

**Total Membership 25**  
**The Forum is quorate if at least 40% (10) of the members are present**



## London Borough of Waltham Forest SCHOOLS FORUM

Day/Date/Time	Venue
Wednesday 16 <sup>th</sup> January 2019 Tea/Coffee and Light Refreshments: 5:00pm Main Meeting: 5:30pm	Council Chambers, 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Waltham Forest Town Hall Forest Road Walthamstow E17 4JF
<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Telephone / Email:</b>
<b>Clerk to Schools Forum</b>	<a href="mailto:meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk">meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>
<b>Maintained Primary Headteacher Representatives (5)</b>	
Jane Harris	Edinburgh Primary
Kate Jennings	Mission Grove
Lindsey Lampard	Chingford CofE Primary
Linda Adair	Henry Maynard Primary School and Nursery
Ruth Boon	St Joseph's Infants
<b>Primary Academies and Primary Free Schools Representatives (4)</b>	
Maureen Okoye ( <b>Vice-Chair</b> )	Davies Lane Primary Academy & Selwyn Primary
Lynne Harrowell	Larkwood Primary Academy
Anne Powell	Riverley Primary
Amanda Daoud	Larkwood / Lime Trust
<b>Maintained Primary Governor Representatives (2)</b>	
Cllr Aktar Beg	Edinburgh Primary
Vacant	
<b>Nursery School Representative (1)</b>	
Helen Currie	Church Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre & Low Hall Nursery School and Children's Centre
<b>Maintained Secondary Headteacher Representatives (3)</b>	
Grainne Smyth	Leytonstone School
Lynnette Parvez	Kelmscott School
Vacant	
<b>Secondary Academies and Secondary Free Schools Representatives (3)</b>	
Mark Morrall	Rushcroft / Chingford Foundation
Gareth Cross	Connaught School for Girls
Rob Pittard	Norlington School for Boys
<b>Maintained Secondary Governor Representative (1)</b>	
Vacant	
<b>Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)</b>	
Gary Pocock	Hornbeam Academy
<b>PRU(1)</b>	
Catherine Davis	Hawkswood Group
<b>Non School Members (4)</b>	
<b>Early Years Providers</b>	Sarah Kendrick (Redwood Pre-School)
<b>16-19 Providers</b>	Joy Kettle (Waltham Forest College)
<b>Trade Unions</b>	Steve White (NUT)
<b>Diocesan</b>	Moira Bishop (Brentwood Diocese)

**Total Membership 25**  
**The Forum is quorate if at least 40% (10) of the members are present**

## AGENDA

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Report Name</b>	<b>Report Authors</b>
1.	Welcome all and Apologies	Chair
2.	Declaration of Interest	All
3.	Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018 and Matters Arising	Chair
3a	Decision Sheet from Meeting 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018	Chair / Duncan James-Pike
4.	Early Years Funding Block	Eve McLoughlin
5.	DSG	Duncan James-Pike
12.	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> 13 <sup>th</sup> February Wednesday 2019 5:30pm (Light refreshments from 5:00pm) <b>Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall</b>	All

**MINUTES OF SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING**  
**Wednesday 12 December 2018**  
**Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall**  
**5:30pm – 7pm**

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	
Virginia Flavius	Clerk to Schools Forum <a href="mailto:meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk">meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>
<b>Maintained Primary Headteacher Representatives (5)</b>	
Jane Harris Rep: Kathryn Soulard	Greenleaf Primary
Kate Jennings Rep: Tracey Griffith	Mission Grove
Linda Adair	Henry Maynard Primary School and Nursery
Lindsey Lampard	Chingford CofE Primary
Ruth Boon	St Joseph Catholic Infants
<b>Primary Academies and Primary Free Schools Representatives (4)</b>	
Amanda Daoud	Lime Trust / Larkswood
Anne Powell	Riverley Primary Academy
Lynne Harrowell	Larkswood Primary Academy
Maureen Okoye (Vice-Chair)	Davies Lane Primary Academy & Selwyn Primary Academy
<b>Maintained Primary Governor Representatives (2)</b>	
Cllr Akhtar Beg	Edinburgh Primary
Vacant	
<b>Nursery School Representative (1)</b>	
Helen Currie	Church Hill & Low Hall Nursery Schools
<b>Maintained Secondary Headteacher Representatives (3)</b>	
Grainne Smyth Rep. Clive Rosewell	Leytonstone School
Lynnette Parvez	Kelmscott School
Shona Ramsay (Chair)	The Lammas School and Sixth Form
<b>Secondary Academies and Secondary Free School Representatives (3)</b>	
Mark Morrall	South Chingford Foundation School (not present)
Gareth Cross	Connaught School for Girls
Rob Pittard	Norlington School and Sixth Form
<b>Maintained Secondary Governor Representative (1)</b>	
Graham Jackson covering	School Business Manager, Willowfield School

vacancy	
<b>Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)</b>	
Gary Pocock	Hornbeam Academy (not present)
<b>PRU (1)</b>	
Catherine Davis	Hawkswood Group
<b>Non-School Representatives (4)</b>	
Sarah Kendrick	Redwood Pre-School – Early Years Provider
Steve White	Trade Unions, NUT (Not present)
Joy Kettle	Waltham Forest College representing the 16-19 Providers Sector (Not present)
Moira Bishop	Diocesan
<b>LBWF Officers</b>	
Angela Wellings	Interim Director of Disability Enablement Service
David Kilgallon	Director of Learning and System Leadership
Duncan James-Pike	Strategic Finance Advisor - Children and Young People Services
Eve McLoughlin	Head of Early Years, Childcare and Business Development
Jerome Francis	Senior Accountant- Education Finance
Linzi Roberts-Egan	Deputy Chief Executive, Families and Homes
Raina Turner	Head of Education Finance
Sergio Dimech	Principal Accountant Education Finance
Virginia Flavius	Business Support – Operations/Clerk to Schools Forum
<b>Observers</b>	
Shermaine Lewis	Frederick Bremer School
Sumera Beg	C Core
<b>Apologies</b>	
Mark Morrall	South Chingford Foundation School
Gary Pocock	Hornbeam Academy
Steve White	Trade Unions, NUT
Joy Kettle	Waltham Forest College representing the 16-19 Providers Sector

**1 Welcome and Apologies**

1.1 The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies were noted in the table above.

**2 Declaration of Interest**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**3 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 November 2018 and Matters Arising**

3.1 The minutes were agreed.

**3.2 Matters Arising**

3.2.1 None

**3.3 Decision Sheet from Meeting 14 November 2018**

3.3.1 Decision sheet was agreed.

**4 Local Funding Formula 2019-20**

**4.1 Comments, Questions & Responses**

4.1.1 **Question:** Is there any thought on changes to the SEN notional budget from the movement from FSM to Low Prior Attainment?

4.1.2 **Answer:** No, we will look at that.

**4.2 Recommendations:**

4.2.1 **Schools Forum to note** the responses to the consultation.

4.3 **Schools Forum to confirm** its decisions that when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to:

4.3.1 Set the Local Funding Formula by moving £1 million from FSM6 to Low Prior Attainment in each phase; and

4.3.2 Use any increase in funding for AWPU.

4.3.3 Schools Forum to agree that when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to set the MFG at

4.3.4 0%; **or**

minus 0.5%.

## 4.4 VOTES

- 4.4.1 16 in favour of 0%
- 4.4.2 3 in favour of minus 0.5%
- 4.4.3 No abstention

## 5. Central School Services Block 2019-20

5.1 This block includes an addition for retained duties from the previous education services grant.

Duties to all schools in the area are shown in appendix 1.

Subject to confirmation of final figure.

5.1.2 Admissions and schools forum have had the same budget for several years so no changes.

5.1.3 The Table on page 18 of the report shows the block reducing over time. Each time the local authority is taking a hit. It was £623k originally and now £539k so the local authority is dealing with the reduction.

## 5.2 Comments, Questions & Responses

5.2.1 **Question:** What is the Schools Forum money spent on?

5.2.2 **Response:** On Clerking and the finance team to help sustain the level of detail you receive.

5.2.3 **Comment:** I went to another Schools Forum and they keep less than £10k for Schools Forum. Other authorities divide the figure and can buy clerk duties from other authorities. Barking and Dagenham and other schools forums are buying from another authority. It does not mean that that pot of money for the forum cannot buy this service from another source.

5.2.4 **Response:** This has been the same figure for several years. There used to be strategic consultant costs which this funding contributed towards and when this arrangement ended the function and funding was transferred to the Education Finance Team.

5.2.5 **Comment:** The cost is flat for Admissions for several years, but the work is changing and moved to an online system, tried and trailed and implemented with the intention of being efficient, but no change in the budget. Can it be looked into?

5.2.6 **Response:** We can look into that for you.

5.2.7 **Response:** It was to make it more efficient and accurate, to remove human error. It was not done with saving target attached. Just to make it a better efficient service. There has been a reduction in time spent with complaints from

parents and late admissions. Overall there is new staff to deal with additional work. We have not saved anything in terms of staff time.

- 5.2.8** **Comment:** The time it takes from application to admission has reduced. That kind of evaluation update that Katherine and I have not seen for a while. The SAOB minutes need to come here.
- 5.2.9** **Comment:** Fewer complaints come about admissions and a real improvement so there is evidence of it working.
- 5.2.10** **Question:** 4.4.2 talks about £45k additional cost and that has been met by medium term financial strategy (MFTS). Does it come from council reserves?
- 5.2.11** **Response:** Council revenue funding. There is an ESG exit strategy, shared burden from schools and local authority to deal with that grant ending. All the expected fall in CSSB going forward has been projected into the final strategy. We have already projected to have less income which means more savings.
- 5.2.12** **Question:** In future, if there are further cuts, that strategy can continue to fill the gaps?
- 5.2.13** **Answer:** Yes. That is why we are holding the other items as cash flat.
- 5.3.14** **Question:** We are critical of Admissions when it is not working. Has there been any review?
- 5.3.15** **Answer:** In the report to SOAB, head teachers bring questions and changes are reported to that meeting along with a general update. But if it was some type of annual report or update on implementation of changes, that can be arranged.
- 5.3.16** **Question:** Is there anything in your reporting cycle?
- 5.3.17** **Answer:** The minutes and the admissions action plan only.
- 5.3.18** **Question:** When is the report coming to SOAB?
- 5.3.19** **Answer:** It is due I think.
- 5.4** **Decision**
- 5.4.1** Members noted the expected value of the CSSB for 2019-20 is £1.515 million from which the DFE will deduct £175,000 for copyright licenses.
- 5.4.2** Schools Forum **to agree** to retain centrally the remaining £1.340 million of the CSSB for the following (subject to final confirmation from the EFSA of the size of the CSSB in 2019-20):
- 5.5** **Vote**
- 5.5.1** Members unanimously agreed to use funding for admissions;

5.5.2 Members unanimously agreed to retained duties funding.

5.5.3 Members agreed to Schools Forum funding.

## 6 **Services for Maintained Schools 2019-20**

6.1 This item is part of the continuing Education Services Grant (ESG) exit strategy.

6.1.1 Representatives of maintained schools were invited to vote to de-delegate £19.78 per pupil for maintained schools and £19.78 per place for the maintained special school and PRU in financial year 2019-20.

6.1.2 **Comment:** I am from maintained school but not funded as maintained school, do I vote?

6.1.3 **Answer:** Yes. It includes voluntary and voluntary control opposition to academy, maintained nursery.

## 6.2 **Vote**

6.2.1 Agree: 10 Reps

6.2.2 Against 0

6.2.3 Abstention: 0

## 7 **Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019-20**

7.1 This item reported on the Growth Fund allocation for 2019-20 and proposals for the re-establishment of a falling rolls fund.

7.1.2 All growth funding has been reallocated by the DFE but are guaranteed will not be reduced by more than 0.5% of the schools block. Table at 4.2.1 shows just over £3.2million this year and £2.2 million next year.

7.1.3 Members are asked to agree the amount we are going to apply to growth plus a new question

## 7.2 **Schools Forum Noted:**

7.2.1 The indicative Growth Fund allocation for the LA on 2019-20 is £2.285 million.

7.2.2 New question: If the call on the Growth Fund turned out to be more than £2.2million should we use schools block funding or scale back?

7.2.3 Last year we voted an amount and it was reported later to be higher, but we should have agreed and not just noted the difference. This year want to get a mandate to make changes one way or other. If there is a surplus we will discuss with a task and finish group in summer term also look at projecting growth and to check the scheme's affordability.



- 7.2.4 Subject to affordability, revisit the fund to support schools that are good or outstanding but have falling rolls. Supports schools with temporary difficulties, previously supported a secondary school.
- 7.3 **Comments, Questions & Responses**
- 7.3.1 **Comment:** When it comes to voting, clarify 2.2.2:
- 7.3.1.1 That if the cost of the Growth Fund scheme is greater than the amount held in the Growth Fund either:
- 7.3.1.2 a) The Growth Fund scheme is honoured and the Schools Block top-sliced **or**
- 7.3.1.3 b) The Growth Fund scheme is scaled back to cost no more than the Growth Fund allocation.
- 7.3.2 **Answer:** 2.2.2 yes this is an either / or.
- 7.3.3 **Comment:** 2.2.2, Can you remind us of the implication the basic scale back?
- 7.3.4 **Answer:** Example, expanding schools where we give average pupil-led funding, assuming when children arrive they have similar characteristics to the school generally.
- 7.3.5 **Comment:** If we choose AWPU only?
- 7.3.6 **Answer:** I know how much it would be, if we were to be over, I would have to scale back 2%.
- 7.3.7 **Comment:** In terms of the growth fund, is there a difference for primary and secondary school funding?
- 7.3.8 **Answer:** Yes, for a lot of the other factors a secondary weighting applies. Average secondary pupil gets more.
- 7.3.9 **Comment:** At 4.1.6 where it says “the growth factor” is that in addition to the AWPU?
- 7.3.10 **Answer:** No. That is how the DFE is allocating it out. How they are funding local authorities. We are being protected. It reduces to £2.2 million. I do not think it will be a problem in 2019-20 due to bulge classes maturing. As secondary expansions kick in, we have some anxiety which is why we are having another meeting in summer.
- 7.3.11 **Comment:** In 2.2.4, the previous decision in 2.2.2 talks of the growth fund or school block, but there seems to be an option in 2.2.4.
- 7.3.12 **Response:** I think I have written it like that because that is something extra we are adding in. If it is the growth fund being capped at the level we agree to it, the schools block may have to fund the falling rolls fund.

- 7.3.13 Question:** At the risk of going back, the £1k for primary is recommended from DFE or are we topping up? Or is that to be extra?
- 7.3.14 Answer:** This is not a recommended level. This is the method DFE used to allocate it out. The amount should be £2.2m: £3.2m less £1m or 0.5% of the schools block. They are using a per pupil amount.
- 7.3.15 Comment:** If we are adding to it, we have to look at it. It's a significant amount which we understand. If adding to it, we need a bit more of a say.
- 7.3.16 Comment:** Can we check? Despite the reduction from £3.291million to £2.285 million, you expect the expenditure to be managed so it looks like it is enough.
- 7.3.17 Answer:** At 4.2.2 page 33 of the report, we may be planning for an extra 6 bulge classes but 14 primary expansions complete and 2 secondary expansions complete: over 20 classes with no more funding.
- 7.3.18 Comment:** Asking about the second part of Falling Rolls, linked to 2.2.4 where there are 2 examples; want to clarify that is not linked to the bulge classes.
- 7.3.19 Answer:** No, completely separate.
- 7.3.20 Comment:** Are we to agree a capped amount?
- 7.3.21 Answer:** Using this year's AWPU £3,545 on page 35, but if we get any additional money and put it into AWPU this figure would rise.
- 7.3.22 Comment:** If this is an additional funding for schools that have less than 80% PAN? The reality is there is a gap; would we all get the same amount? To any school that has a Falling Roll?
- 7.3.23 Response:** It is the calculation shown in 5.4. If a school has a roll that's fallen in the current year by more than 5%, we are funding the balance over 5%. It is not a flat lump sum of £110k, but that is our estimate. As there is a chance it may come from a school block, felt you would be happier with a capped amount.
- 7.3.24 Comment:** Five percent for one school is not the same for another.
- 7.3.25 Response:** It is just for the two schools listed.
- 7.4 Decision**
- 7.4.1** The Schools Forum to agree
- 7.4.2** That Growth Fund allocation is retained centrally
- 7.5 Vote:**
- 7.5.1** 19 Agree
- 7.5.2** None Disagreed

- 7.5.3 No abstention
- 7.6 That if the cost of the Growth Fund scheme is greater than the amount held in the Growth Fund either:
  - 7.6.1 a) The Growth Fund scheme is honoured and the Schools Block top-sliced **or**
  - 7.6.2 b) The Growth Fund scheme is scaled back to cost no more than the Growth Fund allocation.
- 7.7 **Vote:**
  - 7.7.1 A – 3
  - 7.7.2 B – 16
  - 7.7.3 No abstention
- 7.8 To set up a Task & Finish Group to meet in the Summer Term to discuss the use of any surplus balances, growth projections and the affordability of the scheme going forward.
  - 7.8.1 To set aside from the Growth Fund (subject to affordability) or the Schools Block a maximum of £110,000 to support good schools with falling rolls.
  - 7.8.2 That the criteria for support from the falling rolls fund are as set out in 5.1 and the methodology for providing support is as set out on 5.3.
- 7.9 **Vote:**
  - 7.9.1 19 Agree
  - 7.9.2 No disagree
  - 7.9.3 No abstention
- 8 **Review of the Split Sites Factor**
  - 8.1 This item reports on the Split Sites Factor
    - 8.1.1 A lot of passionate feelings were conveyed and schools felt significant burdens by having to deal with offsite sports or split sites.
    - 8.2.2 The Task & Finish group agreed to cap split site funding at £745k and not taking more out of the schools block. A number of schools have received funding but are no longer entitled to it by consolidating their site or having new sport facilities.
    - 8.2.3 The last Task & Finish Group gave two options A & B.
    - 8.2.4 There was not a consensus and a single recommendation to Schools Forum so

officers have produced a compromise option C for consideration.

8.2.5 Three options: A, B or C.

### 8.3 Comments, Questions & Responses

8.3.1 **Comment:** On page 39, the operational split site costs do not show actual costs so how to judge the implication of the options for the Primaries?

8.3.2 **Answer:** Only had one Primary school response in terms of cost and that was about £5k. This funding can only mitigate costs against those burdens and cannot cover them. This was one of the areas of contention in the Task & Finish group. All schools have significant burdens.

8.3.3 **Comment:** Would you say that applies to Holy Family as particular reference to Holy Family is made?

8.3.4 **Answer:** Holy Family were having problems with recruitment. People did not want to go and work there and secondary colleagues did appreciate the significant extra burdens their site produced. Despite this, in the old criteria, they would have lost funding for sports.

8.3.5 **Comment:** The Task & Finish Group did get a little overheated, for most of the time, I feel there are things that are not resolved yet and wonder if a decision is made too soon. It's being decided between a school which has two separate sites, but call themselves the same name, one school with two genuine separate sites, one which has some sports facilities and another with no facilities and cannot deliver its curriculum.

8.3.6 **Comment:** Similar point as above. On option 1, that Norlington is travelling over 1 mile. I find it difficult to understand that the boys cannot walk to the leisure centre. As primary heads, we walk our children to swimming. It's a huge jump for having off site facilities.

8.3.6.1 Was going to say the same thing, we need to think of equity and how they are being arrived at. Where a school is a genuine split site, there needs to be compensation.

8.3.7 **Comment:** The school will bus the children and other things that would affect costs a lot more. Where children are older they can walk. Those children are ferried around long distances.

8.3.8 **Comment:** Thank you for putting together the Task & Finish Group and getting it concluded so quickly.

8.3.8.1 When looking at options, I think dropping £40k is a huge drop to take into consideration and I wonder if there is transitional funding as there are difficulties for that school site.

8.3.9 **Comment:** If that was to be a consideration, I would want to include Our Lady

and St George.

- 8.3.10** **Comment:** Option A for Holy Family is going from £150k to £85k, but gaining in option B not sure where drop is coming from. Holy Family received £150k previously but losing in option A and option C.
- 8.3.11** **Comment:** Schools have not given evidence of the costing perhaps we need to go back if schools cannot provide a reasonable amount of evidence. Looks like we cannot resolve this easily; I don't think we have an answer that will satisfy the majority.
- 8.3.12** **Answer:** When people talked of transitional funding, they were talking of schools no longer eligible and whether there should be protection.
- 8.3.12.1** One of the primary schools provided costing, the primary responded having to have two receptionists, what happens when you have genuine split site. Hillyfield gets one lump sum, but two sites. If they were separate schools, they would be getting another £100k through the route of primary lump sum.
- 8.3.13** **Comment:** I think everyone agrees with you, the concern is, if talking of Norlington getting boys to do P.E. Getting costing and revisiting, it may be premature, it is different from delivering curriculum.
- 8.3.14** **Comment:** We may not have two offices at a great distance, but have separate sites.
- 8.3.15** **Comment:** I've not been involved in any of the discussions, but it does seem there is a fundamental issue, the self-reporting of what the impact is rather than the objective of schools looking at what they face. The ideal model of how you provide rather than the way we have to provide because resources are tight.
- 8.3.15.1** I don't understand why security funding is required, you can put in gates. An objective look at the schools may be a way to resolve it.
- 8.3.16** **Response:** We have a schools facing financial challenges programme and if you want to incorporate some work to look at split site, it does fit into that. How to look at schools become more efficient: we can do it in a positive way in time for next year when we have to do the same thing again.
- 8.3.17** **Question:** Is there any way to delay the decision?
- 8.3.18** **Answer:** No. When we come back in January, we need to show the outcome of the mandate. There was a vote at the Task & Finish group which was not unanimous. The group did not send the options back.
- 8.3.19** Originally we would have given A or B, but thought would table option C. Outcome of the Task & Finish group is A or B.
- 8.3.19.1** We know we cannot solve this now, but if we put something in place to do a closer analysis so will have a better look next year. The group met and could

not come to an agreement. This is about how we can improve it next year.

**8.3.20** **Comment:** Thanks to the officers and the group, but I think we go ahead with the vote. The Task & Finish group might need support from outside the group, but I think the Task & Finish group can make a decision for themselves.

**8.4** **Recommendations:**

**8.4.1** **Schools Forum to agree** that when the LA sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should adopt for split site funding one of the following three options:

- 8.4.2**
- Option A
  - Option B or
  - Option C.

**8.5** **Vote:**

- 8.5.1**
- Option A – 12 in favour
  - Option B – 4 in favour
  - Option C - 1 in favour
  - Abstention – 2

**9** **New High Needs Task and Finish Group**

**9.1** This report recommends new consultation arrangements to address the funding gap in the High Needs Block.

**9.1.1** The current Inclusion Group needs to be refreshed. It was agreed to bring back to Schools Forum to refresh the group to be in a position Easter time to have proposals and options on how to resolve the High Needs under funding.

**9.1.2** Renewing membership: Representation from all sectors to be part of it.

**9.2** **Comments, Questions & Responses**

**9.2.1** **Comment:** Appendix A, No. 2. Should the top line say “Mainstream primary schools without SRP”

**9.2.2** **Answer:** Yes.

**9.3** **Schools Forum to agree:**

**9.3.1** To establish a new Inclusion Group initially as a task and finish group to address the funding gap in the High Needs Block.

**9.3.2** To the terms of reference as set out in Appendix A.

**9.4** **Vote:**

9.4.1 18 in favour

## 9.5 **Comments, Questions & Responses**

9.5.1 **Comment:** For clarity: are we endorsing the same members or do you want us to write out and heads nominate for getting group?

9.5.2 **Answer:** Go on the group we have and then each sector meets for their area. Need to take to Secondary meeting in January 2019 and probably need to send out a request. We will work out the current membership and send a request out

## 10 **Consultation on Scheme for Financing Schools**

10.1 A report on the Scheme for financing schools was given.

10.1.1 The revised scheme should be finished before Christmas and will come back to Schools Forum in February.

### 10.2 **Schools Forum to note:**

10.2.1 The consultation process and timelines.

10.2.2 Maintained schools should refer to the DFE model scheme prior to responding to the consultation.

10.2.3 No comments

### 10.2.4 **School Forums noted.**

## 11 **Chair of Schools Forum**

11.1 Maureen Okoye informed Schools Forum that Shona Ramsay was retiring as Chair and there will be a vacancy at Schools Forum for a new Chair.

11.1.2 Shona was thanked for the way she worked as Chair for the last 4 years and it is hoped that her style of exemplary leadership will continue. Shona has worked with integrity across primary and secondary and ensured no sectional bias came into play.

11.1.3 Members were invited to nominate candidates for chair for consideration at the next Schools Forum on 16 January 2019. Any member of Schools Forum can be nominated or nominate themselves.

11.1.4 The vice chair will cover the January meeting but interim cover is needed for the February and June meetings, if someone is unable to commit long term.

12 **Date of Next Meeting:** Wednesday 16 January 2019, Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall, 5:30pm (Light refreshments from 5:00pm).

## **Schools Forum 12 December 2018**

### **Summary of Decisions**

#### **Item 4**      **Local Funding Formula 2019-20**

Schools Forum noted:

2.1 The responses to the consultation.

Schools Forum confirmed its decisions that when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to:

2.2.1 Set the Local Funding Formula by moving £1 million from FSM6 to Low Prior Attainment in each phase; and

2.2.2 Use any increase in funding for AWPU.

Schools Forum agreed that when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to set the MFG at:

2.3.1 0%

#### **Item 5**      **Central School Services Block 2019-20**

Schools Forum noted:

2.1 The expected value of the CSSB for 2019-20 is £1.515 million from which the DFE will deduct £175,000 for copyright licenses.

Schools Forum agreed:

2.2 To retain centrally the remaining £1.340 million of the CSSB for the following (subject to final confirmation from the EFSA of the size of the CSSB in 2019-20):

2.2.1 Admissions:                      £745,000

2.2.2 Retained Duties:                £539,000

2.2.3 Schools Forum:                 £56,000

#### **Item 6**      **Services for Maintained Schools 2019-2020**

Maintained School members of Schools Forum agreed:

2.1.1 To de-delegate £19.78 per pupil for maintained schools and £19.78 per place for the maintained special school and PRU in financial year 2019-20.



**Item 7**      **Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019-20**

Schools Forum noted:

2.1.1 The indicative Growth Fund allocation for the LA on 2019-20 is £2.285 million.

Schools Forum agreed:

2.2.1 That Growth Fund allocation is retained centrally.

2.2.2 That if the cost of the Growth Fund scheme is greater than the amount held in the Growth Fund, the Growth Fund scheme is scaled back to cost no more than the Growth Fund allocation.

2.2.3 To set up a Task and Finish Group to meet in the Summer Term to discuss the use of any surplus balances, growth projections and the affordability of the scheme going forward.

2.2.4 To set aside from the Growth Fund (subject to affordability) or the Schools Block a maximum of £110,000 to support good schools with falling rolls.

2.2.5 That the criteria for support from the falling rolls fund is as set out in 5.1 and the methodology for providing support is as set out on 5.3.

**Item 8**      **Review of the Split Sites Factor**

Schools agreed that when the LA sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should adopt for split site funding:

- Option A

**Item 9**      **New High Needs Task and Finish Group**

Schools Forum agreed:

2.1.1 To establish a new Inclusion Group initially as a task and finish group to address the funding gap in the High Needs Block.

2.1.2 To the terms of reference as set out in Appendix A.

**Item 10**      **Consultation on Scheme for Financing Schools: Maintained Schools Only**

Schools Forum noted:

2.1. The consultation process and timelines.

2.2 Maintained schools should refer to the DFE model scheme prior to responding to the consultation.

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM</b> <b>16 January 2019</b>	Agenda Item	<b>4</b>
Report Title	<b>Early Years Funding Block : Early Years Task and Finish Group consultation proposals regarding free education for 2, 3 and 4 year olds for 2019-20</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision		
Report Author/ Contact details	<b>Eve McLoughlin Head of Early Years, Childcare and Business Development</b> <b>020 8496 3576</b> <a href="mailto:eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk">eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>		
Appendices	<b>Appendix A:</b> Early Years Task & Finish Group (EYTFG) Members 2019-20 <b>Appendix B:</b> 2019-20 DSG Early Years Block Published Dec 18 <b>Appendix C:</b> Proposed consultation models 2019-20 <b>Appendix D:</b> Draft LA centrally retained budget 2019-20 <b>Appendix E:</b> Draft Early Years Underspend Reserves 2018-2023 <b>Appendix F:</b> Early Years and High Needs Block spend on under 5's with SEND <b>Appendix G:</b> Report from Early Years System Leadership Board		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides initial feedback following the first two meetings of the Early Years Task and Finish Group (EYTFG) on 17 October 2018 and 19 December 2018, and the group's recommendations on the funding models that should be consulted on to set the 2019-20 Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF).

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2.1 Schools Forum to note:

- 2.1.1 The feedback from the first two meetings of the EYTFG on 17 October and 19 December 2018.

## **2.2 Schools Forum to agree:**

- 2.2.1 That all EYFF financial modelling will be based on deductions of 5% for LA centrally retained expenditure and 3% for the SEN Inclusion Fund.
- 2.2.2 The draft LA centrally retained budget for 2019-20 as set out in **Appendix D**.
- 2.2.3 The draft Early Years underspend reserve budget 2018-2023 as set out in **Appendix E**.
- 2.2.4 That further consultation takes place as outlined in Section 7 of this report.

## **3. REASON**

- 3.1 The Local Authority is required to consult annually with Schools Forum on arrangements for Early Years provision.

## **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 Schools Forum agreed for an EYTFG to be set up by the lead officer for the Early Years Block (EYB). The EYTFG's purpose is to make recommendations to Schools Forum on EYB funding for 2019-20, based on wider consultation with Free Early Education Entitlement (FEEE) providers operating in the borough.
- 4.2 Expressions of interest were invited from providers currently commissioned to provide FEEE places via the LA's education website, The Hub, for 10% of them to form the EYTFG
- 4.3 Following receipt of expressions of interest, the membership of the group was confirmed and is shown in **Appendix A**.
- 4.4 This report summarises the key information, discussions and proposals from the EYTFG.

## **5. SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSIONS AND AGREED PROPOSALS FROM INITIAL EYTFG MEETINGS**

### **5.1 EYB funding passed through to providers and LA centrally retained funding**

- 5.1.1 A summary of the indicative 2019-20 EYB budget published by the DfE/ESFA in December 2018 is shown in **Appendix B**.
- 5.1.2 The DfE/ESFA has set a maximum cap of 5% on LA centrally retained funding from the Early Years Block, a reduction from the 7% allowed in 2017-18. The LA centrally retained budget is £1.056 million in 2019-20, and is set out in **Appendix D**.

- 5.1.3 It is a mandatory requirement that the Early Years Block budget includes a SEND Inclusion Fund (SENIF) budget with the level of funding determined by the LA. The SENIF is not classed as LA centrally retained funding by the DfE/ESFA as it is passed through to providers, following approval by the LA's Early Years SENIF panel.
- 5.1.4 Following consultation with providers as part of the 2018-19 EYFF process, it was agreed that the SENIF be based on 3% of EYB funding (£639,000). The EYTFG felt that the budget should remain at 3% of EYB funding for 2019-20 (£633,772) and that this proposal should be part of the consultation with FEEE providers.
- 5.1.5 In line with the above, all financial modelling will be based on the LA centrally retaining 5% (£1.056 million) of the EYB and a further 3% (£633,772) being allocated to the SENIF as outlined in **Appendix B**.
- 5.1.6 **Appendix D** shows the proposed LA centrally retained budget which funds the posts and services that will deliver the LA's Early Years and Childcare statutory duties.

## **5.2 Proposed EYFF Rates for 2019-20**

- 5.2.1 There was consensus from the EYTFG that a lot of work had been carried out in setting the 2017-18 EYFF, due to the significant changes to statutory guidance introduced that year. They felt that this had resulted in setting an EYFF in 2018-19 which, in general, the sector was happy with. The group therefore felt that would not be necessary to propose or consult on significant changes to the current EYFF in setting the 2019-20 EYFF.
- 5.2.2 The EYTFG proposed that overall current levels of funding allocated to supplements (minus the agreed deductions for LA centrally retained expenditure and the SEND Inclusion Fund) remain unchanged for 2019-20 as this meant that all providers received a good hourly base rate.
- 5.2.3 During 2018-19 4.5% of EYB funding passported to providers was allocated to supplements (4% to deprivation, which is a mandatory supplement and 0.5% to quality/system leadership, which is a discretionary supplement). Further consultation will be undertaken with providers as to the percentage of the EYB that will be allocated to deprivation and quality/system leadership in 2019-20 and the payment bands for deprivation payments as outlined in **Appendix C**.

## **5.3 Top-up rates for two year-old places**

- 5.3.1 The EYTFG felt that a top-up to the hourly rate paid by the DfE/ESFA for two year old places increasing the rate to the current level of £5.66 should

continue for 2019-20. The group felt that this was important to ensure that providers were not discouraged from providing places to eligible two years olds. This should ensure that the take up of places is increased and the most vulnerable children are supported. Take up of places by eligible two years olds, as recorded in the January 18 census, was 48% which was below the national and London averages of 72% and 61% respectively. The recent Life Chances Commission report also noted that outcomes for Waltham Forest early years children were good, but that more 2 year olds needed to take up their place to maximise impact and increase outcomes further. This top-up equates to 45p per hour in 2019-20 and would cost £307,800 if 1,200 (80% of those eligible) children took up a place. This would be funded from the early years underspend reserves as outlined in **Appendix E**.

- 5.3.2 The EYTFG noted that topping-up the two year old hourly rate to a level beyond that paid by the DfE/ESFA may not be sustainable in the long term. It may be necessary to look at a phased reduction of the 2 year old hourly rates to the levels paid by the DfE/ESFA beyond 2019-20 unless there was a change in the levels of funding from the DfE/ESFA.

#### **5.4 Early Years System Leadership**

- 5.4.1 The LA's centrally retained budgets are capped at 5%. In light of these decreasing budgets the LA's ability to continue to fund the levels of free information, advice and training as it has done previously is not sustainable.
- 5.4.2 The EYFF can include a discretionary quality supplement payment however this can only be used to support workforce qualifications or system leadership.
- 5.4.3 "The Early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers Operational guidance for 2019 to 2020" has been updated to provide clarification of the rules on the use of the quality/system leadership supplement and states that '*Any system leadership supplement should be open and transparent in terms of the process for choosing the 'leaders', the funding arrangements, and the support to be provided*' and '*The supplement can only be used to cover the cost of providing the system leadership, i.e. no one should benefit financially outside of it, either those supporting or those being supported. Only costs of service provision should be met.*'
- 5.4.4 The terms of reference and procedures that the Early Years System Leadership Strategic Board (EYSLB) currently have in place will need to be reviewed for 2019-20 to ensure that this revised requirement is met. The EYTFG also recommended that membership of the EYSLB should be reviewed and expressions of interest be sought from the sector to become members for the 2019-20 financial year by the Summer Term 19.

- 5.4.5 The 2017-18 EYFF included a system leadership budget of £139,000 (1% of the EYB) but this budget was not spent and was carried over to 2018-19. A further £ 68,748 (0.5% of the EYB) was allocated from the 2018-19 EYFF. A total budget of £207,748 was therefore available during 2018-19.
- 5.4.6 This budget is not paid directly to all providers but is managed by the EYSLB in order to deliver a range of support, advice, information and training regarding teaching and learning to the early years sector.
- 5.4.7 As this model is in its early stages of development, as a result the EYSLB budget has not been fully spent. Any underspend from this budget will however be carried forward to 2019-20. A report from the EYSLB is outlined at **Appendix G**.
- 5.4.8 The EYTFG felt that it was important to ensure that schools and PVI sector providers were able to access a range of teaching and learning support, advice and information from peers across the early years sector in order to further support the improvement in quality of early years foundation stage provision and CPD. However as the EYSLB budget is underspent the EYTFG therefore propose that the sector be consulted on two options:
- a) reducing the top slice to 0.3% of the EYB (£59,653) or
  - b) retaining the top slice at 0.5% of the EYB (£99,422).

## **5.5 Meeting the needs of children with SEND**

- 5.5.1 As outlined in 5.1.3 above, it is a mandatory requirement that the EYB budget includes an SENIF. Details of the budget allocation across the EYB and High Needs Block for early years children (prior to taking up their statutory school place) is outlined at **Appendix F**.
- 5.5.2 Schools and PVI settings are able to use early years pupil premium (EYPP) and disability access funding (DAF), as well as deprivation funding paid as part of their EYFF payments to fund additional costs incurred to support the needs of children with developmental delay or SEND. They are also able to access support from the SEND Success outreach programme which is commissioned by the LA and provided by Whitefield School.
- 5.5.3 Should the funding outlined in 5.5.2 be insufficient to cover the additional cost of meeting the needs of a child with SEND, schools and PVI settings can apply for additional funding from the SENIF via the SENIF panel for pre reception class children.
- 5.5.4 The EYTFG propose that providers are consulted on creating a SENIF based on top-slicing 3% of EYB funding, which is in line with the percentage top

sliced from the 2018-19 EYB funding. 3% would be top-sliced from the DfE/ESFA allocation for 2 year olds; the universal 15 hour offer for 3-4 year olds; and the additional 15 hours for 3-4 year olds from working families as set out in **Appendix B**. This would create a budget of £633,772 and enable providers to make applications for additional funding to meet the needs of children across all of these groups where a child has developmental delay or SEND but does not have an EHC plan. Some of this budget may also be used to contribute to the HNB budget in respect of EHC plan costs for early years children.

5.5.5 Responsibility for the SENIF Panel and associated budget transferred from the Disability Enablement Service to the Early Years and Childcare service from 14 December 2018. The Early Years and Childcare service have carried out an initial review of the application process, criteria and payment types/rates. A full review will be completed by 1 April 2019 in readiness for the 2019-20 financial year.

5.5.6 The SENIF Panel comprises a range of LA officers across Early Years, Early Help and the Disability Enablement Service; the NELFT Designated Clinical Officer for SEND; and sector reps from the early years sector. There are currently vacancies on the SENIF panel for early years sector reps. Expressions of interest will be sought from the sector to seek to fill these vacancies during the Spring 19 term.

## **6. Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS)**

6.1 During 2018-19 the EYB budget contained a supplementary payment for MNS. This equated to an additional £1.71 per hour, which is paid in addition to the base and deprivation payments made to all other providers for 3&4 year olds. There are no supplementary payments made in relation to 2 year old children, so these payments are made in line with all other providers.

6.2 Local authorities with MNS continue to receive supplementary funding in 2019-2020. However there is no confirmation at this point that this funding will continue beyond 31 March 2020. As the academic year ends in July 2020, this could present an issue with regards to a funding shortfall during the Summer term 2020.

6.3 Based on the number of children taking up a place in the Summer term 2018, this could equate to a funding shortfall as outlined in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Estimated MNS funding shortfall Summer term 2020:

	No of hrs universal 3&4 yr old entitlement	No of hrs extended/working family 3&4 yr old entitlement	Total hours	Hourly rate top up	Total Payment
<b>Acacia Nursery</b>	11,160	2,046	13,206	£1.71	£ 22,582
<b>Church Hill Nursery School</b>	18,600	6,138	24,738	£1.71	£ 42,301
<b>Low Hall Nursery School</b>	12,090	3,906	15,996	£1.71	£ 27,353
				<b>Total</b>	<b>£92,236</b>

- 6.4 As the ongoing arrangements for MNS supplementary payments beyond 31 March 2020 are unclear at this point, it would be prudent to have contingency arrangements in place for the Summer term 2020, should this supplement cease. Longer term arrangements with regards to EYNFF payment rates for the full financial year 2020-2021 would be made as part of the 2020-21 EYNFF budget setting process.
- 6.5 The EYTFG understood the challenges that MNS were facing, but felt that the early years sector in general was also facing a number of financial challenges and therefore did not feel it was appropriate to ask all early years sector providers to consider a top slice of the EYNFF hourly rate payable to them, which would be equivalent to approx. 3p per hour, to create a contingency budget for MNS.
- 6.6 EYTFG have requested that the following two options be consulted on:
- a) A contingency budget of approx. £100,000 be set aside in the EYB underspend reserves. (This may affect the ability to pay a top up to the hourly rate payable in respect of 2 year olds as the funds ear-marked for 2 year old top-ups would need to be reduced to create the MNS contingency budget).
  - b) Take no action with regards to the 2019-20 EYFF and await the funding decision from the DfE/ESFA for the 2020-2021 Early Years Block. MNS to work in partnership with the LA during 2019-20 to look at options to support their financial sustainability in the longer term. Where MNS have sufficient reserves to fund any shortfall this should be used in the short term.



## 7. Consultation

- 7.1 In line with the proposal set out in 5.2, modelling of the hourly rate payable to providers in relation to all 3& 4 years olds for 2019-20 will be based on slight variations to the 2018-19 EYFF. The EYTFG has requested that officers consult on the models of funding as set out in **Appendix C**.
- 7.2 Providers will also be consulted on
- Whether the SENIF should remain at 3% of the EYB funding.
  - How a contingency budget for MNS should be funded (see section 6).
- 7.3 The survey questions will include:
- Q1: The percentage of the EYB that providers would like allocated to base rate, deprivation and early years system leadership. 4 options.
- Q2: The hourly payment rate for each of the deprivation rate bands (1-6). 2 options
- Q3: Whether the funding rate for free early education place for 2 year olds should be topped up by 45p per hour. Yes or No options.
- Q4: Whether the SENIF budget should remain at 3% of the EYB. Yes or No options.
- Q5: How a contingency fund for MNS should be funded. 2 options, as set out at 6.6.
- 7.4 Consultation will take place between 17 and 25 January 2019 via an online survey. Providers will be made aware of the survey via the Early Years Hub Newsletter and via their respective EYTFG representative.
- 7.5 The results of the consultation will be reviewed by the EYTFG at its meeting on the 5 February, and will form the basis of the final report to Schools Forum on 13 February on the proposals on the 2019-20 EYFF.

## Appendix A: Early years Task & Finish Group Members 2019-20

The Voting Members of the Group are:

### Voting Members:

<b>Maintained School / Nursery School Reps</b>	Helen Currie	Email: <a href="mailto:helen.currie@churchhill.waltham.sch.uk">helen.currie@churchhill.waltham.sch.uk</a> Tel: 020 8520 4919
	Ruth Boon	E-mail: <a href="mailto:ruth.boon@st-josephs-inf.waltham.sch.uk">ruth.boon@st-josephs-inf.waltham.sch.uk</a> Tel: 020 8539 3000
<b>Academy School Reps</b>	Dawn Davidson	Email: <a href="mailto:dawn.davidson@woodside.waltham.sch.uk">dawn.davidson@woodside.waltham.sch.uk</a> Tel: 020 8509 4375 or 020 8520 5168
	Maureen Okoye	Email: <a href="mailto:maureen.okoye@davieslane.waltham.sch.uk">maureen.okoye@davieslane.waltham.sch.uk</a> Tel: 020 8539 2466
<b>PVI Term Time Provider Reps</b>	Pam Chapman	Email: <a href="mailto:shernallpreschool@btinternet.com">shernallpreschool@btinternet.com</a> Tel: 020 8520 6756
	Ruth Mattison	Email: <a href="mailto:info@handsworthpreschool.co.uk">info@handsworthpreschool.co.uk</a> Tel: 07860 655066
	Aimee Weal	Email: <a href="mailto:cmbcpreschool@yahoo.co.uk">cmbcpreschool@yahoo.co.uk</a> Tel: 020 8559 3903
	<b>Vacant</b>	
<b>PVI Year Round/Full Daycare Reps</b>	Sarah Kendrick	Email: <a href="mailto:redwoodpreschool@btconnect.com">redwoodpreschool@btconnect.com</a> Tel: 020 8539 8559
	Denise O'Sullivan	Email: <a href="mailto:littlediamondsnursery@yahoo.co.uk">littlediamondsnursery@yahoo.co.uk</a> Tel: 020 8509 8080
	<b>Vacant</b>	
	<b>Vacant</b>	
<b>Childminder Rep</b>	Elisha Brett	Email: <a href="mailto:Elisha.Brett@walthamforest.gov.uk">Elisha.Brett@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> Tel: 020 8496 2909
	LBWF EY Teaching & Learning Consultant	

### Non voting members - LBWF Officers:

<b>LBWF staff</b>	<b>Eve Mc</b>	Head of Early Years Childcare and Business
-------------------	---------------	--

	<b>Loughlin</b>	Development (Chair)
	<b>Andrew Cadman</b>	Early Years Business Development Consultant
	<b>Jude Croos-Fernando</b>	Senior Accountant -Schools and Education Finance Team (Early Years Block)

Clerk to the meeting is Temi Adeniji: [temilade.adeniji@walthamforest.gov.uk](mailto:temilade.adeniji@walthamforest.gov.uk)

**Appendix B – 2019-20 DSG early Years Block published December 18**

	<b>PTE No of children</b>	<b>Rate per hour</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>5% LA centrally retained topslice</b>	<b>3% SEND Inclusion Fund Top slice</b>	<b>Balance passed through to providers</b>
Estimated 2 year old allocation	715.9	£5.66	£ 2,309,704	£115,485.20	£69,291.12	£2,124,927.68
Estimated 3-4 year old allocation- Universal 15 hrs p/w	4,683.8	£5.52	£ 14,737,196	£736,859.80	£442,115.88	£13,558,220.32
Estimated 3-4 year old allocation- Additional 15 hrs p/w for working parents	1,296.3	£5.52	£ 4,078,825	£203,941.25	£122,364.75	£3,752,519.00
Maintained Nursery School Supplement Funding	238.2	£1.71	£ 232,132.50			£232,132.50
Early Years Pupil Premium	466.7	£0.53	£ 141,000			£141,000.00
Disability Access Fund	123	£615 per child	£ 75,645.00			£75,645.00
<b>Total</b>			<b>£21,574,503</b>	<b>£1,056,286</b>	<b>£633,772</b>	<b>£19,884,444</b>

	Classed as LA centrally retained by DfE/ESFA
	Classed as pass-through to providers by DfE/ESFA

2019-20 Hourly Rates Less centrally retained		
	2 yr Old Hourly Rate	3-4 yr old Hourly Rate
DfE Hourly Rate	<b>£ 5.66</b>	<b>£5.52</b>
5% LA Centrally retained funding	<b>-£0.28</b>	<b>-£0.27</b>
3% SEND Inclusion Fund	<b>-£0.17</b>	<b>-£0.17</b>
<b>Total average hourly rate</b> ***inclusive of quality supplement, which is not paid to all providers as part of their hourly rate	<b>£5.21</b>	<b>£5.07</b>

## Appendix C- Proposed consultation models 2019-20

### Q1 Percentage split of EYB between base rate, deprivation and EY system leadership

	Base rate	Deprivation***	EY Systems Leadership**	
<b>Option 1 current levels</b>				
Proportion of hourly rate	95.50%	4.00%	0.5%	100.00%
Hourly Rate	£4.84	£0.20	£0.03	£5.07*
<b>Option 2</b>				
Proportion of hourly rate	95.00%	4.50%	0.5%	1.00
Hourly Rate	£4.82	£0.23	£0.03	£5.07*
<b>Option 3</b>				
Proportion of hourly rate	95.00%	4.70%	0.3%	100.00%
Hourly Rate	£4.82	£0.24	£0.02	£5.07*
<b>Option 4</b>				
Proportion	95.50%	4.20%	0.3%	100.00%
Hourly Rate	£4.84	£0.21	£0.02	£5.07*

\*DfE/ESFA rate minus 5% for centrally retained and 3% for SEND inclusion Fund

\*\* This will not be paid directly to providers and does not form part of the hourly rate allocation. See section 5.4 of Schools Forum Report. This funding is delegated to the Early Years System Leadership Board to manage on behalf of the early years sector.

\*\*\* Hourly rates are an average and can range from 2 pence to 50 pence per hour to individual schools/setting

### Q2 Deprivation rate payment bands

	IDACI band 1	IDACI band 2	IDACI band 3	IDACI band 4	IDACI band 5	IDACI band 6
<b>Option 1- current levels</b>	£0.08	£0.18	£0.27	£0.36	£0.80	£1.45
<b>Option 2</b>	£0.10	£0.20	£0.30	£0.45	£0.65	£0.95

The rates above are indicative, and will be finalised as part of the final budget setting exercise

### Q3 Funding rates for FEEE places for eligible 2 year olds

<b>2 year old base funding</b>	
Base Funding rate: PVI and School Nursery Classes (including MNS's)	£5.21*
Top up for 19-20 only:	£0.45
Total hourly rate	£5.66

\*DfE/ESFA rate minus 5% for centrally retained and 3% for SEND inclusion Fund

Appendix D - Draft LA Centrally retained budget 2019-20

EYDSG Topslice Centrally Retained		No of FTE posts	FTE salary	Budget 2019/20
Head of Early Years, Childcare and Business Development		1.0	£80,000	£80,000
Early Years T&L Consultant 0-4's (PVI's)		1.0	£62,000	£62,000
Business Development Consultant		1.0	£56,000	£56,000
EY Safeguarding in Education post		1.0	£55,000	£55,000
Premises & Place Development Officer		1.0	£55,000	£55,000
Project Manager		1.0	£49,000	£49,000
Principal Finance Officer		1.0	£43,000	£43,000
Assessment & Progress Lead (T&L)		1.0	£42,000	£42,000
Childminding Development Team Leader		1.0	£42,000	£42,000
Early Years & Childcare Participation Officer		2.0	£37,000	£74,000
Finance Officer		1.0	£37,000	£37,000
Childminding Dev Workers		2.0	£33,500	£67,000
Project Support Officer		1.0	£31,500	£31,500
Area Senco's (PVI sector)		3.0	£30,833	£92,499

Out of School support contract			£20,000	£20,000
Early Help SLA		0.2	£50,000	£10,000
The Hub Website				£37,500
FEEE places marketing costs				£30,000
Subsidised Training				£28,500
Licence and annual maintenance costs Finance IT system				£15,000
Childcare Sufficiency Assessments	Commissioned service		£10,000	£10,000
FIS/CYPD IT/Licence costs				£10,000
EYFSP Moderation				£9,000
Parents voice in Early Years and Childcare				£5,000
Unallocated/contingency				£26,185
<b>Sub Total Expenditure</b>				<b>£987,184</b>
<b>LA 7% mngt costs</b>	Input from: Deputy Chief Exec, Director of Learning, Data & Research, Legal, Corporate Finance, Corporate Complaints, FOI team, Premises/Accommodation costs, General office costs/supplies, staff travel/permits			£69,102
<b>Total Expenditure</b>				<b>£1,056,286</b>
<b>Total Centrally Retained Budget based on 5% topslice of 19/20 budget</b>				<b>£1,056,286</b>



Appendix E - Draft Early Years Reserves Underspend 2018-2023

Budget EYDSG Underspend	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Total
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Contribution to Children's Centres Contract costs Contract ceases summer 2021	200,000	200,000	200,000	83,500		683,500
SaLT in Children and Family Centres Public Health Contract Ceases Summer 2021	172,000	172,000	172,000	72,000		588,000
Top up of 2 year hourly rate from £5.21 (£5.66 from DfE minus 5% deduction for LA centrally retained and 3% for SEND inclusion Fund) to £5.66 .Top up of 0.45 per hour for 900 (60% take up) children in 18/19.Top up of 0.45 per hour for 1200 (80% take up) children in 2019-20	230,850	307,800				538,650
EY LA Centrally Retained Underspend	31,206	31,206	31,206	31,206	31,206	156,030
Premises & Place development (Revenue Place Creation grant for new FEEE places)	50,000	50,000	50,000			150,000
Workforce Development Commissioned Service - All Talk Project universal SALT support ceases July 2020	67,000	60,000	20,000			147,000
Contingency for any increase in delivery of hours	20,000	20,000	19,000			59,000
Education Psychology visits re SEND panel top up applications Jan to Mar 18	8,050					8,050
Unallocated	262					262
System Leadership underspend 2017-18	139,000					139,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>918,368</b>	<b>841,006</b>	<b>492,206</b>	<b>186,706</b>	<b>31,206</b>	<b>2,469,492</b>

**Committed Expenditure via contract or Schools Forum Decision**

Initial 2018-19 EY DSG underspend	2,525,733		
Adjustment to EYB block allocaton after 2017-18 final budget adjustments in July 18 based on Jan 18 Census Data	-56,241		
	<b>2,469,492</b>		

0

**Appendix F: Early Years and High Needs Block spend on under 5's with SEND**

**Early Years and High Needs Block spend on under 5's with SEND 2018-19**

Description	Funding Source	Early Years Block Funding Budget - 2018-19	High Needs Block Funding Budget 2018-19
Top-up funding for early years pupils with an EHCP in Maintained Special schools (Age 0 to 4)	EY SEN Inclusion fund + HNB	£127,400	£140,000
Top-up funding for early years pupils with an EHCP in Mainstream and SRP's (Age 0 to 4)	High Needs Block (HNB) only	£0	£330,000
Top-up funding for early years pupils with an EHCP in NMSS (Age 0 to 4)	High Needs Block (HNB) only	£0	£105,000
Additional funding for 2, 3 and 4 year olds with low level SEN (pre reception age children not on an EHCP)	EY SEN Inclusion fund	£511,606	£0
<b>Subtotal - Inclusion Fund</b>		<b>£639,006</b>	<b>£575,000</b>
Area SENCo's	Early Years Block	£92,499	£0
4 x FTE - Family Support/Portage workers	High Needs Block (HNB) only		£105,800
Disability Access Fund (DAF)	Early Years Block	£76,000	£0
<b>Total Funding on under 5's</b>		<b>£807,505</b>	<b>£680,800</b>

### SEN Inclusion Fund spend 2018-19

<b>Total SEN Inclusion Budget 2018-19</b>	<b>£511,606</b>
<b>Total expenditure April 18 to Dec 18</b>	<b>£299,812</b>
<b>Projected expenditure Jan 19 to March 19 (Estimated expenditure £10,000 per month existing decisions plus £20k for new decisions)</b>	<b>£50,000</b>
<b>Estimated year end outturn</b>	<b>£349,812</b>
<b>Estimated underspend to carry forward to 2019-20 to contribute to EHCP costs for Early Years Children in Schools and PVI sector provision</b>	<b>£161,794</b>
<b>Number of children supported Apr 18 to Dec 18</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Number of approved applications from PVI sector providers (excluding childminders)</b>	<b>43 (57% of all school delivering FEEE places)</b>
<b>Number of approved applications from Childminders</b>	<b>1 (0.15 % of all childminders delivering FEEE places)</b>
<b>Number of approved applications from Schools</b>	<b>26 (57% of all school delivering FEEE places)</b>

**Proposed Early Years and High Needs block spend on under 5's with SEND 2019-20**

Description	Funding Source	Early Years Block Funding Budget - 2019-20	High Needs Block Funding Budget 2019-20
Contribution to EHCP costs for early years foundation stage pupils in Schools and PVI's (carried forward from 2018-19)		£161,794	
Contribution to EHCP costs for early years foundation stage pupils in Schools and PVI's	High Needs Block (HNB) only	£133,772	£575,000
SEN Inclusion fund (SENIF) panel applications (pre reception age children not on an EHCP only)	Additional funding for 2, 3 and 4 year olds who are not on an EHCP with SEN	£500,000	
<b>Subtotal - Inclusion Fund</b>		<b>£795,566</b>	<b>£575,000</b>
Area SENCo's	Early Years Block	£92,499	£0
4 x FTE - Family Support/Portage workers	High Needs Block (HNB) only		£105,800
Disability Access Fund (DAF)	Early Years Block	£75,645	£0
<b>Total Funding on under 5's</b>		<b>£963,710</b>	<b>£680,800</b>

## Appendix G: Report from Early Years System Leadership Board

### Members of the Early Years Systems Leadership Board

Name	Early Years setting	Sector represented/role
Chris Sheen	Footsteps Nurseries	PVI/Chair
Leanne Valiquette	Little Learners Nurseries	PVI/ Vice Chair
Maria Regan	Downsell Primary	Schools
Sarah Jeffs	Edinburgh Primary	Schools
Rhonda Scott	Sybourn Primary	Schools
Zoe Wells	Whitefield School	Schools/SEND
Denise O'Sullivan	Little Diamonds Nurseries	PVI
Julia Sudbury	Childminding Team Leader	PVI-Childminders
Elisha Brett	EY T & L Consultant	LBWF Early Years

### Early Years Systems Leadership (EYSL) Budget 2018 – 2021

- Average cost of training is only £29.61 per person
- Over 14 CPD sessions run so far based on the needs of the sector
- 6 CPD sessions sold out well in advance, most at least 80% subscribed
- 5 partnership groups formalised
- 58 settings to be visited by Specialist Leaders in Education (SLE) this year – funds have been set aside to carry out this pivotal work
- CPD for practitioners to support children with additional needs and SEND
- Website, logo and booking page have been created to ensure maximum exposure
- Teaching and Learning Annual conference to be led by local leaders

### Introduction

The EYSL Board was convened in November 2017 and the first meeting took place in January 2018. The aim is to support high quality teaching, learning and SEND practice in Early Years Settings in Waltham Forest through training and the creation of partnership groups to offer sector led support.

The EYSL Board meets monthly and comprises representatives from each type of early years provider (Private, Voluntary and Independent sector, schools and childminders) as well as one Local Authority representative.

The EYSL project was based on data provided by the Local Authority which identified sector support, development and training needs. It was then deemed necessary to formalise how the EYSL would operate, set more complex objectives, establish an ethos and consult with the early year's sector before delivering effective training and support.

### Training

All courses are considered on both a need and a cost-benefit basis and the courses carried out in 2018-19 have an average cost per delegate of £29.61 which represents remarkable value for money when similar courses run by private providers usually cost over £100 per delegate.

Our first training course took place in July 2018 and in total by the end of this financial year we will have delivered 20 courses to a total of 280 people (based on actual attendance to 12/12/18 and projected attendance to 31/3/19).

Almost all of the courses we have delivered have been well or fully subscribed and we have carried out analysis on all courses that have been less than 70% full to identify the reason for the poor take up. This informs any actions that need to be made moving forward to ensure good take up. We have also received positive responses from our feedback questionnaires which we have shared with our training providers to ensure they continue to develop their courses to fit the need of the sector.

We delivered courses for 9 months of this year and we will have a full years training programme for the whole of the 2019-20 and 2020-21 financial years which will increase expenditure by 33%. To continue to support the positive take up we also expect to deliver more frequent courses and more in depth multi part courses which will increase costs further.

### **Partnership Group Funding**

A large part of the EYSL Project is based around the formation of partnership groups which are cross sector groups of Early Years providers. These include childminders, private and voluntary nurseries and pre-schools, independent schools, maintained nurseries and school nursery classes who meet regularly to support each other's continuous improvement journey. Partnership groups are eligible to apply for funding to support identified needs within their settings, through training or leadership support. Supporting the creation of these groups was the first priority as they were not established or formalised when the board was allocated the funds.

We have 5 partnership groups registered with the EYSL strategic board which include 17 childminders and 29 PVI, maintained nursery or school settings. £20,000 has been budgeted to support PVI's, Maintained Nurseries and nursery classes in schools in this financial year and £10,000 has been set aside to support childminder applications in this financial year.

All funding applications are assessed to ensure that they are not duplicating support already available within Waltham Forest e.g. SEND Success, All Talk, that they represent good value for money and that they will benefit as many children as possible. It is expected that this budget will be fully spent this year. In order to meet a projected increase in partnership groups' applications in the following years the total budget has been increased by £5,000 for 2019- 2020 and a further £5,000 for 2020-2021.

### **Individual nursery / school visits**

The EYSL Board has an aspiration that all Early Years providers benefit from the EYSL project, not just the ones that join partnership groups or attend training regularly. To support this ideal and to help maintain the positive progress that has been made in the Borough in regards to Ofsted inspection outcomes we have commissioned training visits that will be offered to all settings entitled 'Assessing your setting against the Ofsted Inspection Framework'. This 3 hour training session will be delivered by an SLE (Specialist Leader of Education) via one of the teaching schools in Waltham Forest and will incorporate a toolkit to help the setting carry out their assessment and a report produced by the SLE. Our local agenda utilises and builds on the expertise within our borough.

We expect to reach 58 Schools (Maintained Nursery Schools & School Nursery Classes), Preschool's and Day Nurseries<sup>1</sup> by the end of this financial year. Previously approx. 75 PVI sector early years providers have taken up the offer of support via similar projects, so

---

<sup>1</sup> As at Jan 2019 there were 3 x Maintained Nursery Schools, 44 x School Nursery Classes and 81x PVI Day Nurseries and Preschools in the Borough

we expect to complete the remainder of the visits at the start of next financial year. We will then start visits again in September 2019 with the same objective of visiting as many settings as possible but with the focus of the visit to be set and documentation produced based on further consultation with the sector and the outcomes of the visits taking place in this academic year.

### **Teaching and Learning Conference**

A Teaching and Learning conference for all Early Years providers will be planned for 2019 as we believe it is an invaluable opportunity for training, networking and supporting partnership groups to form and to flourish.

### **Memberships**

Based on the feedback gained from our sector survey more CPD for practitioners to support children with additional needs and SEND was requested. To supplement the existing information, advice and training delivered by the Local Authority, the EYSL Board have delivered training requested by the sector for behaviour management and understanding Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). The EYSL Board has also subsidised group membership of the National Association of Special Educational Needs (NASEN) allowing settings to access resources and training on a wide range of SEND topics.

### **Other activities**

We are in the midst of rolling out our digital strategy which includes the use of a website and social media to support the formation of partnership groups, share ideas and promote training. We will also use these channels to publicise training run by other local partner organisations such as the Local Authority, teaching schools, SEND success and Healthy Eating and Nutrition for the Really Young (HENRY) so that all providers know what is already available and can access it.

The consultation exercise to identify the training needs of the sector was invaluable in 2018 and so a consultation will be launched in early 2019 to inform our training schedule for the financial year 2019-2020. We will also use the feedback from past training and from the individual nursery visits to ensure that we are meeting identified training needs whenever possible.

### **Admin Support / EYSL Board Costs**

We have tried to keep overheads to an absolute minimum but there is a cost associated with meeting as a Board and running our training and support activities. The board costs will be similar each year however year 2018-2019 includes the cost of the EYSL Launch event. A meeting room and clerking services only have been allowed for in future years.

We have had an admin support who started in October 2018 and so his hours charged so far have been extremely limited but 2 hours per day for 4 days per week has been allowed for in future years. This is charged at £100 per day which is made up of 8 hours @ £10/ hour salary and 25% employment costs (National Insurance, Sick pay, holiday etc).

### **Funding**

For the purposes of this budget, we have used the 2017-2018 figures and 2018-2019 allocations and we have assumed that the EYSL project will be funded at the rate of 0.3% of the total FEEE budget.

<b>Activity 2018-19</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Total by activity area</b>
Introduction to Forest Schools Practice	£ 360.00	
Understanding and Supporting Children's Behaviour in the Early Years (9th October)	£ 410.00	
Introduction to Forest Schools Practice	£ 360.00	
Introduction to Forest Schools Practice	£ 360.00	
EYSL School Readiness Training x 2	£ 1,531.00	
A Healthy Start in Childcare	£ 120.00	
The importance of using visual supports in settings	£ 410.00	
Understanding and Supporting Children's Behaviour in the Early Years (4th December)	£ 410.00	
Introduction to ASD	£ 410.00	
Developing Attention Skills in Children with ASD	£ 410.00	
A Healthy Start in Childcare	£ 120.00	
The importance of using visual supports in settings	£ 410.00	
Pupil premium Training	£ 521.12	
Additional Training courses Spring 19 (8 @£410)	£ 3,280.00	
		£ 9,112.12
Childminder partnership funding applications	£ 10,000.00	
PVI & School Partnership funding applications	£ 20,000.00	
		£ 30,000.00
SLE Visits for Assessing your setting against the Ofsted Inspection Framework (48 visits)	£ 16,800.00	
Project leader for Assessing your setting against the Ofsted Inspection Framework (Incl 10 nursery visits)	£ 10,000.00	
		£ 26,800.00
Teaching & Learning Conference	£ 5,000.00	
		£ 5,000.00
Nasen membership	£ 3,000.00	
		£ 3,000.00
Admin Support	£ 1,600.00	
		£ 1,600.00
Early Years System Leadership Launch	£ 1,080.88	
Clerking	£ 1,625.00	
Meeting Room hire	£ 260.00	
logo	£ 250.00	
Survey 2018 + 2019	£ 500.00	
		£ 3,715.88
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 79,228.00</b>	<b>£ 79,228.00</b>



	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>
	£	£	£
Budget	207,748.00	58,200.00	58,200.00
Carry forward from previous year		128,520.00	63,785.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>207,748.00</b>	<b>186,720.00</b>	<b>121,985.00</b>
Training	9,112.12	27,750.00	27,750.00
Partnership Group Funding	30,000.00	35,000.00	40,000.00
Individual Nursery / school visits	26,800.00	42,700.00	36,750.00
T+L Conference	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
Memberships	3,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
Admin Support	1,600.00	4,600.00	4,600.00
EYSL Board costs	3,715.88	1,885.00	1,885.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>79,228.00</b>	<b>122,935.00</b>	<b>121,985.00</b>
Balance @ Year end	128,520.00	63,785.00	-

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 16 January 2019</b>	Agenda Item	<b>5</b>
Report Title	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant 2019-20</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Information		
Report Author/ Contact details	<b>Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 <a href="mailto:duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk">duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk</a></b>		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report is to update Schools Forum on the announcements made in December 2018 confirming the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2019-20, the latest position on the High Needs Block and resulting delays in issuing Schools Block budgets.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Schools Forum to note the contents of this report.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As previously reported, expenditure on High Needs is significantly under-funded. The current projection is of a base pressure of £2.6 million in 2018-19 rising to £3.1 million in 2019-20. The last of the High Needs Block (HNB) reserves will be used up in 2018-19, reducing the carry forward pressure from £2.6 million to £1.7 million.
- 3.2 Without further mitigating actions, the pressure at the end of 2019-20 would be a cumulative underfunding of £4.875 million.
- 3.3 The Local Authority (LA) is required to submit a recovery plan to the DFE if the closing balance on the DSG for 2019-20 exceeds 1% (£2.6 million).
- 3.3 In November the LA asked Schools Forum to support its use of a mechanism provided by the DFE to mitigate pressures in the HNB: transferring 0.5% (£1 million) of the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. Schools Forum did not support this proposal but the LA felt obliged to submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State to allow it to make the transfer even though Schools Forum did not agree.

## 4 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2019-20

4.1 On 17 December the EFSA published the DSG allocations for 2019-20 following a ministerial announcement on 17 December 2018 on High Needs funding that increased funding for the High Needs Block in 2018-19 and 2019-20 as shown in the table below.

**Table: DSG funding 2018-19 and 2019-20**

	2018-19	2019-20	Change	Change
	£m	£m	£m	%
Schools Block	197.828	198.704	0.876	0.4%
Growth Fund	3.291	2.286	-1.006	-30.6%
<b>Schools Block Total</b>	<b>201.120</b>	<b>200.990</b>	<b>-0.130</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>
High Needs Block	36.299	36.642	0.343	0.9%
Additional High Needs Block*	0.683	0.683	0.000	0.0%
<b>High Need Block Total</b>	<b>36.982</b>	<b>37.325</b>	<b>0.343</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>21.562</b>	<b>21.575</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>Central School Services Block</b>	<b>1.554</b>	<b>1.512</b>	<b>-0.043</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>
<b>Dedicated School Grant Total</b>	<b>261.218</b>	<b>261.401</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
*Additional funding announced 17 December 2018 for both 2018-19 and 2019-20 £0.683 million is 1.9% addition to High Needs Block				

4.2 The High Needs Block has been allocated an additional £0.683 million in each of 2018-19 and 2019-20, the equivalent of a 1.9% increase to the HNB.

4.3 The additional funding reduces the pressure brought forward into 2019-20 to £1 million and the cumulative underfunding (without further mitigating actions) at the end of 2019-20 would be £3.5 million.

4.4 On 20 December, the EFSA wrote to LAs asking them to make their Schools Forum aware of the additional funding; and that LAs inform the EFSA by 15 January of whether they:

- now wish to make a smaller transfer (in this case, the EFSA will amend the disapplication request accordingly)
- leave the disapplication unchanged (in this case, providing the reasons a transfer from the schools block at the level originally proposed is still required).

- 4.5 At the time of writing this report, the LA is considering its response.
- 4.6 Until the LA has decided to amend or continue with its disapplication request and the Secretary of State has made a determination, it is not possible to publish indicative Schools Block budgets. These will be published as soon as possible after the determination and it is anticipated that the usual full analysis will come to Schools Forum in February rather than January.
- 4.7 As expected, the Growth Fund has been reduced to the protected level of £2.3 million, but the scheme should still be affordable for 2019-20. A task and finish group will be convened in the Summer term to consider the implications of growth projections in 2020-21 onwards and the future of the local scheme.