



GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 7 July 2022 at 2.00 pm via Microsoft Teams

From the Chief Executive, Sheena Ramsey

Item	Business
1	Apologies
2	Minutes (Pages 3 - 4) The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 12 May 2022
3	River Tyne Multi Academy Trust Funding Formula (Pages 5 - 6) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
4	Nursery Schools Financial Difficulty Funding (Pages 7 - 16) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
5	Special Schools Financial Difficulty Funding (Pages 17 - 28) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
6	Maintained Schools Balances March 2022 (Pages 29 - 32) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
7	Options for Mainstream Maintained Schools in Financial Difficulty (Pages 33 - 36) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
8	SEND Review - Right Support Right Place Right Time (Pages 37 - 38) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
9	Opportunity for All - Schools White Paper (Pages 39 - 40) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital
10	Direct National Funding Formula Consultation (Pages 41 - 46) Carole Smith, Resources and Digital

11 | **DSG Outturn 2021/22** (Pages 47 - 48)

Terence Appleby, Resources and Digital

12 | **Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 22 September 2022 at 2.00pm

Contact: Rosalyn Patterson Email: rosalynpatterson@gateshead.gov.uk,
Tel: 0191 433 2088, Date: Thursday, 30 June 2022

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 12 May 2022

PRESENT:	Peter Largue (Chair)	Trade Union Representative
	Sarah Diggle	Secondary Maintained Governors
	Alison Hall	Primary Maintained Schools
	Denise Kilner	Nursery Sector Representative
	Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
	Mustafaa Malik	Primary Headteachers
	Domenic Volpe	Maintained Secondary Headteachers
	Councillor Sheila Gallagher	Elected Member
IN ATTENDANCE:	Carole Smith	Gateshead Council
	Rosalyn Patterson	Gateshead Council

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Andrew Fowler, Jacqui Ridley, Christina Jones, Julie Goodfellow, Ethel Mills and Paul Harris.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

3 ADMISSIONS FUNDING

The Forum received a report on an issue around funding for the local authorities admissions and admissions appeals service which was looked at following a query from a secondary school.

It was reported that in 2012/13 work was undertaken to split the DSG into three blocks and Gateshead took the decision to hold funding for admission centrally and not delegate the funding to schools. Early academy convertors received LACSEG funding for central services such as admissions. As the academy movement grew the LACSEG calculation was replaced in 2013/14 with the ESG, which provided funding for central services to both local authorities and academies.

In 2015 through a DfE consultation the DfE noted that funding reforms removed the ability of local authorities to allocate specific funding for admissions and ended the separate grant paid to academies for admissions.

It was noted that in 2016 the DfE announced that the general funding rate of the ESG would be removed and in 2017 the retained duties element of the ESG was transferred into the schools block of the DSG.

In 2017 the creation of a central schools services block (CSSB) brought together funding previously allocation through the ESG, ongoing central functions and funding for historic commitments. It was confirmed that the operational guidance categorises admissions as 'other ongoing duties' for all schools. The guidance also states the local authority cannot charge academies for services such as admissions if they do not charge maintained schools.

It was therefore proposed that for 2022/23 all costs associated with School Admissions and School Admissions Appeals be funded from the CSSB, which will result in an overspend to be funded from DSG reserves. It was also proposed that for 2023/24 a disapplication request be made to top slice the Schools Block of DSG to increase the CSSB by the amount needed to fully fund admissions and appeals services for all schools funded from Gateshead's DSG funding allocation.

The Forum agreed this was a sensible approach and that the role of the local authority in coordinating admissions and appeals was essential.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved;

- (i) The overspend of the CSSB to fully fund the Admissions and Admissions Appeals Services
- (ii) To fund the overspend for 2022/23 from DSG reserves
- (iii) To support a submission to the Secretary of State for Education to disapply the regulations and increase the CSSB for 2022/23.

4 ADDITIONAL MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS TOP UPS

The Forum received a report on the outcome of applications for additional mainstream top up funding.

It was reported that a number of schools applied and £101,959 was allocated.

It was noted that the application process will be updated and brought to the Forum for approval.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the outcome of the funding applications.

5 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 7 July 2022 at 2pm.

TITLE OF REPORT: River Tyne Academy Funding Formula

Purpose of the Report

1. To ask for Schools Forum's approval of the proposed changes to River Tyne Academy's funding formula from September 2022.

Background

2. The current funding formula for River Tyne Academy (RTA) was agreed March 2016 and includes Millway and Heworth Hall sites.
3. The formula was based on the provision of a lump sum for fixed costs (funding towards the cost a school will incur irrespective of the number of pupils) and banded top ups ranging from £0 to £10,000.
4. The formula was updated for 2018/19 for the additional Ravensworth Terrace site and the fixed costs were increased for this additional site. From 31 December 2020 RTA vacated the Heworth Hall site, and the site was handed back to the Council.
5. From approximately autumn term 2020 discussions between officers, RTA and River Tees Multi Academy Trust (RTMAT) have been taking place to agree away forward to reduce the fixed cost element of the funding formula. After several meetings and exchanges of e-mails a way forward was not agreed.
6. Following this, and due to new ways of working together, officers and RTMAT agreed on a much-simplified way forward.

Proposal

7. The proposal is that:-
 - Commissioned numbers will remain the same at 103 per financial year
 - Numbers above 103 commissioned will attract place funding on a pro-rata basis.
 - All full-time equivalents (FTE) per pupil top ups will be set at £8,000 and additional funding above this will only be requested in exceptional circumstances
 - There will be no fixed cost lump sum
 - Gateshead Council will guarantee at least 70 full top ups per financial year which will not be subject to clawback if numbers fall below this level
 - 5 places will be reserved for the special education and disabilities (SEND) team
 - 10 places will be reserved for the looked after children (LAC) team
 - The SEN and LAC places will initially be part of the 70 guaranteed places.

- Payments will be made termly in advance for the 70 guaranteed places, and termly in arrears for additional places above this number.
 - The new funding arrangements will start from September 2022 and will follow a financial year basis from April 2023.
 - Places above the 103 commissioned places will be funded on the same basis as above.
8. Although the new funding formula is simplified it still provides stability for the provision due to the 103 commissioned places and the guaranteed top up funding for 70 places.

Recommendations

9. That Schools Forum approves the change to the funding formula for RTA from September 2022, and going forward on a financial year basis from April 2023.

For the following reasons: -

- To enable the funding formula for RTA to be updated and fit for purpose from September 2022.

Carole Smith Ext. 2747

TITLE OF REPORT: Nursery Schools in Financial Difficulty

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring to Schools Forum the proposal for a Nursery Schools in Financial Difficulty Procedure.

Background

2. Following the proposal to introduce a financial difficulty procedure for all schools which is still under legal review, it is proposed that a financial difficulty process for nursery schools should be developed in the interim.
3. Advice has been provided from the DfE that additional funding for maintained nursery schools can be provided from the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) under current regulations and operational guidance.
4. Below is an extract from the Early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers Operational guide 2020-21 which is the current guidance.

“6.2 Additional funding for maintained nursery schools

Local authorities with MNS continue to receive supplementary funding for the whole of the 2020-21 financial year. This funding is provided in order to enable local authorities to protect their 2016-17 funding rates for the universal 15 hour entitlement for MNS (that is, the rates that existed before the EYNFF) and the government expects it to be used in this way. As mentioned in section 6.1.1, all providers must be paid the same hourly base rate; this also applies to maintained nursery schools. However, local authorities may continue to use ‘lump sums’ to distribute additional funding to maintained nursery schools.”

Proposal

5. It is proposed that maintained nursery schools can apply for additional lump sum funding in the form of a financial difficulty payment to enable the school to remain viable and provide a safe learning environment for early years children. For transparency purposes it is proposed that the procedure in Appendix 1 is used for maintained nursery schools to apply for additional lump sum funding and that the outcome of any application will be brought to Schools Forum for approval.

Recommendations

6. It is recommended that Schools Forum approves the proposal for maintained nursery schools to be able to apply for additional lump sum funding via the procedure in Appendix 1.

For the following reasons: -

- To enable maintained nursery schools to provide a safe learning environment for early years children.
-

CONTACT: Carole Smith ext. 2747

Appendix 1

Version 1 2022

Financial Difficulty Funding – Nursery Schools Guidance

Contents

1) Purpose

2) Scope

3) Procedure Steps

a) Schools Procedure for Applying for a Financial Difficulty Payment

b) Review process

c) Notification and Appeal Process

4) Appendix 1 – Detailed instructions for the application process

5) Appendix 2 – Contingency Funding Criteria

6) Appendix 3 - Model of Reasonableness

7) Appendix 4 - Model of Reasonableness – application proforma

1) Purpose

The purpose of this guidance note is to provide Nursery Schools with the process for applying for Financial Difficulty Funding.

2) Scope

This procedure is intended to provide the process for both schools and the Local Authority (LA) on the application, review and allocation of Financial Difficulty Funding to ensure that the process is clear, transparent and fair.

3) Procedure Steps

Below is guidance on how applications are to be made for a financial difficulty payment.

a) Schools Procedure for Applying for a Financial Difficulty Payment

- i) Schools must make a formal request in writing for Financial Difficulty Funding.
- ii) Schools making an application must provide information as required by the Model of Reasonableness (appendix 3) and complete the Model of Reasonableness pro-forma application form (appendix 4) nursery schools.
- iii) Schools must clearly state the amount of contingency that they are applying for and the rationale for the amount requested.
- iv) Applications must be made in the first instance to the Finance Business Partner (Schools)
- v) Schools should contact their budget officer (buyback schools only) for assistance with the process and support with any financial information.

b) Review Process

- i) The Finance Business Partner (Schools) will request financial information from the school budget officer for maintained schools, including 3 year plan projections, and possibly governing body minutes. A review of financial records will be undertaken to ensure that the circumstances of the financial difficulty are outside the control of the Governing Body. For Academies full data sharing including access to all management accounts, pay and grading structures, 3-year financial forecasts and any other information that maybe required to assist in the assessment of the financial difficulty funding request including Governing Body/Trustee and subcommittee minutes.
- ii) Finance Business Partner (Schools) will liaise with relevant officers and school staff to establish facts and for professional opinions.

- iii) Finance Business Partner (Schools) will request confirmation from Finance Business Partner (Children's)) on the value of funds available in Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)
- iv) Once all information has been received, Finance Business Partner (Schools) will review all the information and determine if the application complies with the contingency criteria. The outcome of the review will be to make a recommendation to the Service Director Education, Schools and Inclusion.
- v) The Service Director Education, Schools and Inclusion will either approve or reject the recommendation from the Finance Business Partner (Schools).
- vi) All applications will be taken to Schools Forum for approval and applicants may be requested to attend Schools Forum to provide additional details and context.
- vii) At the end of the financial year in which Financial Difficulty Funding was received, the maintained schools outturn position will be reviewed. For academies both year-end management reports and year-end accounts will be reviewed. Where a school has a surplus balance above 0%, an amount will be deducted from the maintained school budget share or an invoice raised for academies. The calculation for the surplus balance does not include any additional grants including pupil premium. The amount deducted will be the lesser of either the total amount of Financial Difficulty Funding received or the amount of surplus balance above 0%.

c) Notification of Application Decision and Funding

- i) The Finance Business Partner (Schools) will provide written confirmation on the outcome of the application process to the school, Finance Business Partner (Children's)), and where applicable, the school budget officer. The letter will include any funding awarded to the school.
- ii) Schools will then have 10 working days to appeal the decision, and the appeal will be reviewed by a sub group of the Schools Forum. The Sub Group will comprise of any 3 members of the Schools Forum to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest. The Head Teacher and Chair of Governors of the school applying for funding may be asked to attend a meeting to discuss the application for Financial Difficulty Funding. The decision of the Schools Forum Sub Group will be final.
- iii) Schools will receive their Financial Difficulty Funding allocation as a separately identifiable contingency payment. It is anticipated that the inclusion of this funding within the school's budget will enable the school to set a balanced budget for the next financial year.
- iv) All Financial Difficulty Funding appeals and decisions will be reported to Schools Forum at the next appropriate meeting.

Appendix 1

Detailed instructions for the application of Financial Difficulty Contingency Funding

1. All schools must make a request in writing to the Finance Business Partner (Schools), which must include the Model of Reasonableness Pro-forma Application form.
2. All areas must be completed.
3. Factors
 - a. Headteacher – provide the amount of teaching time undertaken by the Head.
 - b. Deputy Head - provide the amount of teaching time undertaken by the Deputy Head.
 - c. Salary Range – ISR for the school and the point both the Head and Deputy are currently on. If either of these are outside the ISR, provide the reason
 - d. Pupil teacher ratio – FTE teachers / pupils, (both excluding nursery and MSB units).
 - e. Adult pupil ratio – FTE adults / pupils, (both excluding nursery and MSB units)
 - f. Whole school Staffing Structure – how individual classes are staffed and managed on a routine basis. Number of teacher sessions that are not class based, including AEN requirements, PPA staffing and management time.
 - g. Office Staff – number and designation of staff.
 - h. Sickness Insurance – Evidence of either insurance bought into, or other method of minimising risk to the school budget.
 - i. Caretaking / PFI charges – level of caretaking and / or PFI costs for the school, (annual).
 - j. Use of other school income e.g. additional grants and Pupil Premium– How other forms of income are being or are intended to be used, including any income from external advisory work carried out by school employees.
 - k. Devolved Formula Capital Balance & Use – the planned current and future use of any DFC that the school currently holds and how this interacts with the school's revenue budget.

Use of Surplus Balances – if there are any surplus balances – how will these be utilised.

Appendix 2

Contingency Funding Criteria

The LA will retain centrally contingency funding that could provide in-year support to schools for:

Schools that are in financial difficulty and can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to address financial issues, and that the current financial difficulties are not as a result of financial mismanagement. Schools must apply the LA's "Model of Reasonableness" before making an application to demonstrate that they meet the criteria.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.

The below factors will only be used to inform discussions between the Local Authority and Schools who are requesting Financial Difficulty Funding, it is intended to help ensure Financial Difficulty Funds are allocated fairly.

The criteria below do not represent ideal staffing and service provision but are reasonable within the current financial constraints.

It is recognised that:

- Circumstances and needs of individual schools vary and the responsibility for the appointment and deployment of staff remains with the Headteacher and Governors.
- The Local Authority will make recommendations on Contingency Funding allocation and will request approval from Schools Forum of the recommendation.
- Schools that receive Contingency Funding and have balances over 0% at the end of the financial year will have amounts over the 0% and up to the amount of the Contingency Funding deducted from their balance.

	Factor	Group 1 School	Group 2 School	Group 3 School
1	Headteacher	Possible teaching commitment	No teaching commitment	No teaching commitment
2	Deputy Headteacher	Full teaching commitment Review and explain if outside ISR	Full teaching commitment (max. 3 x ½ days release) Review and explain if outside ISR	Teaching at least 50% (20%-50% release) Review and explain if outside ISR
3	Salary Range HT/DHT	Review and explain if outside ISR	Review and explain if outside ISR	Review and explain if outside ISR
4	Pupil Teacher Ratios	Should comply with teaching ratios for nursery and infant class sizes	Should comply with teaching ratios for nursery and infant class sizes	Should comply with teaching ratios for nursery and infant class sizes
5	Pupil Adult Ratios	To be appraised	To be appraised	To be appraised
6	Whole School Staffing Structure, (inc PPA)	To be appraised	To be appraised	To be appraised
7	Office Staff	1 F.T.	1.5 F.T. max.	1 – 2 F.T. max
8	Sickness Insurance	Must minimise the risk	Must minimise the risk	Must minimise the risk
9	Caretaking / PFI charges	At minimum level	At minimum level	At minimum level
10	Use of other school income e.g., additional grants and Pupil Premium	To be appraised	To be appraised	To be appraised
11	Devolved Formula Capital Balance & Use	To be appraised	To be appraised	To be appraised
12	Use of Surplus Balances	To be appraised	To be appraised	To be appraised

Appendix 4

**MODEL OF REASONABLENESS FOR NURSERY SCHOOLS – Pro-forma
Application Form**

The below factors will only to be used to inform discussions between the Local Authority and Schools who are seeking deficit approval and Contingency Funding. It is intended to help ensure Contingency Funds are allocated fairly.

	Factor	
	School Grouping e.g. Group 1,2 or 3	
1	Headteacher	
2	Deputy Headteacher	
3	Salary Range HT/DHT	
4	Pupil Teacher Ratios	
5	Pupil Adult Ratios	
6	Whole School Staffing Structure, (inc PPA)	
7	Office Staff	
8	Sickness Insurance	
9	Caretaking / PFI charges	
10	Use of other school income e.g., Additional Grants and Pupil Premium	
11	Devolved Formula Capital Balance & Use	
12	Use of Surplus Balances	

The rational and amount of Contingency Funding Applied for

Total Amount of Contingency applied for	
---	--

Rational for Contingency application	
--------------------------------------	--

TITLE OF REPORT: Special Schools in Financial Difficulty

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring to Schools Forum the proposal for a Special Schools in Financial Difficulty Procedure.

Background

2. Following the proposal to introduce a financial difficulty procedure for all schools which is still under legal review, it is proposed that a financial difficulty process for special schools should be developed in the interim.
3. Advice has been provided from the DfE that financial difficulty funding for special schools and pupil referral units can be provided from the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) under current regulations and operational guidance.
4. In the Schools and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2022, Schedule 2 (Classes or descriptions of planned expenditure prescribed for the purposes or the schools budget of a local authority which may be deducted from it to determine the individual schools budget), Part 5 (children and young people with High Needs) paragraph 37 "Expenditure on special schools and pupil referral units in financial difficulty".
5. Under this regulation special schools and pupil referral units can be allocated funding for financial difficulty.

Proposal

6. It is therefore proposed that special schools and pupil referral units can apply for financial difficulty funding under the above regulation using the procedure in Appendix 1. This will enable schools to apply for additional funding for circumstances outside of their control to ensure that they can provide a safe learning environment for children and young people. It is also proposed that all applications for funding and will be brought to Schools Forum for approval.

Recommendations

7. It is recommended that Schools Forum approves the proposal for special schools and pupil referral units to be able to apply for financial difficulty funding via the procedure in Appendix 1.

For the following reasons: -

- To enable special schools and pupil referral units to provide a safe learning environment for children with higher levels of need.

CONTACT: Carole Smith ext. 2747

Financial Difficulty Funding – Special Schools and Pupil Referral Units Guidance

Contents

1) Purpose

2) Scope

3) Procedure Steps

a) Schools Procedure for Applying for a Financial Difficulty Payment

b) Review process

c) Notification and Appeal Process

4) Appendix 1 – Detailed instructions for the application process

5) Appendix 2 – Contingency Funding Criteria

6) Appendix 3 - Model of Reasonableness

7) Appendix 4 - Model of Reasonableness – application proforma

1) Purpose

The purpose of this guidance note is to provide Special Schools and Pupil Referral Units with the process for applying for Financial Difficulty Funding.

2) Scope

This procedure is intended to provide the process for both schools and the Local Authority (LA) on the application, review and allocation of Financial Difficulty Funding to ensure that the process is clear, transparent and fair.

3) Procedure Steps

Below is guidance on how applications are to be made for a financial difficulty payment.

a) Schools Procedure for Applying for a Financial Difficulty Payment

- i) Schools must make a formal request in writing for Financial Difficulty Funding.
- ii) Schools making an application must provide information as required by the Model of Reasonableness (appendix 3) and complete the Model of Reasonableness pro-forma application form (appendix 4) as far as they are able.
- iii) Schools must clearly state the amount of contingency that they are applying for and the rationale for the amount requested.
- iv) Applications must be made in the first instance to the Finance Business Partner (Schools)
- v) Schools should contact their budget officer (buyback schools only) for assistance with the process and support with any financial information.

b) Review Process

- i) The Finance Business Partner (Schools) will request financial information from the school budget officer for maintained schools, including 3-year plan projections, and possibly governing body minutes. A review of financial records will be undertaken to ensure that the circumstances of the financial difficulty are outside the control of the Governing Body. For Academies full data sharing including access to all management accounts, pay and grading structures, 3-year financial forecasts and any other information that maybe required to assist in the assessment of the financial difficulty funding request including Governing Body/Trustee and subcommittee minutes.
- ii) Finance Business Partner (Schools) will liaise with relevant officers and school staff to establish facts and for professional opinions.
- iii) Finance Business Partner (Schools) will request confirmation from Finance Business Partner (Children's)) on the value of funds available in Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) high needs block.

- iv) Once all information has been received, Finance Business Partner (Schools) will review all the information and determine if the application complies with the contingency criteria. The outcome of the review will be to make a recommendation to the Service Director Education, Schools and Inclusion.
- v) The Service Director Education, Schools and Inclusion will either approve or reject the recommendation from the Finance Business Partner (Schools).
- vi) All applications will be taken to Schools Forum for approval and applicants may be requested to attend Schools Forum to provide additional details and context.
- vii) At the end of the financial year in which Financial Difficulty Funding was received, the maintained schools outturn position will be reviewed. For academies both year-end management reports and year-end accounts will be reviewed. Where a school has a surplus balance above 0%, an amount will be deducted from the maintained school budget share or an invoice raised for academies. The calculation for the surplus balance does not include any additional grants including pupil premium. The amount deducted will be the lesser of either the total amount of Financial Difficulty Funding received or the amount of surplus balance above 0%.

c) Notification of Application Decision and Funding

- i) The Finance Business Partner (Schools) will provide written confirmation on the outcome of the application process to the school, Finance Business Partner (Children's), and where applicable, the school budget officer. The letter will include any funding awarded to the school.
- ii) Schools will then have 10 working days to appeal the decision, and the appeal will be reviewed by a sub group of the Schools Forum. The Sub Group will comprise of any 3 members of the Schools Forum to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest. The Head Teacher and Chair of Governors of the school applying for funding may be asked to attend a meeting to discuss the application for Financial Difficulty Funding. The decision of the Schools Forum Sub Group will be final.
- iii) Schools will receive their Financial Difficulty Funding allocation as a separately identifiable contingency payment. It is anticipated that the inclusion of this funding within the school's budget will enable the school to set a balanced budget for the next financial year.
- iv) All Financial Difficulty Funding appeals and decisions will be reported to Schools Forum at the next appropriate meeting.

Appendix 1

Detailed instructions for the application of Financial Difficulty Contingency Funding

1. All schools must make a request in writing to the Finance Business Partner (Schools), which must include the Model of Reasonableness Pro-forma Application form.
2. All areas must be completed.
3. Factors
 - a. Headteacher – provide the amount of teaching time undertaken by the Head.
 - b. Deputy Head - provide the amount of teaching time undertaken by the Deputy Head.
 - c. Salary Range – ISR for the school and the point both the Head and Deputy are currently on. If either of these are outside the ISR, provide the reason
 - d. Pupil teacher ratio – FTE teachers / pupils, (both excluding nursery and MSB units).
 - e. Adult pupil ratio – FTE adults / pupils, (both excluding nursery and MSB units)
 - f. Whole school Staffing Structure – how individual classes are staffed and managed on a routine basis. Number of teacher sessions that are not class based, including AEN requirements, PPA staffing and management time.
 - g. Office Staff – number and designation of staff.
 - h. Sickness Insurance – Evidence of either insurance bought into, or other method of minimising risk to the school budget.
 - i. Caretaking / PFI charges – level of caretaking and / or PFI costs for the school, (annual).
 - j. Use of other school income e.g. additional grants and Pupil Premium– How other forms of income are being or are intended to be used, including any income from external advisory work carried out by school employees.
 - k. Devolved Formula Capital Balance & Use – the planned current and future use of any DFC that the school currently holds and how this interacts with the school's revenue budget.

Use of Surplus Balances – if there are any surplus balances – how will these be utilised.

Appendix 2

Contingency Funding Criteria

The LA will retain centrally contingency funding that could provide in-year support to schools for:

Schools that are in financial difficulty and can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to address financial issues, and that the current financial difficulties are not as a result of financial mismanagement. Schools must apply the LA's "Model of Reasonableness" before making an application to demonstrate that they meet the criteria.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.

The below factors will only to be used to inform discussions between the Local Authority and Schools who are requesting Financial Difficulty Funding, it is intended to help ensure Financial Difficulty Funds are allocated fairly.

The criteria below do not represent ideal staffing and service provision but are reasonable within the current financial constraints.

It is recognised that:

- Circumstances and needs of individual schools vary and the responsibility for the appointment and deployment of staff remains with the Headteacher and Governors.
- The Local Authority will make recommendations on Contingency Funding allocation and will request approval from Schools Forum of the recommendation.
- Schools that receive Contingency Funding and have balances over 0% at the end of the financial year will have amounts over the 0% and up to the amount of the Contingency Funding deducted from their balance.

Appendix 4

MODEL OF REASONABLENESS FOR SPECAIL SCHOOLS – Pro-forma Application Form

The below factors will only to be used to inform discussions between the Local Authority and Schools who are seeking deficit approval and Contingency Funding. It is intended to help ensure Contingency Funds are allocated fairly.

	Factor	
	School Grouping e.g. Group 1,2 or 3	
1	Headteacher	
2	Deputy Headteacher	
3	Salary Range HT/DHT	
4	Pupil Teacher Ratios	
5	Pupil Adult Ratios	
6	Whole School Staffing Structure, (inc PPA)	
7	Number and bandings of children	
8	Office Staff	
9	Sickness Insurance	
10	Caretaking / PFI charges	
11	Use of other school income e.g., Additional Grants and Pupil Premium	
12	Devolved Formula Capital Balance & Use	
13	Use of Surplus Balances	

The rational and amount of Contingency Funding Applied for

Total Amount of Contingency applied for	
---	--

Rational for Contingency application	
--------------------------------------	--

7 July 2022

TITLE OF REPORT: Schools Balances 2021/22

Purpose of the Report

1. To update the Schools Forum on the movement of school balances for the financial year 2021/22 and the number of schools in a deficit position at the end of the financial year.

Background

2. As part of the Council's responsibilities for the management and good financial practice of maintained schools, the balances held by each individual school, the movement (increase or decrease in balances) and the number of schools with a deficit balance for the financial year will be brought to the attention of Schools Forum to note.
3. This information is also reported to the Strategic Director, Resources and Digital and the Service Director, Education, Schools and Inclusion.

Balances

4. At the 31 March 2021 maintained schools held total revenue balances of £8.91m and eleven schools had a deficit balance amounting to £0.97m.
5. At the 31 March 2022 maintained school balances increased by £0.031m to £8.94m.
6. Seventeen schools were in a deficit position at the end of 2021/22 totalling £1.14m, an increase from £0.97m. Four of these schools are closed academy convertors with small balances due to pay award transactions which will be delt with during 2022/23. There are five new schools in deficit, four schools are out of deficit and four schools increased their deficits. The Council will continue to work with the schools on their deficit recovery plans.
7. These balances consist of all revenue funding streams including schools' individual budgets, government grants and any income received by the school.
8. The detail of the individual balances and the in-year movement is contained in Appendix 1.

Proposal

9. That Schools Forum notes:

- Schools balances have increased from £8.91m at 31 March 2021 to £8.94m at 31 March 2022, an increase of £0.031m.
- The number of schools with a deficit balance has increased by five to 17 (4 of which are closed schools).
- There has been an increase in the value of the total deficits held by schools by £0.17m to £1.14m.

Recommendation

10. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes: -

- The value of maintained school balances and the in-year increase of balances by £0.031m to the year-end value of £8.94m.
- The number of schools with a deficit balance at the end of 2021/22.
- The increase in the value of deficit balances at the end of 2021/22.

For the following reason(s):

- To ensure that the year-end financial position is brought to the attention of Schools Forum.

CONTACT: Carole Smith ext. 2747

Appendix 1

School	Amount	Movement	Closing Balance
Bensham Grove Nursery	-35,701	66,484	30,783
Barley Mow Primary	-94,274	29,460	-64,814
Bede Primary	-120,126	43,824	-76,302
Bill Quay Primary	65,353	-2,813	62,540
Birtley East Primary	-74,148	-15,799	-89,947
Birtley St Josephs Infants	-63,105	65,190	2,086
Birtley St Josephs Junior	-144,752	146,647	1,895
Blaydon RC Primary	-127,311	127,311	0
Blaydon West Primary	-196,000	-96,915	-292,915
Brandling Primary	-278,459	616	-277,844
Brighton Avenue Primary	-1,586	19,523	17,937
Caedmon Primary	-164,722	-117,962	-282,684
Carr Hill Primary	-290,699	-52,623	-343,322
Chopwell Primary	-133,769	7,389	-126,380
Clover Hill Primary	-184,753	-23,880	-208,633
Colegate Primary	129,920	31,716	161,636
Corpus Christi Primary	-209,592	209,592	0
Crawcrook St Agnes Rc Primary	-60,576	-45,175	-105,751
Crookhill Primary	-67,236	13,519	-53,716
Dryden	14,996	-113,627	-98,631
Dunston Hill Primary	-157,961	-15,576	-173,537
Dunston St Philip Neri RCP	-81,147	83,454	2,307
Emmaville Primary	-183,677	-76,012	-259,689
Eslington	9,963	-64,855	-54,891
Falla Park Primary	-118,068	1,941	-116,127
Fell Dyke Primary	-157,526	121,292	-36,234
Fellside Primary	-38,514	-5,600	-44,115
Furrowfield	-176,332	228,647	52,315
Gateshead St Josephs RC	-46,669	47,272	603
Gateshead St Oswalds RCP	-184,545	184,545	0
Gateshead St Peters RCP	-60,485	60,485	0
Gateshead St Wilfreds RCP	-35,665	39,496	3,832
Gibside	-785,018	-36,869	-821,887
Glynwood Primary	-158,809	49,895	-108,914
Greenside Primary	-55,199	-24,425	-79,624
High Spen Primary	-105,895	20,370	-85,526
Highfield Primary	-114,506	4,587	-109,919
Highfield St Josephs RCP	-80,276	-17,686	-97,962
Hilltop	159,960	-21,575	138,385
Kells Lane	-236,616	-37,338	-273,954
Kelvin Grove Primary	-207,157	121,370	-85,787
Kingsmeadow Comp	-1,382,393	-957,130	-2,339,524
Larkspur Primary	1,948	-32,731	-30,783
Lingey House Primary	-385,536	-69,106	-454,643
Lobley Hill Primary	-111,141	-97,371	-208,512
Oakfield Infant	-5,006	5,314	308
Oakfield Junior	-67,570	4,053	-63,517
Parkhead Primary	-129,715	26,563	-103,152
Portobello Primary	-93,855	-15,244	-109,099
Ravensworth Terrace Primary	22,173	-72,053	-49,880
RomanRoad Primary	-230,764	-30,467	-261,231
Ryton Infants	61,333	-7,581	53,752
Ryton Jnr	25,959	-7,510	18,449
South Street	-36,145	31,617	-4,528
St Aidans C of E	-146,456	-46,312	-192,768
St Albans RC	-23,573	23,573	0
St Augustines RC Aided	-314,950	314,950	0
St Mary&StThomasAqCathPrim	-84,305	-15,092	-99,398
Swalwell	-119,179	2,260	-116,919
The Drive	-40,669	-10,604	-51,273
Wardley	-171,731	-1,944	-173,675
Washingwell	14,914	10,444	25,357
Whickham Front Street Primary	-260,136	-73,690	-333,826
Whickham Parochial	-34,094	-10,839	-44,933
Whickham St Marys R C	-58,663	9,339	-49,323
White Mere	229,312	100,078	329,391
Windy Nook Primary	-241,102	-67,727	-308,829
Winlaton West Lane	-329,592	49,401	-280,191
Harlow Green Primary	-361,088	-75,629	-436,717
Rowlands Gill Primary	212,633	26,517	239,150
Gateshead St Annes RCP			
	-8,910,075	-31,022	-8,941,097

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: Options for Mainstream Schools in Financial Difficulty

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring to Schools Forum options for mainstream schools in financial difficulty.

Background

2. Following the proposal to introduce a financial difficulty procedure for all schools which is still under legal review, there has been a request to explore other options for maintained mainstream schools in financial difficulty.
3. Whilst the Schools and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2022, Part 2, Chapter 1, Regulation 6 states: -

The schools budget

6.—(1) The classes or descriptions of local authority expenditure specified in paragraph (2) and Schedule 2 are prescribed for the purposes of section 45A(2) of the 1998 Act and the determination of a local authority's schools budget, subject to the exceptions in regulation 7.

(2) The classes or descriptions of local authority expenditure are—

(a) expenditure on the provision and maintenance of maintained schools and on the education of pupils at maintained schools;

(b) expenditure on the education of children at independent schools, non-maintained special schools, pupil referral units, at home or in hospital, and on any other arrangements for the provision of primary and secondary education for children otherwise than at schools maintained by a local authority

4. The Schools Operational Guide 2022 to 2023 states for dedelegation:-

368: There may be different decisions for each phase. The services which may be de-delegated are:

- contingencies (including schools in financial difficulties and deficits of closing schools)

5. The Scheme for Financing Local Authority Maintained Schools statutory guidance states:-

6.7 Writing off deficits

The scheme should contain a provision which makes it clear that the local authority cannot write off the deficit balance of any school.

If a local authority wishes to give assistance towards elimination of a deficit balance this should be through the allocation of a cash sum, from the authority's schools budget; from a centrally held budget specified for the purpose of expenditure on special schools and pupil referral units in financial difficulty or, in respect of mainstream maintained schools, from a de-delegated contingency budget where this has been agreed by schools forum.

6. Given this mix of guidance and the ongoing legal review it has been requested that mainstream schools appetite for de-delegation for financial difficulty be assessed.
7. In order to assess this some modelling has been undertaken using the 2022/23 authority proforma tool (APT). To ensure that the modelling would be realistic for 2023/24 financial year all catholic primary schools were updated as if they had converted to an academy to ensure that the pupil numbers for de-delegation would be more representative of maintained mainstream schools for 2023/24.
8. Current deficits as of 31 March 2022 are £1.14m, projected to increase to £2.95m for March 2023 without the impact of additional funding and deficit recovery process factored in, therefore modelling has been undertaken looking to de-delegate approx. £1m.
9. To have a financial difficulties fund of approximately £1.m de-delegation would need to be around £95 per pupil. The amounts of estimated de-delegation are based on October 2022 census information. Schools would de-delegate between £8,550 for the smallest school to £39,615 for the largest primary school. If this de-delegation had been implemented for financial year 2021/22 it is estimated that it would have put one additional school into a deficit position. The outcomes of the de-delegation calculation are in Appendix 1.

Proposal

10. It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the content of the report and mainstream maintained school representatives seek the views of their sector.

Recommendations

11. It is recommended that Schools Forum seeks the views of mainstream maintained schools on the option to de-delegated funding for a financial difficulty fund to assist schools in a deficit situation.

For the following reasons: -

- To provide options for mainstream maintained schools in financial difficulty.

CONTACT: Carole Smith ext. 2747

Appendix 1

School Name	Basic Entitlement
Barley Mow Primary School	£13,775
Bede Community Primary School	£17,195
Bill Quay Primary School	£20,235
Birtley East Community Primary School	£17,575
Blaydon West Primary School	£16,910
Brandling Primary School	£17,195
Brighton Avenue Primary School	£27,835
Caedmon Community Primary School	£19,950
Carr Hill Community Primary School	£28,025
Chopwell Primary School	£16,150
Clover Hill Community Primary School	£19,475
Colegate Community Primary School	£13,585
Crookhill Community Primary School	£17,765
Dunston Hill Community Primary School	£35,910
Emmaville Primary School	£39,425
Falla Park Community Primary School	£17,290
Fell Dyke Community Primary School	£24,510
Fellside Community Primary School	£19,855
Front Street Community Primary School	£37,620
Glynwood Community Primary School	£38,095
Greenside Primary School	£16,245
Harlow Green Community Primary School	£34,580
High Spen Primary School	£15,675
Highfield Community Primary School	£10,830
Kells Lane Primary School	£39,615
Kelvin Grove Community Primary School	£31,255
Larkspur Community Primary School	£11,495
Lingey House Primary School	£37,715
Lobley Hill Primary School	£31,065
Oakfield Infant School	£15,580
Oakfield Junior School	£22,610
Parkhead Community Primary School	£26,505
Portobello Primary School	£18,050
Ravensworth Terrace Primary School	£33,250
Roman Road Primary School	£18,525
Rowlands Gill Community Primary School	£18,525
Ryton Community Infant School	£8,550
Ryton Junior School	£12,825
South Street Community Primary School	£21,090
St Aidan's Church of England Primary School	£18,715
Swalwell Primary School	£10,925
The Drive Community Primary School	£16,910
Wardley Primary School	£21,090
Washingwell Community Primary School	£15,485
Whickham Parochial Church of England Primary School	£19,665
White Mere Community Primary School	£13,585
Windy Nook Primary School	£27,645
Winlaton West Lane Community Primary School	£32,775
Total	£1,059,155

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: SEND Review: Right Support Right Place Right Time

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring Schools Forum's attention the recent consultation on special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and alternative provision (AP).

Background

2. On 29 March the Government published the SEND Review: right support right place right time which was a consultation on SEND and AP in England. The consultation set out proposed reforms to the SEND and AP system that seek to address three key challenges:
 - poor outcomes for children and young people with SEN or in alternative provision
 - navigating the SEND system and alternative provision is not a positive experience for children, young people, and their families and;
 - despite unprecedented investment, the system is not delivering value for money for children, young people and families.
3. The consultation closed 1 July 2022, but below is a link to the consultation documents.
[SEND Review - right support, right place, right time - government consultation on the SEND and alternative provision system in England \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/government/consultations/SEND-review-right-support-right-place-right-time)
4. The proposals in the document are very ambitious and aim to make the system better for children parents and carers, have better outcomes for children and make the system sustainable for local authorities (LA).
5. There are no direct financial implications for Gateshead at this moment in time, but as the reforms progress a watching brief will need to be applied to ensure that Gateshead can plan as far as possible for any future changes that will impact on funding to both the LA, our schools and the wider sector needed to meet the needs of our young people.

Proposal

6. It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the content of this report and that further reports will be brought to Schools Forum when additional information is available.

Recommendations

7. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes the content of this report.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Schools Forum is informed of any changes that will impact on the funding and provision for SEND and AP for Gateshead young people.

Carole Smith Ext. 2747

REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM
7 July 2022

TITLE OF REPORT: Opportunity for All: strong schools with great teachers for your child

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring Schools Forum's attention the schools policy paper, Opportunity for All – strong schools with great teachers for your child.

Background

2. In March the Government published the schools policy paper, Opportunity for All – strong schools with great teachers for your child, which sets out the Government's direction of travel for education over the next eight years. The paper has strong links with the recent green paper and special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) consultation that closed 7 July 2022. The policy paper is a mix of old and a number of new announcements with a timeline of achieving them by 2030.
3. The biggest financial impact set out in the policy paper is the intention to raise teachers starting salaries to £30k by 2023. This will have a significant impact on school finances if it is not fully funded and could push more Gateshead schools into deficit.

Below is a link to the policy paper for your information.

[Opportunity for all: strong schools with great teachers for your child - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/opportunity-for-all-strong-schools-with-great-teachers-for-your-child)

Proposal

4. It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the content of this report and that additional reports will be brought to Schools Forum when further information is available.

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes this report

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Schools Forum is informed of any changes that will impact on the funding and finances of schools in Gateshead.

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: Direct National Funding Formula Consultation

Purpose of the Report

1. To bring Schools Forum's attention the second stage consultation on implementing the Direct National Funding Formula (DNFF) for mainstream schools, and to ascertain if Schools Form would like to submit a response to this consultation.

Background

2. Following on from the schools policy paper issued in March the Department for Education (DfE) issued a consultation on moving further towards a DNFF for mainstream schools. The consultation will be open from the 7 June 2022 to the 9 September 2022.
3. The consultation states that the DfE's intention to start to move towards the DNFF from funding year 2023/24, but states that there will still be some local flexibility. The flexibility includes the continued ability for local authorities (LA's) to move funding from the schools block to the high needs block of the dedicated schools grant (DSG). Mainstream schools will continue to have a notional SEND budget, but the DfE are looking for all LA's to have a standard calculation.
4. The consultation also includes proposals on growth and falling rolls funding and how the scope of this funding could be widened to assist LA's in managing schools places for both growing schools and schools with falling rolls, and a more standard approach to allocating funding.
5. There are also proposals on premises factors within the consultation. Private Finance Initiative (PFI) will be subject to a further consultation due the complexities of the different schemes.
6. The DfE intend to implement the proposed split sites changes from 2024-25, but exceptional circumstances factor will be implemented at the same time as the DNNF and will be limited to specific categories such as farm schools, rental agreements or dual or joint use agreements. The DfE will require re-applications for any exceptional circumstances funding and would expect very few applications for new exceptional circumstances going forward.
7. It is proposed to change the calculation method of the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) to exclude school led factors when the DNFF is introduced.
8. The draft Council response is attached in Appendix 1. What has been difficult with this consultation is to understand the possible financial implications of some of the

proposals as there is not enough information in the consultation to have an informed opinion.

Proposal

9. It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the information in the report, the draft Council response to this stage 2 consultation and decides if Schools Forum wishes to respond to this consultation.

Recommendations

10. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes this report and decides if a response should be submitted in the name of Gateshead Schools Forum.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure Schools Forum is aware of the DfE consultation and can respond to it if desired.

Carole Smith Ext. 2747

Appendix 1

Direct National Funding Formula Consultation

1. Do you agree that local authorities' applications for transfers from mainstream schools to local education budgets should identify their preferred form of adjustment to NFF allocations, from a standard short menu of options?

Yes No **Unsure**

If you have any comments on this question or on other aspects of the operation of transfers of funding from mainstream schools to local authorities' high needs budgets, please give these below. Please limit your answer to 200 words.

[Will the DfE provide an updated APT with the current years data, but with MFG calculations updated to enable LA's to model proposal's to top slice the schools block to enable LA's to provide information in the required consultations?](#)

2. Do you agree that the direct NFF should include an indicative SEND budget, set nationally rather than locally?

Yes No Unsure

If you wish to explain your answer, please do so here. Please limit your answer to 200 words.

[There should be a standardised calculation ensure the calculation is standardised across all mainstream schools in England. Will there be any consultation on the factors and percentages involved in the calculation?](#)

3. Do you have any comments on the proposals to place further requirements on how local authorities can operate their growth and falling rolls funding?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

[Will growth and falling rolls funding be able to be channelled through the APT by varying the pupil numbers? Will there also be the opportunity for growth and falling rolls funding to be held centrally for distribution outside of the APT?](#)

4. Do you believe that the restriction that falling rolls funding can only be provided to schools judged "Good" or "Outstanding" by Ofsted should be removed?

Yes No Unsure

5. Do you have any comments on how we propose to allocate growth and falling rolls funding to local authorities?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

[It would be useful to see some modelling of this proposal so that LA's can see the impact the proposed change would have on funding.](#)

6. Do you agree that we should explicitly expand the use of growth and falling rolls funding to supporting local authorities in repurposing and removing space?

Yes No Unsure

7. Do you agree that the Government should favour a local, flexible approach over the national, standardised system for allocating growth and falling rolls funding; and that we should implement the changes for 2024-25?

Yes No **Unsure**

It would be useful to see some modelling of the possible impacts of this proposal so that informed decisions can be made.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to popular growth?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

The extension of popular growth funding to maintained schools is welcome. However, this should be allocated on the same basis as academy schools and therefore maintained schools and local authorities should not have any additional “hoops” or data collections to complete to access this funding.

9. Do you agree we should allocate split site funding on the basis of both a schools’ ‘basic eligibility’ and ‘distance eligibility’?

Yes No **Unsure**

10. Do you agree with our proposed criteria for split site ‘basic eligibility’?

Yes No **Unsure**

11. Do you agree with our proposed split site distance criterion of 500m?

The distance criteria should be shorter That is about the right distance The distance criteria should be longer **Unsure**

12. Do you agree with total available split sites funding being 60% of the NFF lump sum factor?

The funding should be higher That is about the right amount of funding The funding should be lower **Unsure**

13. Do you agree that distance eligibility should be funded at twice the rate of basic eligibility?

The distance eligibility should be given a higher weighting That is about the right weighting The basic eligibility should be given a higher weighting **Unsure**

14. Do you agree with our proposed approach to data collection on split sites?

Yes No **Unsure**

15. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to split sites funding?

It would have been useful to see some worked examples and the effect on schools that currently receive split site funding. What about academies that have acquired a new site that local authorities are unaware of?

16. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the exceptional circumstances factor?

Yes No **Unsure**

17. Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to exceptional circumstances?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

18. Do you agree that we should use local formulae baselines (actual GAG allocations, for academies) for the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) in the year that we transition to the direct NFF?

Yes No Unsure

19. Do you agree that we should move to using a simplified pupil-led funding protection for the MFG under the direct NFF?

Yes **No** Unsure

20. Do you have any comments on our proposals for the operation of the minimum funding guarantee under the direct NFF?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

Schools rely on both pupil led and school led factors to set their budgets and as such both areas of the formula should be protected. If a situation arose where a factor should not be protected, then this could be part of the data collection exercise that LA's will undertake to provide the DfE with the information required to calculate school budgets.

21. What do you think would be most useful for schools to plan their budgets before they receive confirmation of their final allocations: (i) notional allocations, or (ii) a calculator tool?

Notional allocations Calculator tool Unsure

22. Do you have any comments on our proposals for the funding cycle in the direct NFF, including how we could provide early information to schools to help their budget planning?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

Notional allocations would be most useful to schools. A calculator tool might be too complex for some schools to use. What might be best is a hybrid approach where a calculator tool is published with schools notional allocations where schools can update certain sections e.g. pupil numbers, number of FSM and FSM6 pupils etc..

23. Do you have any comments on the two options presented for data collections in regards to school reorganisations and pupil numbers? When would this information be available to local authorities to submit to DfE?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

The second option using the pre-populated data as a data check could be carried out to prevent issues occurring later in the funding year.

24. Regarding de-delegation, would you prefer the Department to undertake one single data collection in March covering all local authorities, or several smaller bespoke data collections for mid-year converters?

One single data collection Several smaller bespoke data collections **Unsure**

25. Do you have any other comments on our proposals regarding the timing and nature of data collections to be carried out under a direct NFF?

Please limit your answer to 200 words.

Under the direct national funding formula, if de-delegation is not collected in some way as it is currently, how will the DfE know how much should be allocated to schools? Or will the DfE issue a tool to LA's once allocations have been calculated using the direct NFF to enable agreed de-delegation to be calculated and net budgets issued to maintained schools?

TITLE OF REPORT: Dedicated Schools Grant Revenue Outturn 2021/22

Purpose of the Report

1. To inform Schools Forum of the provisional outturn position of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2021/22.

Background

2. The DSG is made up of four funding blocks:
 1. The **Early Years (EY) 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 (HNB)** which includes special schools, alternative provision and top-ups to maintained schools and academies; and
 4. **Central Services Schools block** which includes central functions carried out on behalf of schools, for example, licences, schools' admissions, pension costs.
3. Schools Forum receives details of DSG revenue monitoring throughout the financial year, with the format presented based on the expenditure headings of the Section 251 statement.
4. The final outturn report for 2021/22 is included at Appendix 1, which shows an outturn of £106.397m against the budget of £106.641m; an underspend of £0.245m. This is a negative movement of £0.159m on the quarter 3 position.
5. The underspend generally relates to the growth fund, partially being offset by an overspend on the Secondary School ISB.
6. The balance of the DSG reserve at 31 March 2021 was £2.241m. The in-year underspend, together with the 2020/21 Early Years clawback of £0.230m, will result in the reserve increasing to £2.255m at 31 March 2022.

Proposal

7. That Schools Forum notes the content of the report.

Recommendations

8. That Schools Forum notes the content of the report.

CONTACT: Terence Appleby ext. 2468

Appendix 1
2021/22 DSG Revenue Monitoring Quarter 4

DSG Area	Total Approved Budget £'000	Outturn £'000	Variance £'000	Comments/Notes
Maintained Schools Budget Share	75,702	76,101	399	Budget reduced further due to academy conversions
DEDELEGATION				
Contingencies	0	30	30	
Behaviour support services	151	118	(33)	
Support to UPEG and bilingual learners	247	234	(12)	
Staff costs	177	205	28	Maternity Credits & TU facilitator costs
HIGH NEEDS BUDGET				
High Needs Budget (including Special Schools, PRU and Additional Support Top-ups)	19,484	19,584	100	+£150k Independent schools -£391k Special schools - OOB income -£231k PRU -£34k Alternative provision -£271k SEN Support Services +£707k Maintained and Academy
EARLY YEARS BUDGET				
2,3 and 4 year-olds funding to PVI's	8,674	8,557	(117)	
CENTRAL PROVISION WITHIN SCHOOLS BUDGET				
Contribution to combined budgets	532	487	(46)	
School admissions	141	137	(4)	
Servicing of schools forums	116	86	(30)	
Termination of employment costs	313	320	7	Premature Retirement costs
Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes	607	40	(567)	
Other Items	139	139	0	CLA/ MPA Licences top sliced from DSG for all school licences
Statutory/ Regulatory duties	358	358	0	ESG top slice agreed by Schools Forum
TOTAL DSG	106,641	106,397	(245)	Appropriated to DSG reserve

	£'000	Comments/Notes
Reserves balance at 31 March 2021	(2,241)	
Appropriation to reserve: in year adjustments	230	EY 20/21 clawback
Appropriation (to)/from reserve: in-year (surplus)/deficit	(245)	
Projected reserve balance at 31 March 2022 (surplus) / deficit	(2,255)	