and could earn more working in a supermarket. They are highly trained and dedicated, but we cannot afford to pay them what they deserve. Our breakfast club and after-school club help to subsidise our income so we are currently nearly sustainable, but parents are cancelling places because they cannot afford to pay for wraparound care with the increasing cost of living. The Government funding for Nursery children is woefully inadequate to cover our costs and will not allow us to break even – we would run at a loss and be unsustainable without the wraparound income from older children. We are demoralised and disheartened at the lack of support and the lack of acknowledgement of our value to Early Years Children.

S10 Due to increase in cost of living, higher utility bill, food costs and the national minimum wage for PVI providers there should be a higher increase in the funding rates than 0.01p and 0.06p, or should be more in line with last year which was overall 0.16p for 3 & 4 Year olds and 0.21p for 2 year olds. As providers it is becoming unsustainable to provide care and education for funded children and we may be forced to cap our funded places that we offer. Many of our funded 2, 3 & 4 years come and are vulnerable, with some having additional and safeguarding needs which requires a higher demand on staff and administration. We offer full day funded childcare with flexible sessions which can be stretched all year round – this allows parents to go to work. Your proposal is very complicated to understand and as you have not finalised what you are giving us how can you expect us to agree it – your proposal is not realistic for PVI providers and yet again seems to be directed towards school nurseries.

S11 The consultation paper is cut and paste from the DfE document on funding. This is not easy to understand and very misleading. The section in bold which shows a figure of £5 is misleading. When we have tried working out the formula, it seems we will be getting a 4p increase on the current funding? If this is correct this is an insult. We have to increase staff wages from April as many are struggling on the little wages they are currently on, and the living wage will increase. This will have a massive impact on our setting along with the rising costs of utilities, resources, food, and the list goes on. We are struggling to keep our staff due to the poor wage rate. We also have staff looking to seek alternative work away from childcare (the hourly rate stacking shelves in a supermarket is more than we can offer). There is no incentive for well qualified staff to do this job anymore. Due to the after affects of lockdown we have many children needing additional support which also has a massive impact on our setting. We are on the brink of failing our families and children as we are not able to fully support and help them. The system is very much broken with very little support and funding. Our setting is a charity and therefore rely solely on funding to run, with such a poor increase of 1% this may not be viable for much longer. If this is the case Birtley will lose a community based outstanding provision with excellent links to local schools. We have 4 very experienced team members who have 45 years experience between us. Staff morale across early years is at an all time low due to low wages, excessive workload, and very poor financial support from the LA. Our amazing team have always been (and will continue to be despite the struggles) enthusiastic about their roles but the lack of job security is taking its toll.

S12 I feel the consultation document is confusing and hard to follow, we need more clarification which is easier to follow / understand, we desperately need extra money / funding as a setting to remain viable and sustainable with the increase in living wage, increase in bills, resources etc...
Funding should be equal and not taken from PVI sector to then be given to school nursery classes.
I feel due to lack of funding and rising cost of staff wages and bills, PVI sector will struggle to function, and many may be forced to close.

S13 Although we appreciate that this is the best possible solution/ option, it does not go anywhere near the real costs of meeting a nursery provision.

S14 The consultation paper is cut and paste from the DfE document on funding. This is not easy to understand and very misleading. The section in bold which shows a figure of £5 is misleading. When we have tried working out the formula, it seems we will be getting a 4p increase on the current funding? If this is correct this is an insult. We have to increase staff wages from April as many are struggling on the little wages they are currently on, and the living wage will increase. This will have a massive impact on our setting along with the rising costs of utilities, resources, food, and the list goes on. we have staff going on maternity leave and we are struggling to recruit due to the poor wage rate. WE have staff looking to seek alternative work away from childcare (the hourly rate stacking shelves in a supermarket is more than we can offer). There is just no incentive for well qualified staff to do this job anymore. We have a high cohort of SEND children this year which also has a massive impact on our setting. We are failing our families and children as we are not able to support and help them. The system is very broken with very little support and funding. These children need specialist support and provisions (not the little on offer from our LA). The cost impact on time, staffing and resources can not be sustained by our setting this breaks our hearts to see the failings to our families and we on the front line have to see this every day. We have breakfast and out of school facility in our setting which subsidises our pre-school but for how much longer? We may need to consider the future of our pre-school as we cannot allow the lack of funding to send us under. This will leave lots of 3 & 4 year olds without provision of Outstanding Quality. In all the years we have been doing this job which we "loved" we have never felt more demoralised with the uncertainty of the future of our setting. This has a massive impact on our lovely staff too.

S15 I understand that answering those questions may not affect the funding hourly rate. I am still rather confused about what it'd mean to choose "yes" whether it would affect our funding money. We are facing large increased costs from every directions, like everyone else. I won't be able to increase the nursery fees enough to cover all those increased costs. I know the funding won't go up by much from April 2023. If the funding has been increased then I wouldn't have to increase our nursery fees by as much. i don't even know how to tell parents about a £8 to £10 fee increase per day, I am concerned we'll start losing families because no one can afford to pay £60 to £62 a day for childcare If you have any further questions, I am happy to answer them.

First of all I am concerned about the rushed nature of this consultation document, it has been hastily put together and seems purposefully confusing to the readers. It could seem, that it is trying to confuse and also blindside the managers of PVI's. Numerous phone calls have been placed to even understand the nature of its contents.

I am concerned PVI's will not respond in the required time frame for this consultation as it seems very ambiguous and difficult to understand with a tight deadline to reply. Why is the only figure in bold £5.00? My answer is to simply and purposefully mislead the readers, this is not what is being proposed to the sector as the new hourly rate, not by a long shot.

S16

The proposed percentage reduction in the Universal base rate and reallocation of funding to school nursery settings together with the uncaring regard for our most needed sector is upsetting and cannot be taken. It seems an option for the government to find the money in order to satisfy the teachers who have threatened strike action.

Any reduction in percentage allocation funding will force some already cash scarce PVI's to close their doors. Under such tight budgets providing a good education, learning and development programme will prove untenable. Staff deserve better, management deserve better and most of all our youngest students deserve to have their formative years supported with a good level of funding, where the correct early intervention and support can result in a child progressing and reaching their potential when they move onto school.

We love our jobs but seeing the proposed changes in the funding formula is demoralising for both us and our staff, it also raises questions regarding our ability to continue providing Pre-School education for those within our care.

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

16 February 2023

TITLE OF REPORT: Early Years Funding 2023/24

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum the results of the Early Years Funding modelling for 2023/24, and is subject to the approval of the previous report on Gateshead's early years single funding formula (EYSFF).

Background

2. For 2023/24 there has been an increase in funding to the Local Authority (LA) of £0.06 per hour for 2-year-old and £0.16 per hour for 3 and 4-year-old funding. However £0.11 of the increase in funding for 3 and 4 year olds relates to the mainstreaming of the Teachers Pay and Pension Grant (TPPG) and therefore the real increase in funding is £0.05 per hour.
3. The rate for 2 year olds has increased from £5.57 an hour to £5.63, this rate is fully passported to providers.
4. The rate to the LA for 3 and 4 year-olds has increased from £4.84 to £5.00 per funded hour. The early years allocation received in December will be amended to take account of the January 2023 census and the funding will be updated in June 2023. At this time, it is thought that the funding allocation will decrease due to falling birth rates.
5. LA's are able to top slice the early years block by up to 5% for central services. The proposed top slice for 2023/24 is 5%.
6. Total estimated funding for the 3 and 4 year old Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) is

£11,520,499 and is for both the universal and extended hours.

£576,025 5% top slice

£376,709 Early Years Team costs

£199,316 Inclusion Fund
7. The inclusion fund will be allocated to settings on their weighted ACORN score in the summer term. Each year a small proportion of Inclusion Fund is retained to ensure any child who moves into the borough who has an EHCP with significant need can be supported. If this fund remains unused, we would like to reallocate the funding using specific criteria i.e. children who are already in a setting, who are still on the portage waiting list and who are known to Area SENCOs. The total amount remaining will be divided by the number of children in this category and the funding will be re allocated to ensure these children receive some support.

Funding to Providers

8. The basis for the 3 and 4 year old funding formula for 2023/24 has been updated following the mainstreaming of the TPPG to allocate this funding to mainstream nursery classes.
 - 88% of available funding allocated via the universal base rate
 - 5% of available funding allocated via deprivation supplement
 - 5% of available funding allocated via the quality supplement - qualification
 - 2% of available funding allocated via the additional quality supplement – mainstream nursery class
9. With the increase in funding there has been an increase in the universal base rate £0.0418 from £4.1382 to £4.18.
10. For 2022/23 the rates were: -
 - Deprivation Supplement £0.0061 –per deprivation weighted hour
 - Quality Supplement £0.5588 – per quality weighted hour
11. The new rates are: -
 - Deprivation Supplement £0.0065–per deprivation weighted hour
 - Quality Supplement (Qualification) £0.5997 – per quality weighted hour
 - Quality Supplement (TPPG) £0.2644 – per hour
12. The deprivation supplement may change slightly when the Acorn data is refreshed from the January 2023 census.
13. The Maintained nursery school supplementary grant indicative funding allocations has increased from £140,562 to £141,016 and includes the nursery school allocation of the mainstreamed TPPG.

Proposal

14. It is proposed that Schools Forum approves the new funding rates for the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) and the update to the methodology of the formula for the mainstreaming of the TPPG and notes that the increased funding rates for deprived two-year olds.
15. Schools Forum notes that the inclusion fund will be allocated to settings using their ACORN Score, with a small amount held centrally for children entering the borough throughout the year. If there is any funding remaining this will be allocated to settings that have children on the portage waiting list and are known to Area SENDCos.

Recommendations

16. It is recommended that Schools Forum approves the updated EYSFF factor values and note the two-year-old funding rate. Approves the allocation of unspent centrally held inclusion funding.

For the following reasons:

- To comply with the Early Years National Funding Formula Operational Guidance
- To comply with Schools and Early Years (England) Regulations
- To enable early years budgets to be set

Contact: Carole Smith Ext. 2747

This page is intentionally left blank

16 February 2023

TITLE OF REPORT: Special Schools Funding 2022/23

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring to Schools Forum the proposal to increase special school top up unit of funding by 3%, and the allocation of funding to special schools and the pupil referral unit (PRU) for the from April 2023 from the additional high needs block funding as per the updated conditions of grant.

Background

2. The outcome of the special schools top up review was implemented for 2019/20, and the review of the fixed cost element was implemented for 2020/21. There have been no changes to the main formula for 23/24.
3. For the special schools formula, the unit of funding drives the banded top ups, and by increasing or decreasing the unit of funding rather than the top up value themselves maintains the ratios between the bandings.
4. There are allocations within the high needs block (HNB) of the dedicated schools grant (DSG) for the former teachers pay and pension grant and for the increase in NI contributions. For the teachers pay and pension funding there is an amount of £660 for each special school child on roll at the October census, but there is no allocation for children in alternative provision. The allocation basis will remain the same as for 2022/23.
5. There is additional funding for increased costs as announced in the Autumn Statement.
6. The DfE have stipulated that -

“In the financial year 2023 to 2024, maintained special schools and pupil referral units (PRUs) special and alternative provision (AP) academies (including free schools), and maintained and academy hospital schools, will receive a separate allocation amounting to 3.4% of their total place and top-up funding income, similar to the mainstream schools additional grant. This will be paid directly by the local authority which maintains the school or (in the case of academies) previously maintained the school, or (in the case of special and AP free schools) in whose area the school is located. Local authorities are required, by a condition of grant attached to their additional high needs funding, to pass on to these schools a proportion of their additional high needs funding allocation.”

7. The DfE produced information to assist local authorities in making the 3.4% additional allocation to maintained AP schools (normally referred to as pupil referral units or PRUs), and AP academies (including AP free schools).

Proposal

8. It is proposed to increase the funding for special schools by uplifting the unit of funding by 3%. This will equate to an increase of between 1.6% and 2.3% in main funding via the formula excluding the additional elements for the former teachers pay and pension grants and the increase in NI contributions and the new additional grant for 2023/24. The on average 2% increase is above the mainstream minimum funding guarantee (MFG) of 0.5%
9. The additional funding allocation for Gateshead's AP academy has been provided by the DfE.
10. It is proposed that Gateshead special schools allocation is based on the Spring term payment calculation will be 3.4% of:-
 - Top ups paid for the financial year
 - Commissioned and additional places
 - Fixed cost funding

Recommendations

11. That Schools Forum approves:-

- The 3% increase in the special school unit of funding for special school top ups.
- The methodology for allocating the additional grant payment to special schools

That Schools Forum notes that the DfE have already provided the additional grant funding allocation for Gateshead's AP Academy.

For the following reasons: -

- To enable Special School and PRU budgets to be calculated and disseminated by the statutory deadline

Carole Smith Ext. 2747

Appendix 1

Primary Social Emotional Mental Health		
	2022/23	2023/24
Band 1	£12,378.15	£12,978.11
Band 2	£7,544.96	£7,999.92
Band 3	£934.58	£1,191.23
Band 4	-£2,371.04	£-2,213.56
Secondary Social Emotional Mental Health		
Band 1	£12,378.15	£12,978.11
Band 2	£5,989.94	£6,398.25
Band 3	£934.58	£1,191.23
Band 4	-£2,371.04	£-2,213.56
Autistic Spectrum Disorder		
Band 1	£12,378.15	£12,978.11
Band 2	£8,193.69	£8,668.11
Band 3	£4,240.20	£4,596.02
Band 4	-£15.95	£212.18
Cognition and Learning		
Band 1	£10,767.25	£11,318.88
Band 2	£8,193.69	£8,668.11
Band 3	£934.58	£1,191.23
Band 4	-£2,176.08	£-2012.75

This page is intentionally left blank