



GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 15 October 2015 at 10.00 am at the Dryden Centre

From the Chief Executive, Jane Robinson

Item Business

1. Apologies

2. Minutes (Pages 1 - 4)

The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 17 September 2015

3. Education Consultation Response (Pages 5 - 10)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

4. De-Delegation Options (Pages 11 - 14)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

5. Draft Authority Proforma Tool (Pages 15 - 20)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

6. Early Years Funding (Pages 21 - 22)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

7. Notional SEN Information (Pages 23 - 26)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

8. Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations Consultation 2015 (Pages 27 - 46)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

9. **DSG Outturn** (Pages 47 - 50)
Alan Foster, Corporate Resources
10. **Growth Fund Application** (Pages 51 - 52)
Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
11. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**
Thursday 10 December 2015 at 2.00pm

Contact: Rosalyn White - email: rosalynwhite@gateshead.gov.uk, Tel: 0191 433 2088,
Date: Thursday, 8 October 2015

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

16 July 2015

PRESENT: Ken Childs – Special School Governor
Steve Haigh – Secondary Academies
Chris Richardson – Maintained Secondary Heads
Allan Symons – Primary Governor
Ethel Mills – PVI Sector
Denise Henry – Nursery Sector
Matt Younger – Primary Heads
Jane Bryant – Special Heads
Christine Ingle – RC Sector
Peter Lague – Teacher Unions
Linda Alder – Secondary Academies
Steve Williamson – Behaviour Support Service

IN ATTENDANCE: Carole Smith – Corporate Resources
John Turvey – Corporate Resources
Neil Porteous – Corporate Services and Governance

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Clive Wisby, Councillor Malcolm Brain, Sarah Diggle, Mustafaa Malik, Julie Goodfellow and Elaine Pickering.

2. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

3. **RESEARCH ON FUNDING FOR YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SEN**

The forum received a report requesting it to note the outcome of research into funding for young people with special educational needs (SEN).

The research was undertaken by the Isos Partnership on behalf of the Department for Education (DfE). The Partnership was asked to advise on options for a Local Authority level funding formula through which the DfE would distribute funding through the high needs block within the dedicated schools grant (DSG). The Partnership was also asked to consider how setting level funding formula (for early years, schools and colleges) might need to be adjusted to take full account of SEN.

A summary of the research together with the partnership's 17 proposals were appended to the report.

Proposals 1, 3, 6, 10 and 11 could have a direct impact on all three blocks of the DSG and as such were outlined in the meeting.

RESOLVED - That the information be noted.

4. EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

A report was presented proposing an amendment to the Early Years Single Funding Formula for 2016/17, needed to make the administration of the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant more efficient.

The Forum was asked to consider proposals to:

- Convert the termly contribution to support costs into hourly rates,
- Make initial payments to PVI's based on estimates,
- Introduce an Amendments Procedure (for instances where estimates cause under or overpayments by more than 10%) and;
- Cease funding 2 year olds who start after headcount information has been submitted.

Concerns were raised about the funding cessation for 2 year olds who start after headcount information has been submitted, as it was commented that there would be a significant impact due to the 1:4 staffing ratio. It was agreed that Carole Smith liaise with Early Years colleagues to determine the likely impact and report the findings at the next meeting.

RESOLVED - i) That the proposals, as outlined in the report, be endorsed with the exception of the funding cessation for 2 year olds after headcount.

ii) That a decision on the cessation of funding for 2 year olds be delayed, until the forum has received and considered information relating to the potential impact of this change.

5. NOTIONAL SEN

The forum received a report detailing the findings of the review of Gateshead Notional SEN funding within mainstream schools.

It was noted that an initial review of school census information revealed some inconsistencies in reporting SEN provision. The forum also heard the difficulty in ascertaining other significant drivers to SEN other than low prior attainment or deprivation that are outside the funding

system, or if reporting inconsistencies exist across mainstream schools.

It was commented that the secondary sector is more consistent in regards to SEN reporting.

It was said that SEN identification varies and many schools identify SEN at entry, which could be the cause of inconsistencies. Therefore it was agreed that regional and national data be obtained and considered at a future meeting.

RESOLVED - That regional and national SEN data be obtained for consideration by Schools Forum.

6. MAINSTREAM SCHOOL CONSULTATION

The Forum was invited to comment on the Council's consultation document relating to education funding from April 2016.

RESOLVED - Schools Forum approved the consultation document.

7. COST OF CHILDCARE – CALL FOR EVIDENCE

Schools Forum received a report advising of the Local Authorities response to the DfE call for evidence on the cost of childcare.

The overall findings of Gateshead's call for evidence were that costs have increased, this is especially evident for direct employee costs, and funding has remained stagnant. All settings have also seen general inflationary pressures for goods and services which have impacted on costs.

The result of these costs pressures is that for Gateshead's maintained settings 90% subsidise their nursery provision from their mainstream budget, estimated at just over £1M and equating to underfunding of over 30%.

RESOLVED - That the information be noted.

8. SCHOOL BALANCE PERCENTAGES

At its meeting on 16 July, the Forum raised concerns that some maintained schools are not controlling their balances appropriately.

To address these concerns a report was presented with information on maintained schools' opening and closing balance for 2014/15, the total balance per school, the percentage balance and existing licences.

It was commented that the presence of additional grant funding in the balances gives the impression there is underspend. The forum was also reminded that many schools are saving as they are anticipating difficult financial challenges and some are saving for capital works.

It was noted that whilst each school will be able to explain how their balance is reached, the forum considered it appropriate to look at schools finances over a 3 year period along with their development plan. It was said that schools should be focussed on sustaining staffing levels.

Schools also need to be made aware of the licensing conditions impact of unspent monies.

RESOLVED - That the information be noted, pending any requests for further analysis.

9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 15 October 2015 at 10am.



15 October 2015

Item 3

TITLE OF REPORT: Education Consultation Outcome

Purpose of the Report

To present to Schools Forum the results of the 2016/17 Gateshead Education Funding Consultation, to note the responses and comments received and to approve the proposals made.

Consultation

The 2016/17 Gateshead Education Funding Consultation was sent to all schools and settings on the 18th September 2015, with all chairs of governors receiving a copy on 21st September 2015.

23 consultation responses were received, with an average "Yes" response of 76% an average "Don't know" response of 21% and an average "No" response of 3%.

A synopsis of the responses is attached at appendix 1 and appendix 2 shows the comments made against each question.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the responses and comments made on the Education Consultation for 2016/17, and that the funding proposals are accepted.

The proposals will be reflected in the various different funding formula's and used to prepare the Authority Proforma Tool which has to be uploaded to the DfE by 31st October.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum

- Notes the content of the report
- Accepts the proposals for
 - Mainstream School Formula
 - 2 year old funding
 - 3 & 4 year old Early Years Single Funding Formula

For the following reasons:

- To enable the draft Authority Proforma Tool to be uploaded to the DfE within the required timescale

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1 - Responses

Question	Responses				% Responses				
	Yes	Don't Know	No	Total	Yes	Don't Know	No	Total	
Q1	Do you accept the proposed change to KS3 AWPU rate?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q2	Do you accept the proposed change to the deprivation factors and funding values?	14	4	5	23	60.87%	17.39%	21.74%	100.00%
Q3	Do you accept the proposal not to change the LAC factor value?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q4	Do you accept the proposed change to the EAL factor?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q5	Do you accept the proposal not to change the Mobility factor?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q6	Do you accept the proposal not to change the primary and secondary prior attainment funding rates?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q7	Do you accept the proposed no change to the lump sum values?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q8	Do you agree with the proposal not to include a sparsity factor in Gateshead's formula	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q9	Do you accept the proposal to cap the gains of those schools that benefit financially from the new formula?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q10	Do you accept the proposed update to the calculation of the PFI funding factor?	13	9	1	23	56.52%	39.13%	4.35%	100.00%
Q11	Do you agree the proposal to top slice the mainstream schools block to maintain the growth fund at £100K, which will be administered by procedures agreed by Schools Forum, and used to help support those schools that are required to provide extra places to support basic educational needs within the authority?	16	5	2	23	69.57%	21.74%	8.70%	100.00%
Q12	Do you accept the proposal not to amend the notional SEN calculation for the October submission of the APT and to carry out further work to review the notional SEN calculation in the Autumn term with a view to amending the notional SEN calculation for the final submission of the APT in January 2016?	17	6		23	73.91%	26.09%		100.00%
Q13	Do you accept the proposal to change the termly support cost funding allocations into an hourly rate?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q14	Do you accept that estimates for 2 year old payments should be based on the actual number of children in the previous term?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q15	Do you accept that estimates for 3 and 4 year old payments should be based on actual number of children in the same term of the previous year?	17	4	2	23	73.91%	17.39%	8.70%	100.00%
Q16	Do you accept the there should be an Amendment Procedure to override the estimate calculation?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q17	Do you accept that the Amendment Procedure should only apply if the actual number of children are at least 10% above or below the number of children used for the estimate?	18	4	1	23	78.26%	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
Q18	Do you agree with the proposal not to change the payment mechanism of the Early Years Pupil Premium?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q19	Do you accept no changes to the hourly funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds?	18	4	1	23	78.26%	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
Average		331	91	15	437	75.74%	20.82%	3.43%	100.00%

Appendix 2 – Comments

Q1 Do you accept the proposed changes to KS3 AWPU rate?

Reluctantly as this is taking money away from the Primary sector which may have an impact on outcomes. This will then have a greater impact on the Secondary sector.

Q2 Do you accept the proposed change to the deprivation factors and funding values?

There are definite concerns over this. We are in an area of high social deprivation.

This appears to affect our school greatly. We agree deprivation should be a priority but how it is proposed to be calculated doesn't reflect the need we see in our families. A quarter of our total pre-MFG funding for deprivation for this year was for children in IDACI bands 1 & 2. As our proportion of total pre-MFG funding for deprivation was only 6.71%, this would significantly reduce the proportion of total pre-MFG funding deprivation. This does not reflect the reality of the families in our school.

This change seems to affect schools, such as ours, adversely with regards to addressing need.

It is essential that the weighting is towards the most deprived children/schools

This is going to significantly impact on us. Our % of pupil premium eligibility is relatively low but this does not reflect our families, many of which are low income families. The proposal to remove IDACI bands 1 and 2 will have significant impact for our school as this accounted for over £10,000 of our current year budget allocation. Looking specifically at the IDACI indicators (taking out FSM6), IDACI 1 and 2 account for 34% of our deprivation budget. The new proposals will be a great detriment to our school and does not reflect the reality of our catchment area and family backgrounds.

Q3 Do you accept the proposal not to change the LAC factor value?

We agree LAC should be a priority

It is agreed that this is a priority

Q4 Do you accept the proposed change to the EAL factor?

There is no change to EAL factor

It seems reasonable to increase the basis of funding considering the demands and the fact that more refugee children may arrive in the future.

It seems reasonable to increase the basis of funding from 1 to 3 years considering the demands placed upon these schools and we agree EAL is a priority.

It would be useful to know the range of EAL funding across the borough, the average for EAL funding across the borough or the proportion of total funding aimed at EAL.

Again agreed that this is a priority.

Q5 Do you accept the proposal not to change the Mobility factor?

It seems reasonable to fund a proportion of the budget based on mobility as these issues clearly place demand on schools so we agree this is a priority.

However as we don't have data about the range of mobility funding across the borough, the average for mobility funding across the borough or the proportion of total funding aimed at mobility, it is difficult for us to know whether £2,000 is a reasonable amount.

Q6 Do you accept the proposal not to change the primary and secondary prior attainment funding rates?

This needs to be considered.

We agree that prior attainment should be priority.

Prior attainment should be the priority.

Q7 Do you accept the proposed no change to the lump sum values?

We agree, this is a good mechanism to release funding to secondary schools.

Q8 Do you agree with the proposal not to include a sparsity factor in Gateshead's formula?

Makes sense if no schools meet the criteria.

We agree as no schools in Gateshead meet the criteria.

Does not seem to apply to Gateshead.

Q9 Do you accept the proposal to cap the gains of those schools that benefit financially from the new formula?

We agree. Protecting the MFG seems reasonable but capping % should be as high as possible balanced against the affordability of the funding envelope.

Q10 Do you accept the proposed update to the calculation of the PFI funding factor?

Very little knowledge of PFI funding and the difference to other schools.

It seems that this is an additional source of funding for PFI's – there seems no equivalent for non PFI schools such as ours.

This is an additional revenue stream for PFI schools to fund building services and grounds maintenance from the shared pot? Do non-PFIs (like ours) have a separate funding stream to fund grounds maintenance, building work and etc.

Q11 Do you agree the proposal to top slice the mainstream schools block to maintain the growth fund at £100K, which will be administered by procedures agreed by Schools Forum, and used to help support those schools that are required to provide extra places to support basic educational needs within the authority?

We agree, having a set of clear and transparent procedures to support those required to provide extra places seems reasonable.

Q12 Do you accept the proposal not to amend the notional SEN calculation for the October submission of the APT and to carry out further work to review the notional SEN calculation in the Autumn term with a view to amending the notional SEN calculation for the final submission of the APT in January 2016?

We agree. This makes sense.

This is a pragmatic decision, however if possible I would like this to be amended for this submission.

Agreed to review calculation in autumn term

Q13 Do you accept the proposal to change the termly support cost funding allocations into an hourly rate?

Is this just because there is a software change- the hourly rate is low enough so would be against any cuts.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q14 Do you accept that estimates for 2 year old payments should be based on the actual number of children in the previous term?

This could be problematic between the summer term and the following autumn term.

This does not affect us

No direct impact on our school

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q 15 Do you accept that estimates for 3 and 4 year old payments should be based on actual number of children in the same term of the previous year?

We think funding should be based on maximum capacity.

This could be problematic between the summer term and the following autumn term.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q16 Do you accept that there should be an Amendment Procedure to override the estimate calculation?

Yes – we find the amendment procedures used so far fair and clear

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q17 Do you accept that the Amendment Procedure should only apply if the actual number of children are at least 10% above or below the number of children used for the estimate?

Yes – we find the amendment procedure is fairly clear

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q18 Do you agree with the proposal not to change the payment mechanism of the Early Years Pupil Premium?

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q19 Do you accept no changes to the hourly funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds?

Agreed but does not directly affect us

2 year olds regardless of background often need a lot of support especially around social development and communication and language. The rate does not reflect the amount of resources (including staffing) that is needed.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Other comments

More comparative data across schools for each area of the budget would help schools to understand where we all are compared to similar schools.

Well done Carole!

Time given for consultation was not sufficient

Overall the increase in KS3 AWPU is welcomed

Having data about the range and average of total funding across the primary sector for each factor would have helped us get a sense of how our needs compare to those across the borough.

Item 4

TITLE OF REPORT: De – Delegation Options

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of the report is to bring to Schools Forum options for them to consider for de-delegation so that maintained phases can consult with their sector on the options for de-delegation.

The options provided in this paper are for the October submission of the Authority Proforma Tool, and therefore not the final proposals as a further paper for EMTAS, In School Support and Fair Access Funding.

Background

1. Revenue funding arrangements for schools have changed following the school funding review which started in 2013/14. It is now not permissible for LA's to hold budgets centrally for the provision of some services to schools. This previously centrally held funding has been delegated to schools on a per pupil basis.
2. However there are some areas that schools have the option for de-delegation.

These are:-

- a) Contingencies, (including support for schools in financial difficulties, new/closing/amalgamating schools, closing school deficits and growing schools)
 - b) Behaviour Support Services
 - c) Support for minority ethnic minority pupils or underachieving groups
 - b) Free School Meals (FSM) eligibility
 - c) Insurance
 - d) Library and museum services
 - e) Licences/subscriptions
 - f) Staff costs – supply cover (long term sickness, maternity, trade union and public duties)
3. For each of these areas, it is for the Schools Forum members in the relevant phase (primary or secondary) to decide whether that service should be retained centrally.
 4. The decision will apply to all maintained schools in that phase and will mean that the funding for these services was removed from the formula before school budgets are issued. There can be different decisions for each phase.
 5. Academies, special schools and nursery schools can buy back into these services if they wish too.

6. This report brings proposals for Staff Costs –Maternity Credits and Trade Union Facility time, and reminds Schools Forum of the all current areas of de-delegation.
7. The DfE have requested that all de-delegation be included in the funding proforma that must be completed and returned to them by 31st October 2015.

Maternity Credits

8. Under the current Maternity Credits scheme, schools can claim from the 7th to the 18th week for maternity or adoption leave at a specified daily rate depending on the staff role.

Trade Union Facility Time

9. The trade union facility time credits facilitate the recognised trade union reps undertaking the following duties on behalf of all schools and individual members as required:-
 - Attendance at LA meetings and briefings re policy decisions
 - Attending school based meetings to resolve staffing issues, facilitate return to work interviews, capability meetings and disciplinary meetings
10. Having a central Trade Union resource will benefit all schools as it will negate the need for additional training for staff in every school, ensure a consistent approach and bring economies of scale savings.

Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups - EMTAS

11. The Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) aims to enhance the quality of educational opportunity and support the educational achievement of all ethnic minority and Traveller pupils by offering a range of services to Gateshead schools.
12. It works in partnership with schools and other partners in providing a challenging and exciting learning environment which celebrates cultural diversity, promotes equal opportunities and raises the level of achievement of pupils from all ethnic minority groups including travellers.

Behaviour Support – In School Support

13. The In School Support Team are targeted at early intervention, and work principally with primary aged children in their school setting and offer 1:1 support alongside consultancy for primary heads. This work includes assessment of pupils' needs and training for staff where this is identified as a need.
14. The work of the ISS team is non statutory and since April 2013 TA Team has been subject to a buy back arrangement.
15. The buy-back was calculated on the basis of a 100% uptake by the primary schools plus additional support from the HNFB for the two teacher posts (to maintain consultancy and guidance for all primaries).

Primary Fair Access Process

16. Transitional support is required when placing a child in a new school. Moving a child from one school to another and/or a child moving into a school from out of borough or out of the country can present with challenges. As with secondary placements, short term transition support will be provided via the Education Support Service under the Fair Access process.
17. The model adopted is for all primary schools to give an agreed amount of funding to be held centrally by the Education Support Service but to be administrated by the Fair Access Panel. Criteria for the use of these funds could include: use of a translator, translation of documents, and a one off assessment by an EP etc.
18. To undertake these addtinal assessments an addition Education Pyscologist has been employed at the approximate cost of £65K including on costs.

Proposal

19. It is proposed that Schools Forum representatives from mainstream maintained schools consult with their colleagues to ascertain if maintained mainstream schools would like to retain the current areas of de-delegation.
20. In the interim it is proposed for the October submission of the APT, that the areas and levels of de-delegation for 2014/15 be replicated, as all areas and amounts for de-deligation can be amended before the final January submission.
21. Current areas of de-delegation are:-
 - a. Supply Cover
 - i. Maternity Credits £ 8.00 per pupil
 - ii. Trade Union Covyery £ 4.00 per pupil
 - b. EMTAS £14.78 per pupil (primary only)
 - c. In School Support £ 7.50 per pupil (primary only)
 - d. Fair Access £ 4.50 per pupil (primary only)
22. Further reports on the areas of de-delegation will be brought to Schools Forum for consideration.

Recommendations

23. That School Forum consults with their respective phases on the areas of de-deligation.
24. Consult with maintained colleagues for their views on the continuation of De-delegation, and note that further reports will be brought to Schools Forum for consideration.

For the following reason(s):

25. To enable Schools Forum representatives to liaise with mainstream maintained colleagues on de-delegation

This page is intentionally left blank



15 October 2015

Item 5

TITLE OF REPORT: Authority Proforma Tool

Purpose of the Report

To request Schools Forum to approve the Draft Authority Proforma Tool (APT) containing Gateshead's draft school funding formula prior to uploading to the DfE.

Background

This report builds on the previous two reports re the outcome of the Education Funding Consultation and the de-delegation report.

The APT has been completed on the basis of the outcome of the consultation and the proposals in the de-delegation report.

The data within the APT will change when we receive the updated data set and APT in December 2015, and it will be necessary to change some of the funding rates or the capping factor depending on the actual schools block funding which will be notified to all Local Authorities mid-December 2015.

There is other information within the APT that needs to be completed at this time, which includes the Notional Special Educational Needs calculation, any adjustment factors, (number of places in mainstream support bases, rates and PFI funding), comments on any adjustment, commentary on local factors, (e.g. how the PFI factor is calculated).

The DfE also request that any areas that maintained schools and Schools Forum may want to de-delegate be included at an indicative level within the APT, with a note stating that these have not been agreed at Schools Forum and are for indicative purposes only.

Proposal

That Schools Forum approves the draft APT for submission to the DfE, and notes that funding rates and data will change when the updated APT is issued and Dedicated Schools Grant allocation is issued in December. Any de-delegated areas agreed by Schools Forum will be updated in the new APT that will be submitted in January 2016.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum approves the draft APT

For the following reason(s):

- To enable the draft APT to be uploaded to the DfE
 - To adhere to DfE timelines and requirements
-

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

LA Name:	Gateshead
LA Number:	390

Pupil Led Factors

	Reception uplift	No	Pupil Units		0.00		Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
	Description	Amount per pupil	Pupil Units	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)			Notional SEN (%)	
1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Primary (Years R-6)	£2,905.00	14,316.00		£41,587,980		£76,358,870	40.40%	5.00%	
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£3,750.00	5,175.00		£19,406,250			18.85%	5.00%	
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£4,360.00	3,524.00		£15,364,640			14.93%	5.00%	
	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 (%)
2) Deprivation	FSM6 % Primary	£850.00		4,693.63		£3,989,588	£11,307,227	10.99%	23.00%	
	FSM6 % Secondary		£1,400.00		2,867.19	£4,014,070			19.00%	
	IDACI Band 1			1,445.26	873.68	£0			0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 2			1,619.88	982.53	£0			0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 3	£280.00	£350.00	2,465.82	1,415.17	£1,185,740			0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 4	£360.00	£450.00	1,215.38	604.76	£709,677			0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 5	£440.00	£550.00	696.80	388.63	£520,341			23.00%	19.00%
IDACI Band 6	£640.00	£800.00	838.25	439.16	£887,812	23.00%	19.00%			
	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 (%)
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	LAC X March 14	£1,500.00		193.78		£290,672		0.28%	0.00%	
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	EAL 3 Primary	£260.00		560.02		£145,604		0.16%	0.00%	
	EAL 3 Secondary		£260.00		66.23	£17,219			0.00%	0.00%

Description	Weighting	Amount per pupil	Percentage of eligible Y1-2 and Y3-6 NOR respectively	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
5) Mobility		£2,000.00		67.29	0.00	£134,577	£588,072	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%
6) Prior attainment										
	Low Attainment % new EFSP	75.00%	£320.00	40.18%	3,663.25	£1,172,240	£2,100,721	2.04%	100.00%	
	Low Attainment % old FSP 73			17.40%						
	Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English or Maths)		£550.00		1,688.15	£928,481			100.00%	

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	£115,000.00	£140,000.00			£8,965,000	8.71%	0.00%
8) Sparsity factor					£0	0.00%	0.00%
Please provide alternative distance and pupil number thresholds for the sparsity factor below. Please leave blank if you want to use the default thresholds. Also specify whether you want to use a tapered lump sum for one or both of the phases.							
Primary distance threshold (miles)		Primary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity primary lump sum?		Fixed	
Secondary distance threshold (miles)		Secondary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity secondary lump sum?		Fixed	
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)		Middle school pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity middle school lump sum?		Fixed	
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)		All-through pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity all-through lump sum?		Fixed	
9) Fringe Payments					£0	0.00%	
10) Split Sites					£0	0.00%	
11) Rates					£1,411,747	1.37%	
12) PFI funding					£2,196,993	2.13%	
13) Sixth Form					£0	0.00%	
14) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)							

Circumstance	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY15-16	£0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools	£0	0.00%		
Exceptional Circumstance3	£0	0.00%		
Exceptional Circumstance4	£0	0.00%		
Exceptional Circumstance5	£0	0.00%		
Exceptional Circumstance6	£0	0.00%		

Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total) (£)	£102,928,630	100.00%	£7,900,215	
--	---------------------	----------------	-------------------	--

15) Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG is set at -1.5%)				£373,260		
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)				Yes		
Capping Factor (%)	2.52%	Scaling Factor (%)	100.00%			
Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied				£0		
				Total (£)	Proportion of Total funding(%)	
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling)				£373,260	0.36%	
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)				£69,000.00		
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)				£0.00		
Total Funding For Schools Block Formula				£103,301,890		
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement				74.19%		
% Pupil Led Funding				87.78%		
Primary: Secondary Ratio				1 :	1.26	

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 6

TITLE OF REPORT: Early Years Funding

Purpose of the Report

This report builds on a report from Septembers Schools Forum on proposed amendments to the Early Years Single Funding Formula and 2 year old funding for 2016/17 needed to make the administration of the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant more efficient.

Background

Gateshead currently uses several elements of the Tribal Synergy information system across Care Wellbeing and Learning. The Tribal Synergy system was initially extended to manage the administration of two year old offer, but officers saw the potential to use the system to calculate payments which would remove the need for information to be transferred from the system into calculation spreadsheets.

Queries were raised on the proposal to move 2 year old funding on to the same basis as 3 & 4 year olds and only fund children at the setting on head count day. Schools Forum made the request to identify the possible impact of this proposal if it is implemented.

Data was collected for the summer term 2015. Under the current system providers with 2 year olds had up until the 1st July 2015 to submit their final summer term numbers, and this was the date used to determine at which setting a child was deemed to be attending.

As the date for final amendments is so late in the term no children left any settings after this date and no children started after this date, but 13 children left before 1st July 2015, and 9 settings were affected.

The table below shows the impact on the settings, if only children who were present on 1st July were funded.

Settings most affected by this potential change are the smaller settings as this possible reduction in funding represents a larger proportion of their funding.

Child		Date Left	Cost to setting	Total	Total Summer Funding	Potential % decrease
Child 1	Setting 1	15/06/2015	£509.25			
Child 2	Setting 1	01/05/2015	£363.75			
Child 3	Setting 1	29/04/2015	£145.50	£1,018.50	£46,870.40	2.17%
Child 4	Setting 2	15/05/2015	£291.00	£291.00	£10,330.50	2.82%
Child 5	Setting 3	15/05/2015	£291.00	£291.00	£32,955.75	0.88%
Child 6	Setting 4	03/06/2015	£436.50	£436.50	£6,722.10	6.49%
Child 7	Setting 5	05/06/2015	£436.50	£436.50	£23,875.34	1.83%
Child 8	Setting 6	28/04/2015	£106.70			
Child 9	Setting 6	19/06/2015	£582.00	£688.70	£21,121.75	3.26%
Child 10	Setting 7	22/05/2015	£303.12	£303.12	£4,486.10	6.76%
Child 11	Setting 8	08/05/2015	£218.25			
Child 12	Setting 8	17/06/2015	£218.25	£436.50	£45,711.25	0.95%
Child 13	Setting 9	22/05/2015	£363.75	£363.75	£9,224.70	3.94%

Proposals

As children leaving before 1st July would not be funded under the proposed arrangements, and this issue affects a small number of children, the decision was taken that the current funding arrangements to remain in place and settings will be funded for the weeks children attend the setting. As this does not represent a change to current funding arrangements settings do not need to be consulted.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Schools Forum notes the proposals to fund on a participation basis, and that this aspect of the current funding arrangements for 2 year olds will not change.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that settings receive funding on a participation basis for 2 year olds.
- Small settings are not disadvantaged.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Item 7

TITLE OF REPORT: Notional SEN in Mainstream Schools

Purpose of the Report

This report builds on a report from September and provides further data on Notional SEN.

Background

As part of the mainstream schools funding formula there is a notional SEN calculation that must be included as part of submission of both the October (draft) Authority Proforma Tool, (APT) and the final submission in January.

Some preliminary work on Gateshead's notional SEN calculation was undertaken over the summer, with Schools Forum requesting that further information be provided.

The notional SEN calculations for Gateshead's statistical neighbours have been collated and are in the attached appendices.

Appendix 1 shows the percentages of the various factors that the different LA's have used to calculate their schools notional SEN budgets, and the percentage of total Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that the notional SEN budget represents. For this calculation Gateshead is ranked 4 out of 11, and the percentage being lower than the average.

Appendix 2 shows the values of the various factors that different LA's have used to calculate their schools notional SEN budgets. The approximate notional SEN per pupil has also been calculated. For primary notional SEN amount per pupil Gateshead is ranked 8 out of 11, for secondary notional SEN amount Gateshead is ranked 7 out of 11 with both amounts being higher than average.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the report and considers if any further work should be undertaken on the calculation of the notional SEN, and the current calculation method be used for the October submission of the APT.

Recommendation

That Schools Forum notes the report and discusses if any further actions or work should be undertaken, and that the current calculation method is used for the October submission of the APT.

For the following reasons:

To consider if further work or actions should be taken on the review of notional SEN, and to enable the APT to be submitted before the October deadline.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

LA Identifier	876	841	384	390	392	840	394	355	393	805	370	
Local Authority	Halton	Darlington	Wakefield	Gateshead	North Tyneside	Durham	Sunderland	Salford	South Tyneside	Hartlepool	Barnsley	Average
AWPU Primary Notional Sen (%)	5.00%	0.00%	3.64%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%	7.00%	8.50%	2.00%	3.53%
Key stage 3 Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	2.62%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%	1.80%	0.00%	7.00%	8.50%	2.00%	3.36%
Key stage 4 Notional SEN (%)	5.00%	0.00%	2.52%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%	1.70%	0.00%	7.00%	8.50%	2.00%	3.34%
Primary FSM Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	35.00%	23.00%	15.00%	0.00%	100.00%	44.00%	5.00%	7.50%	20.00%	27.59%
Secondary FSM Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	35.00%	19.00%	15.00%	37.00%	100.00%	60.00%	5.00%	7.50%	20.00%	32.05%
IDACI Band 1 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	14.73%
IDACI Band 1 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	12.36%
IDACI Band 2 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	14.73%
IDACI Band 2 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	12.36%
IDACI Band 3 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	16.82%
IDACI Band 3 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	19.18%
IDACI Band 4 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	19.18%
IDACI Band 4 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	16.82%
IDACI Band 5 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	23.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	21.27%
IDACI Band 5 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	19.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	18.55%
IDACI Band 6 Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	23.00%	15.00%	71.00%	25.00%	21.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	21.27%
IDACI Band 6 Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	49.00%	0.00%	19.00%	15.00%	37.00%	25.00%	29.00%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%	18.55%
EDAC Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%
EAL Primary Notional SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.91%
EAL Secondary Notional SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.27%
Mobility Primary Notional SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
Mobility Secondary Notional SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
Prior Att Primary Notional SEN	5.00%	27.50%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.00%	83.86%
Prior Att Secondary Notional SEN	5.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.00%	90.45%
Lump Sum Notional Sen - Primary	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Lump Sum Notional Sen - Secondary	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Sparsity Notional SEN - Primary	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Sparsity Notional SEN - Secondary	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Split sites Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Rates Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
PFI Notional SEN	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Sixth form Notional SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Additional lump sum Notional SEN - Primary	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Additional lump sum Notional SEN - Secondary	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%
Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	5.00%	6.07%	7.57%	7.70%	7.77%	7.92%	8.18%	8.32%	8.79%	9.41%	11.90%	8.06%

Appendix 2

LA Identifier	384	390	392	394	355	393	805	370	841	840	876	
Local Authority	Wakefield	Gateshead	North Tyneside	Sunderland	Salford	South Tyneside	Hartlepool	Barnsley	Darlington	Durham	Halton	Average
AWPU Primary Notional Sen	£110.11	£145.25	£132.36	£77.65	£0.00	£189.64	£230.26	£52.85	£0.00	£0.00	£127.27	£96.85
Key stage 3 Notional SEN	£109.88	£180.50	£198.60	£77.70	£0.00	£286.85	£353.20	£64.12	£0.00	£0.00	£218.23	£135.37
Key stage 4 Notional SEN	£109.85	£218.00	£249.08	£77.41	£0.00	£325.35	£353.20	£74.18	£0.00	£0.00	£228.18	£148.66
Primary FSM Notional SEN	£65.90	£63.14	£24.25	£152.58	£62.50	£8.91	£45.41	£44.16	£116.87	£0.00	£14.94	£54.42
Secondary FSM Notional SEN	£63.82	£87.61	£35.75	£138.18	£53.48	£7.18	£64.40	£42.17	£142.05	£172.86	£28.35	£75.99
IDACI Band 1 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00
IDACI Band 1 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00
IDACI Band 2 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00
IDACI Band 2 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00
IDACI Band 3 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.04	£0.01	£0.01
IDACI Band 3 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.06	£0.02	£0.00	£0.01
IDACI Band 4 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.04	£0.02	£0.00	£0.01
IDACI Band 4 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.02	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00
IDACI Band 5 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.04	£0.02	£0.00	£0.01
IDACI Band 5 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.02	£0.01	£0.00	£0.01	£0.06	£0.02	£0.00	£0.01
IDACI Band 6 Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.01	£0.00	£0.01	£0.04	£0.04	£0.00	£0.01
IDACI Band 6 Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.01	£0.02	£0.02	£0.04	£0.01	£0.00	£0.02	£0.06	£0.02	£0.00	£0.02
LAC Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.37	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.52	£0.08
EAL Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
EAL Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.04	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Mobility Primary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.01	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Mobility Secondary Notional SEN	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.02	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Prior Att Primary Notional SEN	£124.01	£87.83	£99.72	£73.30	£210.66	£127.22	£126.59	£356.49	£47.11	£92.97	£9.83	£123.25
Prior Att Secondary Notional SEN	£232.11	£104.54	£132.66	£88.70	£212.71	£148.95	£69.12	£430.86	£6.46	£61.04	£12.13	£136.30
Lump Sum Notional Sen	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£21.41	£1.95
Approx Notional SEN Primary	£519.74	£694.74	£704.18	£458.92	£273.69	£938.40	£1,108.66	£592.02	£164.59	£93.44	£620.45	£560.80
Approx Notional SEN Secondary	£515.65	£590.68	£616.14	£382.04	£266.35	£768.72	£839.92	£611.38	£148.70	£233.97	£487.43	£496.45
Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	£14,986,082	£7,901,511	£8,489,737	£12,888,941	£11,062,522	£7,315,527	£5,645,676	£15,024,041	£3,413,818	£21,573,117	£3,918,592	£10,201,779
Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	7.57%	7.70%	7.77%	8.18%	8.32%	8.79%	9.41%	11.90%	6.07%	7.92%	5.00%	8.06%



REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

15 October 2015

TITLE OF REPORT: Schools and Early Years Schools Finance Regulations Consultation

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forums attention the current School and Early Years School Finance Regulations consultation and to ask Schools Forum if they would like to make a response in the name of Gateshead Schools Forum.

Background

The DfE usually update the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations annually. As part of this process the DfE release a consultation on the proposed changes. The regulations provide how local authorities set their education budgets and how they allocate funding to schools and providers of free early years provision in their area.

The summary of proposed changes is at appendix 1 and a copy of the LA's response is included as a starting point at appendix 2.

Schools and governing bodies are also able to submit their individual responses.

Proposal

That Schools Forum consider if they would like to make a response to the current Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations consultation, and that any response be debated during the meeting of the 15th October to ensure a response can be made to the DfE in time for the deadline of 13th November.

Recommendations

The Schools Forum considers responding to the current Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations consultation.

For the following reasons:-

To put forward their views on the proposed changes to the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

The follow changes are minor updates to the regulations.

1) Regulation 3: Amendments to the School Forums (England) Regulations

Regulation 8 of the School Forums (England) Regulations refers to the School and Early Years Finance Regulations 2013. Regulation 8 has been updated so that it refers to the 2015 School and Early Years Finance Regulations.

The Department is considering the ways in which the interaction between the School and Early Years Finance Regulations and the School Forums Regulations might be improved, without changing the underlying policy as reflected in the regulations.

2) Regulation 14: Transitional arrangements

The transitional provision in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 for separate levels of funding for Alternative Provision no longer applies. Since September 2015 the value of all such places has been £10,000.

Regulation 8: Determination of the individual schools budget for the funding period and limit on increase in central expenditure

Background

Regulation 8 (7) makes amendments to how local authorities calculate individual schools budgets, and the funding they can retain centrally.

Proposal and rationale

Any expenditure deducted by the local authority to support outstanding or good schools with falling pupil numbers where their capacity will be needed within three years, which is unspent can be carried forward to use on these funds.

Any expenditure incurred before the opening of new schools to fund the appointment of staff and to enable the purchase of any goods and services, which is unspent can be carried forward to use for this purpose.

The purpose of this change is to allow local authorities to carry forward any unspent falling rolls fund or new schools fund for the same purpose in the following year, in line with their ability to carry forward any unspent funding for growing pupil numbers and extra infant classes.

Regulation 16: Early Years provision

Background

Currently, local authorities can fund early years providers on a place- based (as opposed to participation-based) approach in certain circumstances. This allows local authorities to give early years providers a guaranteed level of funding when

needed. For 3 and 4 year olds, this is limited to SEN children and children in need.

When the 2 year old entitlement was introduced, the option of using place-based funding was extended to all eligible 2 year olds on a temporary basis to help local authorities grow the offer and allow them to offer providers a guaranteed income even if the places were not filled.

Proposal and rationale

Local authorities will no longer be able to fund all 2 year olds eligible for the early years entitlement using place-based funding. This is to be limited to SEN children and children in need.

The flexibility to allow place-based funding for all eligible 2 years olds was a temporary measure whilst local authorities developed their offer. The two year old programme is now embedded and from 2015-16, the Department has used participation-based funding. The circumstances for participation-based funding for 2 year olds are to be brought in line with those for 3 and 4 year olds. Regulation 16 (8) provides for this change.

Regulation 21: New schools, merged schools and closing schools

Background

Regulation 21 of the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 required local authorities to calculate the budget share of a new, amalgamated school by adding together the budget share of the discontinued schools which it replaced. In the following financial year, the amalgamated school was then entitled to 85% of the total lump sums the predecessor schools would have received. In the regulation, amalgamations of schools were defined only to include cases where two or more schools have closed and a new successor school has opened.

Proposal and rationale

A frequent way of amalgamating is where one school closes and the other extends its age range. Currently, local authorities have to submit a written request to treat these as amalgamated schools. Additionally, this type of amalgamation is specifically referred to in the department's statutory guidance on school organisation.

The definition of amalgamated schools has therefore been expanded, so that the requirements outlined above also apply where a school has had their upper or lower age range changed as a direct consequence of another school's closure. This is provided for by regulation 21(7) and 21(8).

The purpose of this change is to bring the regulations into line with current practice and departmental guidance (which envisages amalgamations of this sort), and specifically to avoid the need for local authorities to submit requests to disapply the regulations in these cases.

Regulation 21 (9) enables a local authority to transfer any budget surplus of a closing school directly to the replacement school, in whole or in part, without

having to channel it through the de-delegated contingency. We also propose to amend paragraph 4.8 of the Department's statutory guidance "Scheme for financing schools", which currently encourages local authorities to have a scheme which expressly prohibits the transfer of a surplus to another school.

Schedule 1: Additional education and training for children, young persons and adults

Background

Section 15B of the Education Act 1996 outlines the functions of a local authority in respect of education for persons over 19. A local education authority may secure the provision of education, training, of organised leisure time occupation and other provision.

Proposal and rationale

Schedule 1 of the Regulations outlines the expenditure a local authority can incur from their non-schools education budget.

In order to bring the Regulations in line with policy intention, paragraph 18 has been amended so that local authorities' functions outlined under section 15B of the Education Act 1996 are included under Schedule 1.

Schedule 2 Part 4: Children and Young People with High Needs

Background

The matters listed in Schedule 2 to the Regulations are part of the schools budget, on which local authority expenditure is authorised. Paragraph 17 of Schedule 2 specifies expenditure in respect of pupils at special schools and special academies, or in reserved places at primary or secondary schools, where the expenditure cannot be met from the place funding described in Regulation 14. Paragraph 21 of Schedule 2 makes similar provision in relation to Pupil Referral Units.

Proposal and rationale

Paragraph 17 of Schedule 2 has been updated to allow local authorities to authorise expenditure in respect of pupils at special academies, where it is unreasonable for the expenditure to be met from the general annual grant paid to an academy.

This change is to bring the regulations in line with current practice. Special academies do not receive place funding from the local authority under Regulation 14, but instead receive equivalent funding direct from the Education Funding Agency.

Paragraph 21 of Schedule 2 has also been updated so that it makes explicit reference to alternative provision academies. Local authorities are able to authorise expenditure in respect of pupils at alternative provision academies, where it would be unreasonable for such expenditure to be met from the general annual grant paid to an alternative provision academy. Similarly to the above,

alternative provision academies do not receive place funding from the local authority under Regulation 14, but receive equivalent funding from the Education Funding Agency.



Department
for Education

Appendix 2

Consultation response form

Consultation closing date: 13 November 2015

Your comments must reach us by that date

**School and Early Years Finance (England)
Regulations 2015**

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 put in place arrangements for local authorities to set school budgets for the financial year 2015 to 2016 only.

We are drafting the School and Early Years Finance Regulations 2015, which will apply for the financial year 2016 to 2017.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	

Name: Carole Smith	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of organisation (if applicable): Gateshead Council	
Address: Civic Centre, Regent Road,	

Gateshead,
NE8 1HH

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by email: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact us'](#) page.

Please insert an 'x' into one of the following boxes which best describes you as a respondent.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Schools forum	<input type="checkbox"/>	Governor
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other				

Comments:

Regulation 8 makes amendments to the unspent funding centrally retained by local authorities which can be carried forward. Any unspent funding retained centrally to cover falling pupil numbers and to cover the

opening of new schools, can now be carried forward to use for the same purpose.

- 1 a) Do you agree that local authorities should be able to carry forward any unspent funding retained centrally to support outstanding or good schools with falling pupil numbers where their capacity will be needed within three years, for the same purpose?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments: Yes, where LA's have top sliced the schools block for this purpose, this will enable a more efficient system of maintaining levels of centrally retained support, without having to add the top sliced funding back to the schools block and then top slicing again.

- 1 b) Do you agree that local authorities should be able to carry forward any unspent funding retained centrally to support the opening of new schools (funding the appointment of staff and enable the purchase of any goods and services), to be used for the same purpose?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments: Yes, where LA's have top sliced the schools block for this purpose, this will enable a more efficient system of maintaining levels of centrally retained support, without having to add the top sliced funding back to the schools block and then top slicing again.

- 2) Regulation 16 (8) amends the provision for local authorities to fund all 2-year-olds eligible for the early years entitlement using place-based funding. This is to be limited to SEN and children in need. For all other eligible 2-year-olds, local authorities are to use participation-based funding. Do you agree with this change?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments: Now 2 year old funding is more established, there is less need for guaranteed place funding for new provision. However the hourly rate of £4.85 per hour needs to be reviewed upwards to reflect the increased employment costs and the difficulty that schools have providing 2 year old places because of funding levels.

Regulation 21 amends the definition of amalgamated schools, so that the requirement to add together budget shares also applies in situations where a school has closed and another school has had its upper or lower age range changed. The regulation also enables local authorities to transfer budgets of closing schools.

- 3 a) Do you agree that the definition of amalgamated schools should be extended to include situations where a school has closed and another school has had its upper or lower age range changed?

Agree Disagree Not sure

Comments:

3 b) Where a school's age range is expanded, or a new school is established, as a result of the closure of another school, the local authority is allowed to add all or part of the unspent budget of the closed school to the budget of the successor or, expanded school. This is provided for by regulation 21(8) and (9). Do you agree with this change?

Agree Disagree Not sure

Comments: It should be at the LA's discretion how much of any unspent balances can be added to the successor or expanded school. The successor's schools financial position as well as the strain put on their budget by taking the additional students should be taken into consideration.

- 4) Schedule 1 paragraph 18 has been updated so that local authorities' functions under section 15B of the Education Act 1996 are included under the agreed expenditure that can be incurred from their non-schools education budget. Do you agree with this change?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments: As this brings 19 year olds into line with 16-18 year olds in terms of education funding.

5 a) Paragraph 17 of Schedule 2 has been updated to allow local authorities to authorise expenditure in respect of pupils at special academies, where it is unreasonable for the expenditure to be met from the general annual grant paid to an academy. Do you agree with this change?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

5 b) Paragraph 21 of Schedule 2 has been updated so that it also allow local authorities to authorise expenditure in respect of pupils at alternative provision academies, where it is unreasonable for the expenditure to be met from the general annual grant paid to an alternative provision academy. Do you agree with this change?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

- 6) The other changes introduced by the regulations reflect current practice, as well as updating references to reflect the financial year 2016 to 2017. For these changes we are therefore only consulting on the drafting of the regulations rather than the substance of the policy. Do you have any comments on the drafting?

Comments:

Regulation 16 (8) of the 2014 regulations mentions regulation 3 (2) of the 2014 Early Years Regulations. I could not find a copy of this document to check the reference.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply.

X

Email address for acknowledgement: carolesmith@gateshead.gov.uk

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [consultation principles](#)

The key consultation principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please email: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Completed responses should be sent by **13 November 2015**

Send by post to:

Amy Sullivan, Department for Education, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT

Send by email to:

2015SchoolFinanceRegulations.Consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 9

TITLE OF REPORT: Dedicated Schools Grant Revenue Monitoring Qtr. 2 2015/16

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forum attention information on the quarter 2 position of DSG for 2015/16.

Background

The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is made up of three main funding blocks.

1. The early years block - for 2 and 3 & 4 year old funding
2. Mainstream Schools block - which includes some centrally held and de-delegated funding
3. High Needs Block - which includes special schools and PRU funding

Schools Forum receives details of DSG revenue monitoring throughout the financial year. Following discussion regarding the format of the statement at Forum in June 2014, a new format has been presented based on the expenditure headings of section 251.

The quarter 2 report for 2015/16 is included at appendix 1.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the content of the report.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum:-

- Note the contents of the report

CONTACT: Alan Foster

Appendix 1

2015/16 DSG Revenue Monitoring Qtr 2				
DSG Area	Total Approved Budget	Outturn	Variance	Comments/Notes
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Maintained Schools Budget Share	73,774	73,774	0	
DEDELEGATION				
Contingencies	0	0	0	
Behaviour support services	166	166	0	
Support to UPEG and bilingual learners	227	227	0	
Free school meals eligibility	0	0	0	
Insurance	0	0	0	
Museum and Library services	0	0	0	
Licences/subscriptions	0	0	0	
Staff costs – supply cover	184	184	0	
HIGH NEEDS BUDGET (inc Special Schools, PRU and Additional Support Top-ups)	14,610	14,581	-29	-£212k ARMS, +£395k OOA, -£115k staff slippage, -£95k AP
EARLY YEARS BUDGET				
2,3 and 4 year old funding to PVI's	5,002	5,002	0	
CENTRAL PROVISION WITHIN SCHOOLS BUDGET				
Contribution to combined budgets	440	440	0	
School admissions	122	122	0	
Servicing of schools forums	105	105	0	
Termination of employment costs	527	377	-150	PRC
Falling Rolls Fund	0	0	0	
Capital expenditure from revenue (CERA)	0	0	0	
Prudential borrowing costs	0	0	0	
Fees to independent schools without SEN	0	0	0	
Equal pay - back pay	0	0	0	
Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes	100	100	0	
SEN transport	0	0	0	
Exceptions agreed by Secretary of State	0	0	0	
Other Items	77	124	47	CLA/ MPA Licences top sliced from DSG for all school licences
TOTAL DSG	95,333	95,201	-132	

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 10

TITLE OF REPORT: Growth Fund Allocation

Purpose of the Report

To inform Schools Forum that there has been a successful application for Growth Funding which has satisfied all of the growth fund criteria approved by schools forum.

Background

In December 2014 Schools Forum approved the creation and the criteria of a Growth Fund for mainstream schools. Schools Forum agreed to centrally hold £100K of the Dedicated Schools Grant for a Growth Fund as a permitted centrally retained service in accordance with Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations and the Education Funding Agency Schools Revenue Funding 2015 -16 Operational Guide.

The criteria for the Growth Fund have been checked and passed for compliance by the Department for Education.

St. Philip Neri R. C. Primary School

St Philip Neri R. C. Primary School made an application to the Growth Fund for funding for pupil growth from September 2015.

In order to accommodate the number of pupils within the Dunston area requiring places for Reception Class in 2015, the school increased their planned admission number from 16 to 30, admitted 23 children in to reception.

Due to the general population growth in the area, the school has seen its pupil numbers increase from October 2014 to October 2015 by 21 which required the school to have an additional class, as the pre September school structure could not support the increased numbers, and the school will still have some mixed year groups until the school is full.

The school has also received basic need funding to expand the school due to the current and anticipated need in the Dunston area.

In accordance with the Growth Funding criteria, the allocation is calculated as
AWPU * pupil numbers * 7/12

£2,905 * 23 pupils * 7/12 = £38,975

However as this calculation is above the £35,000 maximum for a 7/12ths payment the school was awarded the maximum of £35,000.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the application for Growth Funding by St. Philip Neri R. C. Primary School and the allocation of £35,000 for additional pupils from September 2015.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum notes that funding has been awarded to Philip Neri R. C. Primary School for growth in pupil numbers.

For the following reasons:-

- To provide funding for increased pupil numbers from September 2015

CONTACT: Carole Smith