

London Borough of Waltham Forest SCHOOLS FORUM

Day/Date/Time	Venue
Wednesday 12 December 2018 Tea/Coffee and Light Refreshments: 5:00pm Main Meeting: 5:30pm	Council Chambers, 1 st Floor, Waltham Forest Town Hall Forest Road Walthamstow E17 4JF
Contact:	Telephone / Email:
Clerk to Schools Forum	meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk
Maintained Primary Headteacher Representatives (4)	
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
Primary Academies and Primary Free Schools Representatives (4)	
Maureen Okoye (Vice-Chair)	Davies Lane Primary Academy & Selwyn Primary
Lynne Harrowell	Larkwood Primary Academy
Anne Powell	Riverley Primary
Amanda Daoud	Larkwood / Lime Trust
Maintained Primary Governor Representatives (3)	
Cllr Aktar Beg	Edinburgh Primary
Vacant	
Nursery School Representative (1)	
Helen Currie	Church Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre & Low Hall Nursery School and Children's Centre
Maintained Secondary Headteacher Representatives (3)	
Grainne Smyth	Leytonstone School
Lynnette Parvez	Kelmscott School
Shona Ramsay (Chair)	The Lammas School
Secondary Academies and Secondary Free Schools Representatives (3)	
Mark Morrall	Rushcroft / Chingford Foundation
Gareth Cross	Connaught School for Girls
Rob Pittard	Norlington School for Boys
Maintained Secondary Governor Representative (1)	
Vacant	
Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)	
Gary Pocock	Hornbeam Academy
PRU(1)	
Catherine Davis	Hawkswood Group
Non School Members (4)	
Early Years Providers	Sarah Kendrick (Redwood Pre-School)
16-19 Providers	Joy Kettle (Waltham Forest College)
Trade Unions	Steve White (NUT)
Diocesan	Moira Bishop (Brentwood Diocese)

AGENDA

Agenda Item	Report Name	Report Authors
1.	Welcome all and Apologies	Chair
2.	Declaration of Interest	All
3.	Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 November 2018 and Matters Arising	Chair
3a	Decision Sheet from Meeting 14 November 2018	Chair / Duncan James-Pike
4.	Local Funding Formula 2019-20	Duncan James-Pike
5.	Central School Services Block 2019-20	Duncan James-Pike
6.	Services for Maintained Schools 2019-20	Duncan James-Pike
7.	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019-20	Duncan James-Pike
8.	Review of the Split Sites Factor	Jerome Francis / Duncan James-Pike
9.	New High Needs Task and Finish Group	David Kilgallon
10.	Consultation on Scheme for Financing Schools	Raina Turner
11.	Chair of Schools Forum	Maureen Okoye
12.	Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 16 January 2019 5:30pm (Light refreshments from 5:00pm) Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall	All

MINUTES OF SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
Wednesday 14 November 2018
Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall
5:30pm – 7pm

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

Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)	
Gary Pocock	Hornbeam Academy
PRU (1)	
Gabrielle Grodentz Rep: Catherine Davis	Hawkswood Group
Non-School Representatives (4)	
Sarah Kendrick	Redwood Pre-School – Early Years Provider (Not present)
Steve White	Trade Unions, NUT (Not present)
Joy Kettyle	Waltham Forest College representing the 16-19 Providers Sector (Not present)
Moira Bishop	Diocesan
LBWF Officers	
Duncan James-Pike	Strategic Finance Advisor – Children and Young People Services
Raina Turner	Head of Education Finance
Linzi Roberts-Egan	Deputy Chief Executive, Families and Homes
David Kilgallon	Director of Learning and System Leadership
Sergio Dimech	Principal Accountant Education Finance
Observers	
Jerome Francis	
Apologies	
Sarah Kendrick	Redwood Pre-School – Early Years Provider
Lynne Harrowell	Larkwood Primary Academy
Helen Currie	Church Hill & Low Hall Nursery Schools
Anne Powell	Riverley Primary Academy
Raza Ali	Leytonstone School
Steve White	Trade Unions, NUT
Joy Kettyle	Waltham Forest College representing the 16-19 Providers Sector
Cllr Akhtar Beg	Edinburgh Primary

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

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

2. **Declaration of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 September 2018 and Matters Arising.**

The minutes were agreed with amendments. These include:

- Under Attendees: Kathryn Souland from Greenleaf Primary rep: Jane Harris. Jane Harris was not present.
- Under Attendees: School Mark Morrall represents should read South Chingford Foundation.
- Item 9 (DSG Pressures), 2nd answer reading *“Primary numbers will go up rapidly although at present we are not sure exactly how it will look like”* to be deleted.

3.1 **Matters Arising**

None

3.2 **Decision Sheet from Meeting 19 September 2018**

School Forum agreed this is an accurate record of the meeting.

3.3 **Statement of movements in Reserves**

School Forum noted the statement.

3.4 **DCE Presentation to September 2018 Schools Forum**

School Forum noted the presentation slides.

4. **High Needs Pressures**

This report proposes that Schools Forum agree to transfer £1 million (0.5%) of Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block in 2019-20 to mitigate the financial pressures in the High Needs Block. This is a short-term action to slow the pace of the accumulating deficit balance and create time to consider other measure to reduce pressure from High Needs. The Local Authority and Schools will need to work together to address these pressures. Top Slice of 0.5% is part of the solution.

4.1 **Comments, Questions & Responses**

- 4.1.1 Question: Currently, schools managing day to day are being squeezed and they have had to make some resource and financial cuts. Can you provide a projection on the financial pressures that will be coming forward in the next year to help reflect on this discussion and decision?

- 4.1.2 Response: The Local Authority has invested some money to support schools in dealing with the financial pressures they are facing. We are aware this is a systemic issue and we have to target it. The top slice deals with the current situation to offset the deficit which indicates we are likely to maintain this position however an accurate projection cannot be provided at present.
- 4.1.3 Comment: There is an early indication that as budgets are set for December, there will be additional monies for the forthcoming year for schools on top of the normal distribution. Pressures still remain even with additional support as it will not breach the gap. There is no additional resource available for what school can do separately.
- 4.1.4 Question: Is the 0.5% top slice just for 1 year?
- 4.1.5 Response: The Local Authority can only ask for this 1 year at a time. The Local Authority is allowed to ask for it a second year as per guidance and hence we may come back to ask again next year if the gap is not bridged. It's an on-going commitment based on the current state.
- 4.1.6 Response: It is likely the Local Authority will ask for this again next year. The current proposal is not sustainable in dealing with the current issue and may increase from the position of 0.5% if we have not been able to slow the growth of the deficit. Part of this will include reviewing alternative provision and other resources. Moving forward from today meeting, the Local Authority will evaluate the position for next year.
- 4.1.7 Comment: Strategic response is good and the only path forward is to do things differently. Different measures should take into consideration Early Intervention, Resource provisions including Special Schools and PRU. We can't continue doing what we are doing. May need to accept that Schools will attract less funding and have to work differently to meet the pupil's needs as well as consider the long term plan.
- 4.1.8 Comment: It is increasing difficult to meet the cost of the individual child and this has been ongoing for some time now. Here is hoping we don't have to make decisions about keeping the units or closing them. We need to know that if we have less capacity at Special Schools, that pupil's will end up in classrooms as the SEND guidance states you cannot move them from mainstream school.
- 4.1.9 Question: previously, there was a discussion around Special Schools contribution to this. Is there a decision about subsidy as well?
- 4.1.10 Response: If School Forum agrees to transfer the 0.5%, there will be discussion with Special Schools about the contribution they will need to make. This is part of the mechanism that can be used. If a decision is made today, there will be continued discussions around this.
- 4.1.11 Question: Is the letter included in the pack a draft copy?
- 4.1.12 Response: It's a draft with the content based on previous discussions.
- 4.1.13 Comment: It was pointed out the letter could be more specific in its request and for the last paragraph to be tailored to the person who will be reading the letter.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.2.1 Schools Forum notes:

4.2.1.1 The reasons for the LA requesting a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block as set out in section 3 of this report.

4.2.2 Schools Forum agrees:

4.2.2.1 To transfer 0.5% of the 2019-20 Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block.

4.2.2.2 To send a letter to the Secretary of State for Education explaining that Schools Forum have agreed reluctantly to the transfer in the spirit of partnership, sharing the local authority's view that there is no other option in the short term to mitigate the pressures in the High Needs Block; highlighting current and expected budget pressures faced by schools in our borough; and setting out why it is unreasonable for the DFE to add a further financial burden onto schools. (See Appendix A for draft letter to the Secretary of State).

4.2.3 VOTES: 16 against and 1 abstention.

4.3 Comment: A modified letter should still be sent to the Secretary of State detailing the financial pressures on Schools. Learning Partnership and Heads of Secondary Schools agreed to draft and send a modified version of the letter.

4.4 Comment: The letter must reflect the consideration given to the decision made which was not agreeing to the transfer of 0.5%.

4.5 Comment: The current letter should School Forum have agreed with the 0.5% transfer states that 'School Forum have agreed reluctantly with the top slice in the spirit of partnership sharing the Local Authority's view that there is no other option in the short term to mitigate these pressures'. The language in the letter to be drafted must be carefully constructed as if it reflects that the Local Authority and Schools Forum are not in agreement over this; the DFE would say they are not involved and it's a matter for the two groups to sort out.

4.6 Comment: Schools support the fact that measures need to be taken to mitigate the financial pressures however; we are not in agreement of how it is being done. We wouldn't want to go back to the Governors/ Head Teachers (for those representing them) saying we agreed to a 0.5% cut. After a long debate, School Forum decided to vote against the 0.5% cut on a matter of principle and the impact it will have on Schools. School Forum understands the Local Authority's position.

5 Local Funding Formula

5.1 Comments, Questions & Responses

5.1.1 Question: If we transfer the £1million, would this impact Schools as shown in figures.

5.1.2 Response: Yes, the figures are a series of actions that follow based on the decision made. Figures shown in Appendix C2, C3 and C4 are linked to the transfer of the £1 million. It shows the options, impact, contributions and cost.

5.1.3 Question: Is it likely that Waltham Forest will gravitate to the National Funding Formula over time?

5.1.4 Response: It is unclear what our position will be. We can't necessarily expect the same increase following this year's in 2019-20 subject to the current financial situation and the 2020 spending review... The original national position was reversed before the general election.

5.1.5 Comment: On behalf of Secondary Heads, we sought to continue all different aspects of this in order to make a decision and it's clear we need to do something different than what we are doing while moving toward the National Funding Formula and away from the Local Funding Formula. There should be some protection and some capping. If the MFG is set at 0%, it will not be bringing any change towards the National Funding Formula and hence, will not be supporting the status quo from last year nor the full move.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.2.1 Schools Forum to note:

5.2.1.1 That option (a) in each of the following recommendations mirrors decisions taken in 2018-19. If any one of the other options is chosen there will be a short general consultation with schools with the results reported back to Schools Forum to consider in December.

5.2.2 Schools Forum to agree that when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to:

5.2.2.1 Set the Local Funding Formula by using one of these methods:

- a) Using the same formula factor rates as in 2018-19.
- b) Mirroring the national funding formula by using formula factor rates close to those in the NFF.
- c) Moving £1 million from FSM6 to Low Prior Attainment in each phase.
- d) Setting the FSM6 factor rates at the NFF level and moving the balance created in each phase to Low Prior Attainment in that phase.

VOTES:

- a) 0
- b) 0
- c) 15

d) 0

2 people abstained from voting.

5.2.2.2 Set the MFG at one of:

- (a) -0%
- (b) -0.5%
- (c) -1.0%
- (d) -1.5%

VOTES:

a) 8

b) 8

c) 0

d) 0

1 person abstained from voting.

5.2.2.3 Ensure that that no school contributes to the cost of MFG more than:

- a) 1% of its pre-MFG budget
- b) 3% of its pre-MFG budget
- c) 5% of its pre-MFG budget

VOTES:

a) 16

b) 0

c) 0

1 person abstained from voting.

5.2.2.4 Use any increase in funding to one of the following:

- a) Increase Primary lump sum by up to £10,000 and add any remaining increase in funding to AWPU
- b) AWPU

VOTES:

a) 7

b) 8

2 people abstained from voting.

5.3 Comment: there will be a consultation for two weeks due to the split votes in point 5.2.2.2. and the changes agreed in 5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.4

6 AOB

Papers to be circulated to the entire distribution list at the same time and uploaded to the Hub. All who did not receive papers to inform Duncan to ensure we have the correct email address.

- 7 **Date of Next Meeting:** Wednesday 12 December 2018. 5:30pm (Light refreshments from 5:00pm). Council Chambers, Waltham Forest Town Hall

DRAFT

Schools Forum 14 November 2018

Summary of Decisions

Item 4 **High Needs Pressures**

Schools Forum did not agree:

2.2.1 To transform 0.5% of the 2019-20 Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block.

Therefore recommendation 2.2.2 that a letter be sent to the Secretary of State for Education explaining that Schools Forum had agreed reluctantly to the transfer became redundant.

Item 5 **Local funding Formula**

Schools Forum noted:

2.1.1 That option (a) in each of the following recommendations mirrors decisions taken in 2018-19. If any one of the other options is chosen there will be a short general consultation with schools with the results reported back to Schools Forum to consider in December.

Schools Forum agreed:

2.1. That when the Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to:

- A) Set the Local Funding Formula by moving £1 million from FSM6 to Low Prior Attainment in each phase (option c).
- B) Set the MFG at 0% (option a) **or** -0.5% (option b).
- C) Ensure that no school contributes to the cost of MFG more than 1% of its pre-MFG budget (option a).
- D) Use any increase in funding for AWPU (option b).

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	4
Report Title	Local Funding Formula 2019-20		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		
Appendices	Appendix A: Consultation documents		

1. SUMMARY

1.1. On 14 November Schools Forum agreed to two changes to how the 2019-20 budget should be set compared to the 2018-19 budget and were split on whether to make a third change.

1.2 Following a short consultation, Schools Forum is invited to confirm its decisions.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

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

2.2 **Schools Forum to confirm** 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.

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

2.3.1 0%; **or**

2.3.2 0.5%.

3. REASON

3.1 On 14 November Schools Forum agreed that when Local Authority sets the 2019-20 School Budgets, the LA should aim to set the Local Funding Formula by: moving £1 million from FSM6 to Low Prior Attainment in each phase; and use any increase in funding for AWPU.

- 3.2 There was a tied vote on whether to change the MFG from 0% to -0.5%.
- 3.3 As these two (potentially three) decisions are different from how the 2018-19 budget was set compared to the 2018-190 budget, the LA conducted a wider consultation for Schools Forum to consider.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 A short consultation was launched from 20 November to 3 December. The consultation documents can be found at Appendix A.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS

- Q1. Should the Local Funding Formula be varied by moving £1 million from the Free School Meals Ever 6 (FSM6) factor to the Low Prior Attainment factor in each phase?

YES	26
NO	5

Comments

- Although I am agreeing with this, funding for FSM Ever 6 I thought was ring-fenced for identified children. For our school this is the better option.
- Although, I feel sad because the FSM money should be ring-fenced.
- In principle yes, we as a school lose the most in this move but we have always responded to these types of consultation process with the wider picture in mind similar to when we supported primary schools receiving more money in the last formal consultation process. We would only support this move if the MFG protection was set to 0% so it alleviates our losses in the short term.
- Maintaining the status quo in the current uncertainty seems the most appropriate approach.
- As a Junior Academy we are different to an all-through primary setting as our KS1 infant school results dictate our funding for our Low Prior Attainment. How will this impact upon the transitional protection period for those pupils eligible for FSM until end of educational phase?

Q2. Should the Minimum Funding Guarantee be set at 0% OR -0.5%?

0%	19
-0.5%	11

Comments

- Again, best out of the all the options, for a minimum loss to the school.
- This should continue to alleviate the short term losses for schools.
- Certainty of funding will aid planning at this current time
- Given the uncertainty over future funding is seems inappropriate to change matters at present. Consistency of funding will give schools the certainty to plan and manage effectively

Q3. Should the whole of any increase in funding be added to the Basic Entitlement – Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)?

YES	26
NO	4

Comments

- This appears to be a fair option
- All schools desperately need further funding and any increase should be fairly distributed to all schools through the AWPU.
- This would seem the fairest and most equitable solution
- At this juncture it would seem the most equitable means of allocating any additional funding
- As I understand this means we will have greater freedom over how we spend this based on the needs of our own school and its priorities.
- I think that any increase in funding should go towards ensuring that the Primary Lump Sum of £10,000 remains in place. Any additional money should then go towards increasing the AWPU.

- I would prefer the model that increases the lump sum to primary schools

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	5
Report Title	Central School Services Block 2019-20		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		
Appendices	Appendix A: Responsibilities local authorities hold for all schools		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report sets out the services funded from the Central School Services Block (CSSB) and requests that this funding is retained centrally.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Schools Forum **to note** the expected value of the CSSB for 2019-20 is £1.515 million from which the DFE will deduct £175,000 for copyright licenses.
- 2.2 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):
- 2.2.1 Admissions: £745,000
- 2.2.2 Retained Duties: £539,000
- 2.2.3 Schools Forum: £56,000

3. REASON

- 3.1 The Schools revenue funding 2019 to 2020 Operational guide states that responsibilities held by local authorities for all schools are funded from the central schools services block, with the agreement of schools forums.
- 3.2 Schools Forum approval is required each year to confirm the amounts on each line.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1. Composition of the CSSB

- 4.1.1 The CSSB was introduced in 2018- 2019 to fund local authorities for the statutory duties that they hold for both maintained schools and academies.
- 4.1.2 The CSSB brings together: funding previously allocated through the retained duties element of the Education Services Grant; funding for ongoing central functions previously top-sliced from the Schools Block (in Waltham Forest these are Admissions, Schools Forum administration and Copyright Licences); and residual funding for historic commitments, previously top-sliced from the Schools Block (none in Waltham Forest).
- 4.1.5 The duties included in the CSSB are set out in Appendix A.

4.2 Education Services Grant (ESG) Exit strategy

- 4.2.1 The CSSB includes a continuation of the Retained Duties funding: originally the £15 per pupil in schools and academies in the ESG; and formed the second of the three elements of phase 2 of the ESG Exit Strategy presented to the September 2017 Schools Forum. The three elements of Phase 2 were: the “Purchasing Intentions” exercise; the retained duties funding from the CSSB; and the request for de-delegation by maintained schools of £19.78 per pupil to cover costs that the local authority incurs for its maintained schools and that academy trusts have to fund for themselves.
- 4.2.2 The continued agreement of Schools Forum for the Retained Duties element of the CSSB to be retained centrally is therefore crucial for the successful maintenance of the ESG Exit Strategy and will support the LA to keep its commitments to maintain services that schools are contributing to such as Early Help and Community Safety.

4.3 Regulations

- 4.3.1 Where local authorities hold duties in relation to all schools (as set out in Schedule 2, Parts 1 to 5 of the School and Early Years Finance Regulations 2017), all schools must be treated on an equivalent basis.
- 4.3.2 Local authorities should not be treating voluntary aided schools, foundation schools, or academies, differently from maintained schools in the services they provide to them; this is set out in the DSG conditions of grant.
- 4.3.3 Schools such as voluntary aided schools, foundation schools, and academies, cannot therefore be charged for services that are provided free of charge to community and voluntary controlled schools, and paid for out of the centrally held DSG.
- 4.3.4 This does not include funding that has been retained centrally from maintained school budgets only (as set out in Schedule 2, Parts 6 and 7),

where some statutory duties relate to community and voluntary controlled schools only. However, in these situations authorities should not charge voluntary aided and foundation schools if requested to provide services to these schools and where there is no charge to community and voluntary controlled schools for the same service.

4.3.5 Services will also include administrative costs and overheads relating to these services (regulation 1(4)) for:

- Expenditure related to functions imposed by or under Chapter 4 of Part 2 of the 1998 Act (financing of maintained schools), the administration of grants to the authority (including preparation of applications) and, where it's the authority's duty to do so, ensuring payments are made in respect of taxation, national insurance and superannuation contributions;
- Expenditure on recruitment, training, continuing professional development, performance management and personnel management of staff who are funded by expenditure not met from schools' budget shares and who are paid for services;
- Expenditure in relation to the investigation and resolution of complaints; and
- Expenditure on legal services.

4.4 CSSB 2018-19 and 2019-20

4.4.1 The CSSB Baselines for 2018-19 and 2019-20 issued by the EFSA are set out in the table below:

Service	Expected 2018-19	Actual 2018-19	Expected 2019-20
Admissions	£745,000	£745,000	£745,000
Retained Duties	£623,000	£578,000	£539,000
Copyright Licences	£160,000	£175,000	£175,000
Schools Forum	£56,000	£56,000	£56,000
TOTAL	£1,584,000	£1,554,000	£1,515,000

4.4.2 The actual CSSB received in 2018-19 was £30,000 (2%) lower than expected and the cost of copyright licences increased by £15,000. The £45,000 cost of these changes has been covered by adjusting the LA's medium term financial strategy (MTFS). Similarly, the further £39,000 (2.5%) reduction in funding for 2019-20 has been covered within the LA's MTFS.

- 4.4.3 Services that are covered by the CSSB were subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increases in expenditure from 2017 to 2018. This limit does not now apply to admissions or the servicing of schools forums, but the LA does not propose to increase these amounts.
- 4.4.4 The DFES has indicated that the CSSB is likely to be reduced by each year and Schools Forum is asked to approve funding for 2019-20, subject to final funding announcements.

APPENDIX A

Central services that may be funded with agreement of schools forums

Source: *Schools Revenue Funding 2019 to 2020 Operational Guide*, pages 50-55 (left column)

Central services that may be funded with agreement of schools forums
Responsibilities local authorities hold for all schools (funded by the central school services block with the agreement of schools forums)
<p><u>Statutory and regulatory duties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Director of children’s services and personal staff for director (Sch 2, 15a)• Planning for the education service as a whole (Sch 2, 15b)• Revenue budget preparation, preparation of information on income and expenditure relating to education, and external audit relating to education (Sch 2, 22)• Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure not met from schools’ budget shares (Sch 2, 15c)• Formulation and review of local authority schools funding formula (Sch 2, 15d)• Internal audit and other tasks related to the authority’s chief finance officer’s responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 except duties specifically related to maintained schools (Sch 2, 15e)• Consultation costs relating to non-staffing issues (Sch 2, 19)• Plans involving collaboration with other LA services or public/voluntary bodies (Sch 2, 15f)• Standing Advisory Committees for Religious Education (SACREs) (Sch 2, 17)• Provision of information to or at the request of the Crown other than relating specifically to maintained schools (Sch 2, 21)
<p><u>Education welfare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Functions in relation to the exclusion of pupils from schools, excluding any provision of education to excluded pupils (Sch 2, 20)• School attendance (Sch 2, 16)• Responsibilities regarding the employment of children (Sch 2, 18)
<p><u>Asset management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management of the LA’s capital programme including preparation and review of an asset management plan, and negotiation and management of private finance transactions (Sch 2, 14a)• General landlord duties for all buildings owned by the local authority, including those leased to academies (Sch 2, 14b)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Other ongoing duties</u>• Licences negotiated centrally by the Secretary of State for all publicly funded schools (Sch 2, 8) – this does not require schools forum approval• Admissions (Sch 2, 9)• Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils (Sch 2, 10)

- *Remission of boarding fees at maintained schools and academies (Sch 2, 11)**
- Servicing of schools forums (Sch 2, 12)
- Back-pay for equal pay claims (Sch 2, 13)
- Writing to parents of year 9 pupils about schools with an atypical age of admission, such as UTCs and studio schools, within a reasonable travelling distance (Sch2, 23).

**Not current in Waltham Forest*

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	6
Report Title	Services for Maintained Schools 2019-2020		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by <u>Maintained Schools only</u>		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		
Appendices	Appendix A: Responsibilities local authorities hold for maintained schools Appendix B: Illustration of the cost to each maintained school		

1. SUMMARY

1.1.1 This report requests maintenance of the Education Services Grant (ESG) exit strategy by the de-delegation of £19.78 per pupil from maintained schools for services previously funded from the general funding rate of the ESG.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Maintained School members of Schools Forum to agree :

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.

3. REASON

3.1 LAs can fund some services relating to maintained schools only from maintained school budget shares with the agreement of maintained school members of the Schools Forum.

3.2 The relevant maintained schools members of the Schools Forum (primary, secondary, special and pupil referral units (PRUs), should agree the amount the local authority will retain.

3.3 If the LA and Schools Forum are unable to reach a consensus on the amount to be retained by the local authority, the matter can be referred to the Secretary of State.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 Education Services Grant Exit Strategy

4.1.1 In the Director of Learning's letter to Chairs of Governors, "ESG purchasing intentions activity; new arrangements for schools to purchase services", 22 May 2017, the LA stated that:

- *The services that the Council provides to maintained schools only (and that academies have to perform for themselves or pay their MATs to do) have direct staffing costs of £500,000 and these will be charged to maintained schools through de-delegation at £19.78 per maintained pupil. This charge excludes any overheads worth approximately £175,000 which will continue to be borne by the Council.*

4.1.2 In the report "Update on ESG Exit Strategy" to September 2017 Schools Forum the LA stated again that:

- *...maintained schools will be asked to de-delegate £19.78 per pupil in 2018-19 to cover costs that the local authority incurs for its maintained schools and that academy trusts have to fund for themselves, such as preparing annual consolidated accounts and performance information, and health and safety and asset management responsibilities.*

4.1.3 The LA will continue to limit the contribution of maintained schools to £19.78 per maintained pupil for financial year 2019-20 and will limit the contribution of the maintained special school and PRU to £19.78 per place.

4.1.4 This is less than 0.5% of each maintained school's budget share.

4.1.5 This de-delegation request continues the third of the three elements of phase 2 of the ESG Exit Strategy. The three elements of Phase 2 were: the "Purchasing Intentions" exercise; the retained duties funding from the CSSB; and the request for de-delegation by maintained schools.

4.1.6 The agreement of maintained schools to this de-delegation is therefore crucial for the successful continuation of the ESG Exit Strategy and will enable the LA to keep its commitments to maintain services that schools are contributing to such as Early Help and community Safety.

4.1.7 The list of responsibilities local authorities hold for maintained schools that may be funded from maintained school budgets with agreement of the maintained school members of the schools forum is attached as Appendix A.

4.1.8 An illustration of the cost to each maintained school based on the 2018-19 APT (Authority Pro forma Tool) is attached as Appendix B. These figures will be updated when the DFE releases the 2019-20 APT.

4.2 Methodology permitted

4.2.1 LAs should set a single rate per 5 to 16 year old pupil for all mainstream maintained schools, both primary and secondary; in the interests of simplicity, this should be deducted from basic entitlement funding.

4.2.2 No adjustments are allowed to other factors, and the rate will not include early years or post-16 pupils, who are funded through different formulae.

4.2.3 LAs can choose to establish differential rates for special schools and PRUs, if the cost of fulfilling the duty is substantially different for these schools. The rate will be expressed per-place rather than per-pupil for special schools and PRUs.

4.2.4 As with de-delegation, the amount to be held by the local authority will be determined after MFG has been applied.

4.2.5 Services can also include administrative costs and overheads relating to these services for:

- Expenditure related to functions imposed by or under Chapter 4 of Part 2 of the 1998 Act (financing of maintained schools), the administration of grants to the authority (including preparation of applications) and, where it's the authority's duty to do so, ensuring payments are made in respect of taxation, national insurance and superannuation contributions
- Expenditure on recruitment, training, continuing professional development, performance management and personnel management of staff who are funded by expenditure not met from schools' budget shares and who are paid for services
- Expenditure in relation to the investigation and resolution of complaints
- Expenditure on legal services.

4.3 Schools that convert to academy status

4.3.1 If a school converts to academy status, the ESFA will recoup the amount retained for that school from the local authority's DSG for the remaining months of the financial year that the school is an academy.

4.3.2 The academy will be reimbursed in its monthly general annual grant (GAG) payment from the point of conversion.

4.3.3 Unlike for de-delegated services, there will be no phased transfer of funding following conversion so there will be immediate recoupment of this part of the budget.

4.3.4 For example: if a school converts on 1 January 2020 (three months prior to the end of the financial year), ESFA will recoup three twelfths of the retained amount relating to that school.

APPENDIX A

Services to Maintained Schools

Source: Schools Revenue Funding 2019 to 2020 Operational Guide (right column)

Central services that may be funded with agreement of schools forums
Responsibilities local authorities hold for maintained schools (funded from maintained school budgets only) with agreement of the maintained school members of the schools forum)
<u>Statutory and regulatory duties</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Functions of LA related to best value and provision of advice to governing bodies in procuring goods and services (Sch 2, 57)• Budgeting and accounting functions relating to maintained schools (Sch 2, 74)• Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets, and related financial administration (Sch 2, 58)• Monitoring of compliance with requirements in relation to the scheme for financing schools and the provision of community facilities by governing bodies (Sch 2, 59)• Internal audit and other tasks related to the authority's chief finance officer's responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 for maintained schools (Sch 2, 60)• Functions made under Section 44 of the 2002 Act (Consistent Financial Reporting) (Sch 2, 61)• Investigations of employees or potential employees, with or without remuneration to work at or for schools under the direct management of the headteacher or governing body (Sch 2, 62)• Functions related to local government pensions and administration of teachers' pensions in relation to staff working at maintained schools under the direct management of the headteacher or governing body (Sch 2, 73)• Retrospective membership of pension schemes where it would not be appropriate to expect a school to meet the cost (Sch 2, 76)• HR duties, including: advice to schools on the management of staff, pay alterations, conditions of service and composition or organisation of staff (Sch 2, 64); determination of conditions of service for non-teaching staff (Sch 2, 65); appointment or dismissal of employee functions (Sch 2, 66)• Consultation costs relating to staffing (Sch 2, 67)• Compliance with duties under Health and Safety at Work Act (Sch 2, 68)• Provision of information to or at the request of the Crown relating to schools (Sch 2, 69)• School companies (Sch 2, 70)• Functions under the Equality Act 2010 (Sch 2, 71)

- Establish and maintaining computer systems, including data storage (Sch 2, 72)
- Appointment of governors and payment of governor expenses (Sch 2, 73)

Education welfare

- Inspection of attendance registers (Sch 2, 79)

Asset management

General landlord duties for all maintained schools (Sch 2, 77a & b (section 542(2)) Education Act 1996; School Premises Regulations 2012) to ensure that school buildings have:

- appropriate facilities for pupils and staff (including medical and accommodation)
- the ability to sustain appropriate loads
- reasonable weather resistance
- safe escape routes
- appropriate acoustic levels
- lighting, heating and ventilation which meets the required standards
- adequate water supplies and drainage
- playing fields of the appropriate standards
- General health and safety duty as an employer for employees and others who may be affected (Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974)
- Management of the risk from asbestos in community school buildings (Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012)

Central support services *

- *Clothing grants (Sch 2, 53)*
- *Provision of tuition in music, or on other music-related activities (Sch 2, 54)*
- *Visual, creative and performing arts (Sch 2, 55)*
- *Outdoor education centres (but not centres mainly for the provision of organised games, swimming or athletics) (Sch 2, 56)*

Premature retirement and redundancy

- Dismissal or premature retirement when costs cannot be charged to maintained schools (Sch 2, 78)

Monitoring national curriculum assessment

- Monitoring of National Curriculum assessments (Sch 2, 75)

Therapies

- This is now covered in the high needs section of the regulations and does not require schools forum approval

**Not current in Waltham Forest*

APPENDIX B	An illustration of the cost to each maintained school based on the 2018-19 APT (Authority Pro forma Tool). These figures will be updated when the DFE releases the 2019-20 APT.
------------	--

per pupil	£19.78
-----------	--------

School Name	NOR	Education functions for mainstream maintained schools	2018-19 Post MFG Budget	2018-19 Post MFG per pupil Budget	Education functions for mainstream maintained schools as % of budget
Chase Lane Primary School	634.00	£12,540.52	£3,151,623.18	£4,971.01	0.40%
Whitehall Primary School	426.00	£8,426.28	£1,932,085.74	£4,535.41	0.44%
Downsell Primary School	541.00	£10,700.98	£2,879,283.18	£5,322.15	0.37%
Newport School	812.00	£16,061.36	£3,561,247.63	£4,385.77	0.45%
Chapel End Infant School and Early Ye	256.00	£5,063.68	£1,306,848.45	£5,104.88	0.39%
Edinburgh Primary School	570.00	£11,274.60	£2,670,598.70	£4,685.26	0.42%
Greenleaf Primary School	445.00	£8,802.10	£1,944,190.19	£4,368.97	0.45%
Handsworth Primary School	417.00	£8,248.26	£1,720,198.89	£4,125.18	0.48%
Thorpe Hall Primary School	449.00	£8,881.22	£2,045,979.45	£4,556.75	0.43%
The Winns Primary School	785.00	£15,527.30	£3,542,264.85	£4,512.44	0.44%
Woodford Green Primary School	181.00	£3,580.18	£842,913.80	£4,656.98	0.42%
Oakhill Primary School	227.00	£4,490.06	£993,946.09	£4,378.62	0.45%
Henry Maynard Primary School	827.00	£16,358.06	£3,539,034.07	£4,279.36	0.46%
South Grove Primary School	426.00	£8,426.28	£2,248,781.15	£5,278.83	0.37%
Dawlish Primary School	186.00	£3,679.08	£902,757.66	£4,853.54	0.41%
Gwyn Jones Primary School	392.00	£7,753.76	£1,703,454.53	£4,345.55	0.46%
George Tomlinson Primary School	495.00	£9,791.10	£2,233,400.17	£4,511.92	0.44%
Mission Grove Primary School	743.00	£14,696.54	£3,344,637.70	£4,501.53	0.44%
Coppermill Primary School	257.00	£5,083.46	£1,204,939.75	£4,688.48	0.42%
Stoneydown Park School	482.00	£9,533.96	£2,203,182.45	£4,570.92	0.43%
Parkside Primary School	506.00	£10,008.68	£2,339,582.50	£4,623.68	0.43%
The Jenny Hammond Primary School	316.00	£6,250.48	£1,415,873.18	£4,480.61	0.44%
Ainslie Wood Primary School	409.00	£8,090.02	£1,854,783.16	£4,534.92	0.44%
Barn Croft Primary School	191.00	£3,777.98	£953,081.70	£4,989.96	0.40%
Chingford CofE Primary School	403.00	£7,971.34	£1,677,315.31	£4,162.07	0.48%
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	217.00	£4,292.26	£924,313.98	£4,259.51	0.46%
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	216.00	£4,272.48	£992,224.77	£4,593.63	0.43%
St Joseph's Catholic Infant School	169.00	£3,342.82	£838,153.17	£4,959.49	0.40%
Our Lady and St George's Catholic Priir	393.00	£7,773.54	£1,733,590.08	£4,411.17	0.45%
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	411.00	£8,129.58	£1,839,715.08	£4,476.19	0.44%
Frederick Bremer School	878.00	£17,366.84	£6,102,812.11	£6,950.81	0.28%
Heathcote School & Science College	877.00	£17,347.06	£5,836,721.50	£6,655.33	0.30%
Willowfield Humanities College	819.00	£16,199.82	£5,193,383.36	£6,341.13	0.31%
Leytonstone School	814.00	£16,100.92	£5,011,796.93	£6,157.00	0.32%
Walthamstow School for Girls	892.00	£17,643.76	£5,463,768.48	£6,125.30	0.32%
Kelmscott School	860.00	£17,010.80	£5,503,576.08	£6,399.51	0.31%
Holy Family Catholic School	934.00	£18,474.52	£5,617,467.67	£6,014.42	0.33%
Buxton School	1,410.00	£27,889.80	£7,550,691.51	£5,355.10	0.37%
TOTAL	20,266.00	£400,861.48	£104,820,218.21	£5,172.22	0.38%

School Name	2018-19 Places	Education functions	2018-19 Budget	2018-19 Budget per place	Education functions as % of budget
Belmont Park	56.00	£1,107.68	£1,123,333.33	£20,059.52	0.10%
Hawkswood PRUs	309.00	£6,112.02	£7,719,333.33	£24,981.66	0.08%

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	7
Report Title	Growth Fund and Falling Rolls Fund 2019-20		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report sets out the indicative Growth Fund allocation for 2019-20 and proposes for the re-establishment of a falling rolls fund.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Schools Forum to note:

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

2.2 Schools Forum to agree:

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 either:

- a) The Growth Fund scheme is honoured and the Schools Block top-sliced **or**
- b) 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.

3. REASON

- 3.1 Schools Forum decides the level of central spend and the criteria for allocating funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth, including new schools set up to meet basic need, whether maintained or academy.
- 3.2 Schools Forum decides on funding for good or outstanding schools with falling rolls where growth in pupil numbers is expected within three years.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 Growth Funding in the National Funding Formula from 2019-20

- 4.1.1 Growth funding enables LAs to support schools with significant in-year pupil growth, which is not otherwise immediately recognised by the lagged funding system. LAs may also retain a small fund to support schools with temporarily falling rolls. LAs will continue to manage their growth funding locally in 2019-20 as they did in 2018-19.
- 4.1.2 In 2018-19 the DFE allocated £282m of growth funding nationally to LAs based on what they had planned to spend on growth and falling rolls in 2017-18, for Waltham Forest this was £3.2 million.
- 4.1.3 In 2019-20, the DFE are introducing a formulaic approach to allocating growth funding to LAs based on the actual growth that LAs experience, rather than the amount they have historically chosen to spend.
- 4.1.4 Growth allocations for 2019-20 will be based on pupil data from the October 2018 census and the DFE will calculate actual growth allocations for 2019-20 after the October census and provide LAs with the details of their growth allocation as part of their Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation in December 2018.
- 4.1.5 Growth funding will be based on the actual growth in pupil numbers LAs experienced the previous year. Growth will be measured at middle layer super output area (MSOA)¹ level as these are small enough geographical areas to detect 'pockets' of growth within LAs. The DFE will count the increase in pupil numbers in each MSOA in the LA between the two most recent October censuses. Only positive increases in pupil numbers will be included, so a LA with positive growth in one area, and negative growth in another, will not be denied growth funding.
- 4.1.6 For each local authority, the growth factor will allocate:
 - £1,370 for each primary 'growth' pupil,
 - £2,050 for each secondary 'growth' pupil, and

- £65,000 for each brand new school that opened in the previous year (that is, any school not appearing on the October 2017 census but appearing on the October 2018 census)

4.1.7 The DFE set these values by looking at the amount spent on growth across all LAs in 2017-18.

4.1.8 The DFE does not expect LAs to use these rates in their local arrangements for funding growth as growth funding is generally allocated locally for a smaller number of pupils (where additional pupils have required an additional class), and will use higher factor values. The growth factor in the national funding formula is a proxy for overall growth costs at LA level, and not at the level of individual schools.

4.1.9 The DFE does not anticipate that LAs' spending on growth will necessarily match precisely the sum allocated to them for growth, and they will continue to have the ability to 'top slice' their overall schools block funding to fund pupil number growth.

4.1.10 In line with other elements of the national funding formula, the hybrid area cost adjustment (ACA) will be applied to growth allocations to reflect the variation in labour market costs across the country.

4.1.11 There is currently very wide variations in per pupil spend on growth and the DFE will therefore apply protection so that no local authority's growth allocation will fall by more than -0.5% of their overall 2018-19 schools block funding.

4.1.12 In order to make this affordable, the DFE will scale growth gains above a threshold so that LAs will gain in full up to a maximum increase of 50% compared to their 2018-19 growth allocation, with gains above this scaled by a factor of 50%.

4.2 Impact in Waltham Forest

4.2.1 In 2018-19, Waltham Forest received £3.291 million in Growth Funding. Protection under the National Funding Formula suggests that the minimum to be received for 2019-20 is £2.285 million as shown in the table below.

	£m
Growth Funding 2018-19	3.291
<i>Overall Schools Block funding 2018-19</i>	<i>201.120</i>
Maximum deduction 0.5% of Schools Block	-1.006
Minimum Growth Funding expected 2019-20	2.285

- 4.2.2 In 2019-20, the demand on the local Growth Fund falls considerably, as even though there are an extra six secondary bulge classes planned: eight primary bulges mature, 14 primary expansions (started Sept 2012) complete and two secondary expansions (started 2014) complete. In addition, two primary expansions were suspended.
- 4.2.3 It is not possible to predict an accurate cost of the Growth Fund at the time of writing this report moment as it is dependent on the final October 2018 census position and the rate of AWPU and average pupil-led funding which will be set following Schools Forum decisions on the local funding formula and the data in the Authority Pro forma Tool (APT), however it seems likely that payments under the local scheme will be within the funding expected. A full report will be made to the January 2019 Schools Forum.

4.3 Falling Rolls Fund

- 4.3.1 LAs may set aside schools block funding to create a small fund to support good schools with falling rolls, where local planning data shows that the surplus places will be needed within the next three financial years.
- 4.3.2 Schools Forum should agree both the value of the fund and the criteria for allocation and the LA should regularly update Schools Forum on the use of the funding.
- 4.3.2 Criteria for allocating falling rolls funding should contain clear objective trigger points for qualification, and a clear formula for calculating allocations. Differences in allocation methodology are permitted between phases.
- 4.3.3 Compliant criteria would generally contain some of the features set out below:
- Support is available only for schools judged good or outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (this is a mandatory requirement)
 - Surplus capacity exceeds a minimum number of pupils, or a percentage of the published admission number
 - Local planning data shows a requirement for a minimum percentage of the surplus places within the next three years
 - Formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort
 - The school will need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget

4.3.4 Methodologies for distributing funding could include:

- a rate per vacant place, up to a specified maximum number of places (place value likely to be based on AWPU)
- a lump sum payment with clear parameters for calculation (for example, the estimated cost of providing an appropriate curriculum, or estimated salary costs equivalent to the number of staff who would otherwise be made redundant)

4.3.5 Where falling rolls funding is payable to academies, the local authority should fund the increase for the period from the additional September intake through until the following August.

4.3.6 Local authorities should report any falling rolls funds remaining at the end of the financial year to the schools forum.

4.3.7 Funding may be carried forward to the following funding period, as with any other centrally retained budget, and local authorities can choose to use it specifically for falling rolls.

5. FALLING ROLLS PROPOSAL

5.1 Schools that meet the following criteria will receive support from the Falling Rolls Fund:

- Good or Outstanding
- Numbers on Roll are less than 80% of total Planned Admission Number (PAN)
- Numbers on Roll are more than 5% lower in the October 2018 census than the October 2017 census
- School is a planning area where the vacant places are required

5.2 These criteria have been set to ensure that funding supports good and outstanding schools with falling rolls in planning areas where places are needed and the LA cannot not support reductions in PAN and does not support schools that have vacant places as they have increased their PAN for reasons other than addressing basic need.

5.3 Schools will receive protection for the fall in numbers above the 5% threshold. This will be paid at the current AWPU rate. For example, a school that experienced a drop from of 6.5% will receive AWPU for 1.5% of its previous intake.

5.4 There are two schools that would qualify under these criteria: George Tomlinson and St Joseph's Infants. The support to these schools is calculated as follows:

		George Tomlinson	St Joseph's Catholic Infants
A	PAN	600	180
B	Oct 2017 census	495	169
C	Oct 2018 census	456	140
D (C-B)	Fall in NOR	-39	-29
E (D/A)	Fall as % of PAN	-6.5%	-16.1%
F (E-5%)	Fall over 5%	1.5%	11.1%
G (F x A)	This amount over 5% of PAN	9	19.98
H	AWPU (2018-19 rate)	£3,545	£3,546
J (H x G)	Falling Rolls Fund Support	£31,905	£70,849
	Total		£102,754

5.5 The actual amount these schools would receive will be slightly higher once the 2019-20 AWPU rate had been set.

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	8
Report Title	Review of the Split Sites Factor		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		
Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A • Option B • Option C • Split Site Options Compared 		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report proposes changes to the allocation of the Split Site factor keeping the allocation within the ear-marked funding of £745,000 in 2019-20.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **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:

- Option A
- Option B or
- Option C.

3. REASON

- 3.1 The LA received £745,000 for split site funding in 2018-19 and will get the same amount for 2019-20.
- 3.2 Following an appeal from Connaught School for Girls that they met the criteria for a higher level of funding the total allocated in 2018-19 for split-site funding was £815,000, leading to an overspend of £70,000 which was covered by Schools Block reserves.
- 3.3 A task and finish group was established with the aim of reviewing spending and criteria so that it returns to the £745,000 funding envelope, however a consensus was not reached and Schools Forum needs to decide which method of allocation to recommend to the LA.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 A local authority formula can include a factor to provide additional funding to schools that operate on more than one site.
- 4.2 Criteria for providing extra funding should be clear and transparent, incorporating clear and objective trigger points, and a clear formula for allocating additional funding.
- 4.3 All schools and academies that meet the criteria will be eligible for split site funding.
- 4.4 Schools sharing facilities, federated schools and schools with remote sixth forms or remote early years provision are not eligible for split site funding.
- 4.5 Examples of clear trigger points are:
- the sites are a minimum distance apart, as the crow flies, and the sites are separated by a public highway
 - the provision on the additional site does not qualify for an individual school budget share through the DSG
 - the school has remote playing fields, separated from the school by a minimum distance, and there is no safe walking route for the pupils
 - a percentage of staff are required to teach on both sites on a daily basis, to support the principle of a whole school policy and to maintain the integrity of the delivery of the national curriculum
 - a minimum percentage of pupils are taught on each site on a daily basis
- 4.6 Examples of a clear formula for funding schools with split sites are:
- a lump sum payment
 - a per pupil rate
 - a rate per square metre of the additional site
- 4.7 Values for primary and secondary schools may be different. There may be one rate of payment for the first additional site, and a separate rate for each additional site. Payment rates may be stepped, for example as the distance between sites increases.
- 4.8 The split-site funding factor's aim is to mitigate the additional and unavoidable costs of operating over two or more sites so that those schools are not

significantly financially disadvantaged. It does not aim to fully cover the costs of those schools.

4.9 The split-site funding factor was simplified in 2015-16 and has been allocated in the same way each year since, with the exception of adding Frederick Bremer School and removing Willowfield Humanities College in 2016-17.

4.10 Split-site funding was allocated in 2018-19 according to the following criteria:

Level 1	Second site within 1/4 mile of main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	£15,000
Level 2	Sport on a separate site over 1/4 mile away or joint use of sports hall	£40,000
Level 3	Second site over 1/4 mile from main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	£20,000
Level 4	Some movement of pupils between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	£40,000
Level 5	Significant movement of pupils and teachers on a daily basis between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	£110,000

4.11 The current allocations for 2018-19 are set out in Appendix C.

5. DEVELOPMENTS LEADING TO SCHOOLS FALLING OUT OF ELIGIBILITY

5.1 Following significant capital investment across the borough some schools are no longer eligible for split sites funding. Some schools that were formerly split sites have now consolidated onto single sites. Other schools that had to go off site for sports provision now have new sports facilities on site.

5.2 The DfE's Operational Guidance states that:

“Schools sharing facilities, federated schools and schools with remote sixth forms or remote early years provision are not eligible for split site funding.”

Therefore, schools in receipt of Split Sites funding who use their second site exclusively for Early Years provision or sixth form provision are ineligible for the funding as per the guidance above.

5.3 Following these developments six schools are no longer eligible for any split site funding with one further school, Holy Family, no longer able to claim for sports off site.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 All schools in receipt of Split Site funding were asked to provide evidence of the costs they bear as a split site school that would not be the case were they on a single site.
- 6.2 Schools using off-site sports provision provided evidence of their additional costs ranging from £40,000 to £112,000 per annum.
- 6.3 The majority of evidence provided by responding schools identified their costs as not being related to transport/movement of pupils or distance between sites but to do with premises and staffing costs. These costs focused on needing additional Site Service Officers, receptionist/office/security and catering staff, as well as utilities and ICT costs. A map of the responses is set out below:

OPERATIONAL SPLIT SITE COSTS - ALL SCHOOLS	PRIMARY SPLIT SITES	SECONDARY - LESS THAN 50% CURRIC ON BOTH SITES	SECONDARY - MORE THAN 50% CURRIC ON BOTH SITES
Office staff	y	y	y
SSO staff	y	y	y
Cleaning staff	y	y	y
IT & Reprographics costs	y	y	y
Energy/Utilities	y	y	y
Maintenance	y	y	y
MDA staff	y	y	y
DSL staff	y	y	y
Additional catering costs including energy consumption	y	y	y
Insurance costs	y	y	y
Additional training(eg First Aiders & Safeguarding)	y	y	y
SLA's often doubled	y	y	y
Parking	y	y	y
ADDITIONAL SPLIT SITE COSTS BORNE BY SECONDARIES			
Additional Science Technicians		y	y
Security Staff			y

- 6.4 A majority of the schools fit into one category: 'true split site', where the schools have two distinct sites, both with receptions, catering facilities etc. The majority of these are Primary Schools.

- 6.5 Another category which emerged is those schools that have pupil movement between sites. A number have insufficient facilities for the full sports curriculum on site and thus have to transport and rent facilities off site.
- 6.6 One secondary school has a separate science block necessitating large pupil movement on a daily basis, but not with some of the associated costs of the 'true split site'. Another secondary has two large split sites, both hosting a wide array of subjects. It was therefore deemed appropriate to differentiate between the two, done by introducing two tiers, one for 'Over 50% of curriculum is taught on both sites' and another for 'Less than 50% of curriculum is taught on both sites.'
- 6.7 One school is in a unique situation in that it has no sports facilities on site and as a result has to hire off site facilities for all sports provision.
- 6.8 Different models and criteria were presented to three Task and Finish Group meetings on 2 October, 6 November and 27 November.

7. OPTIONS

- 7.1 Attached to this report are the final two models from the 27 November meeting and one further model.
- 7.2 Option A is the most beneficial to primaries, giving each primary an extra £20,000 or £25,000. It represents a shift of around £105,000 from secondaries.
- 7.3 Option B is less beneficial to primaries, giving each primary an extra £12,775 or £17,775. It represents a shift of around £40,000 from secondaries. A feature of this option is the support given to Holy Family which secondary colleagues agreed faced particular challenges.
- 7.4 Option C was not presented to the task and finish group but has been tabled by officers as a possible compromise position. Option C gives each primary an extra £16,000 or £21,000 and represents a shift of around £69,000 from secondaries.

OPTION A

HOLY FAMILY & CONNAUGHT MOVE ONTO SECONDARY SPLIT SITE BAND, BUT DIFFERENTIATED AS CONNAUGHT'S SECOND SITE IS ANNEX HOSTING SCIENCE AND SPORTS, AS OPPOSED TO FULL CURRICULUM. CONNAUGHT AND HOLY FAMILY REMAIN ON A PUPIL MOVEMENT BAND, LOWER THAN REGULAR DUE TO THE NATURE AND COST OF PUPIL MOVEMENT. SPORTS ALLOCATED ACCORDING TO COSTINGS ON 'SPLIT SITES COSTS' TAB.

				CURRENT FUNDING 2018-19	PROPOSED 2019-20	CHANGE IN FUNDING
				£	£	£
	NO LONGER ELIGIBLE	New Sports Facilities built	Holy Family (Sports)	40,000	0	-40,000
		New Sports Facilities built	Leytonstone School	40,000	0	-40,000
		New build = Consolidated site	George Mitchell (Secondary)	40,000	0	-40,000
		New build = Consolidated site	George Mitchell (Primary)	15,000	0	-15,000
		New build = Consolidated site	Buxton	15,000	0	-15,000
		The second site is an Nursery/EY centre and therefore not covered by Schools Block funding	Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	15,000	0	-15,000
		The second site is an Nursery/EY centre and therefore not covered by Schools Block funding	Newport School	15,000	0	-15,000
		The second site is an Nursery/EY centre and therefore not covered by Schools Block funding	Sybourn Primary School	20,000	0	-20,000
Level 1	SPLIT SITE - OPERATIONAL - THIS IS A FLAT SUM PAYMENT FOR SCHOOLS WHO HAVE SPLIT SCHOOL SITES REQUIRING TWO RECEPTIONS/OFFICES	PRIMARY	Davies Lane	15,000	40,000	25,000
			Henry Maynard Primary School	15,000	40,000	25,000
			Stoneydown Park School	15,000	40,000	25,000
			Barclay Primary School	20,000	40,000	20,000
			Chingford CofE Primary School	20,000	40,000	20,000
			Hillyfield Primary Academy	20,000	40,000	20,000
			Mission Grove Primary School	20,000	40,000	20,000
			Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	20,000	40,000	20,000
			The Woodside Primary Academy	20,000	40,000	20,000
					SECONDARY - MORE THAN 50% OF CURRICULUM IS TAUGHT ON BOTH SITES	Holy Family
SECONDARY - LESS THAN 50% OF CURRICULUM IS TAUGHT ON BOTH SITES	Connaught School for Girls	110,000			60,000	-50,000
Level 2	CURRICULUM MOVEMENT - THIS IS FOR SCHOOLS WHERE INSUFFICIENT FACILITIES ON ONE SITE FOR FULL CURRICULUM REQUIRING MOVEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE SITES	REGULAR - SCHOOLS WHERE THE AVERAGE PUPIL MOVES LESS THAN DAILY BUT MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK BETWEEN SITES - BUT WITH TRAVEL/HIRING COSTS	Walthamstow School for Girls	40,000	30,000	-10,000
			Frederick Bremer	40,000	30,000	-10,000
		SIGNIFICANT MOVEMENT - SCHOOLS WHERE THE TYPICAL PUPIL MOVES BETWEEN SITES ON A DAILY BASIS - BUT WITHOUT TRAVEL/HIRING COSTS	Holy Family		22,250	22,250
			Connaught School for Girls		22,250	22,250
Level 3	NO OR LIMITED SPORTS FACILITIES ON SCHOOL SITE AND SIGNIFICANT MOVEMENT	NO TRAVEL	Kelmscott School	40,000	45,000	5,000
		TRAVEL OVER 1 MILE TO SPORTS SITE	Norlington School and 6th Form	110,000	90,000	-20,000
				815,000	744,500	
				AVAILABLE 2019-20	745,000	745,000
				Overspend	-70,000	

OPTION B

REMOVING NON-ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS AND DISTRIBUTING UNDERSPEND AMONGST LEVELS 1 & 3 AS SUBMITTED COSTS SUGGEST THESE GROUPS ARE MOST UNDERFUNDED AT CURRENT(18-19) FUNDING

			2018-19	2019-20	CHANGE
LEVELS			£	£	£
Level 1	within 1/4 mile of main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	Buxton	15,000		-15,000
		George Mitchell (Primary)	15,000		-15,000
		Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	15,000		-15,000
		Davies Lane Primary School	15,000	32,775	17,775
		Henry Maynard Primary School	15,000	32,775	17,775
		Newport School	15,000		-15,000
		Stoneydown Park School	15,000	32,775	17,775
Level 2	Sport on a separate site over 1/4 mile away or joint use of sports hall	Frederick Bremer	40,000	40,000	0
		Holy Family	40,000		-40,000
		Kelmscott School	40,000	40,000	0
		Leytonstone School	40,000		-40,000
		Walthamstow School for Girls	40,000	40,000	0
Level 3	Second site over 1/4 mile from main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	Barclay Primary School	20,000	32,775	12,775
		Chingford CofE Primary School	20,000	32,775	12,775
		Hillyfield Primary Academy	20,000	32,775	12,775
		Mission Grove Primary School	20,000	32,775	12,775
		Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	20,000	32,775	12,775
		Sybourn Primary School	20,000		-20,000
		The Woodside Primary Academy	20,000	32,775	12,775
Level 4	Some movement of pupils between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	Connaught School for Girls			0
		George Mitchell (Secondary)	40,000		-40,000
Level 5	Significant movement of pupils and teachers on a daily basis between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	Holy Family Catholic School	110,000	130,000	20,000
		Connaught School for Girls	110,000	100,000	-10,000
		Norlington School and 6th Form	110,000	100,000	-10,000
			815,000	744,975	-70,025

Schools appearing in two Levels

George Mitchell		55,000	0	-55,000
Holy Family		150,000	130,000	-20,000

OPTION C

2018-19

2019-20 CHANGE

SUGGESTED COMPROMISE MODEL			£	£	£
Level 1	within 1/4 mile of main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	Buxton	15,000		-15,000
		George Mitchell (Primary)	15,000		-15,000
		Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	15,000		-15,000
		Davies Lane Primary School	15,000	36,000	21,000
		Henry Maynard Primary School	15,000	36,000	21,000
		Newport School	15,000		-15,000
		Stoneydown Park School	15,000	36,000	21,000
Level 2	Sport on a separate site over 1/4 mile away or joint use of sports hall	Frederick Bremer	40,000	40,000	0
		Holy Family	40,000		-40,000
		Kelmscott School	40,000	40,000	0
		Leytonstone School	40,000		-40,000
		Walthamstow School for Girls	40,000	40,000	0
Level 3	Second site over 1/4 mile from main site with no movement of pupils on a daily basis	Barclay Primary School	20,000	36,000	16,000
		Chingford CofE Primary School	20,000	36,000	16,000
		Hillyfield Primary Academy	20,000	36,000	16,000
		Mission Grove Primary School	20,000	36,000	16,000
		Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	20,000	36,000	16,000
		Sybourn Primary School	20,000		-20,000
		The Woodside Primary Academy	20,000	36,000	16,000
Level 4	Some movement of pupils between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	George Mitchell (Secondary)	40,000		-40,000
Level 5	Significant movement of pupils and teachers on a daily basis between sites more than 1/4 mile apart	Holy Family Catholic School	110,000	111,000	1,000
		Connaught School for Girls	110,000	95,000	-15,000
		Norlington School and 6th Form	110,000	95,000	-15,000
			815,000	745,000	-70,000

Schools appearing in two Levels

George Mitchell		55,000
Holy Family		150,000

0	-55,000
111,000	-39,000

SPLIT SITE OPTIONS COMPARED	CURRENT FUNDING 2018 19	OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C	GAIN OR LOSS FROM CURRENT BY EACH OPTION		
					OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C
Buxton	15,000	0	0	0	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
George Mitchell	55,000	0	0	0	-55,000	-55,000	-55,000
Barclay Primary School	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	15,000	0	0	0	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
Chingford CofE Primary School	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Davies Lane Primary School	15,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	25,000	17,775	21,000
Henry Maynard Primary School	15,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	25,000	17,775	21,000
Hillyfield Primary Academy	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Mission Grove Primary School	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Newport School	15,000	0	0	0	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Stoneydown Park School	15,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	25,000	17,775	21,000
Sybourn Primary School	20,000	0	0	0	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
The Woodside Primary Academy	20,000	40,000	32,775	36,000	20,000	12,775	16,000
Connaught School for Girls	110,000	82,250	100,000	95,000	-27,750	-10,000	-15,000
Frederick Bremer	40,000	30,000	40,000	40,000	-10,000	0	0
Holy Family	150,000	107,250	130,000	111,000	-42,750	-20,000	-39,000
Kelmscott School	40,000	45,000	40,000	40,000	5,000	0	0
Leytonstone School	40,000	0	0	0	-40,000	-40,000	-40,000
Norlington School and 6th Form	110,000	90,000	100,000	95,000	-20,000	-10,000	-15,000
Walthamstow School for Girls	40,000	30,000	40,000	40,000	-10,000	0	0
	815,000	744,500	744,975	745,000	-70,500	-70,025	-70,000
PRIMARY					195,000	129,975	159,000
SECONDARY					-105,500	-40,000	-69,000

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	9
Report Title	New High Needs Task and Finish Group		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor, 020 8496 3502 duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk		
	Appendix A: New terms of reference Appendix B: Current terms of reference		

1. SUMMARY

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

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Schools Forum to agree:

- 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.

3. REASON

- 3.1 Waltham Forest's High Needs Block (HNB) is currently projected to have a funding gap of around £1.4 million in 2018-19 after the last of the High Needs reserves have been applied. The base budget gap for 2019-20 is estimated to be £2 million. Carrying forward the deficit (and assuming that the base budget gap could not be reduced) would mean that the cumulative deficit for 2019-20 would be £3.4 million, approaching 10% of the total HNB allocation and 1% of the total DSG. This would breach the DFE's threshold for deficits and the DFE would require a report that set out the local authority's plans for bringing the DSG back into balance.
- 3.2 The greater the deficit, the greater the efficiencies that will have to be made by the recovery plan across a three-year period over and above addressing the base budget gap.
- 3.3 The current High Needs Inclusion Group, which became a standing sub-group of Schools Forum, needs to be refreshed by establishing a new Inclusion Group to address the funding gap in the High Needs Block.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 The current High Needs Inclusion Group has not had clear or up to date terms of reference; its meetings have not been planned sufficiently in advance leading to poor attendance / representation on occasion; and it has not been able to address the High Needs funding gap.
- 4.2 The terms of reference of the current HN Inclusion Group comprise a number of Schools Forum decisions as set out in Appendix B.
- 4.3 Schools Forum is being asked to refresh the Inclusion Group by adopting new terms of reference as set out in Appendix A.

APPENDIX A

INCLUSION GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. PURPOSE

The LA is required to consult annually on financial issues relating to:

- Arrangements for pupils with special educational needs, in particular the places to be commissioned by the LA and schools and the arrangements for paying top-up funding
- Arrangements for use of pupil referral units and the education of children otherwise than at school, in particular the places to be commissioned by the LA and schools and the arrangements for paying top-up funding

Schools Forum is required to give a view and inform the governing bodies of all consultations.

Schools Forum has established the Inclusion Group initially as a task and finish group with the intention of agreeing proposals to address the funding gap in the High Needs Block.

These proposals will be reported to Schools Forum in June 2019.

2. REPRESENTATION

The Inclusion Group will comprise the following representatives:

Mainstream schools without Special Resource Provision	2
Mainstream secondary schools without Special Resource Provision	2
Mainstream primary schools with Special Resource Provision	1
Mainstream secondary schools with Special Resource Provision	1
Each Special School / Special Academy Trust	3
PRUs / Alternative Provision	1
Early Years Providers	1
Post 16 Providers	1

Each constituent group is responsible for appointing its own representatives.

Representatives commit to representing their constituents at the following meetings:

Weds	28 January		Committee Room 3	2.00 pm to 4.00 pm
Weds	13 February		Committee Room 2	2.30 pm to 4.30 pm
Thurs	21 March		Committee Room 2	10 am to 12 noon
Tues	23 April		Committee Room 2	10 am to 12 noon
Tues	14 May		Committee Room 2	10 am to 12 noon
Weds	12 June	Schools Forum	Council Chamber	From 5.30 pm

Representatives commit to feeding back discussion of the Group to their constituents and representing their constituents' views to the Group.

3. CHAIR

The representatives will elect the Chair and Vice Chair of the Inclusion Group from among themselves.

4. OFFICERS

The lead officer is the Director of Learning and Systems Leadership. Other officers of the LA will attend the inclusion Group as required by the Director.

5. CHATHAM HOUSE RULES

Attendance at the Group meetings will be recorded. The Group meetings will be minuted and the Group will operate under Chatham House rules:

“When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.”

This will be an aid to free discussion of sensitive issues. It provides a way for speakers to openly discuss their views in private while allowing the topic and nature of the debate to be made public and contribute to a broader conversation.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY

The Director may specify that certain items of discussion are restricted and must be kept confidential until proposals are ready to be put to a public consultation. The Group will discuss the need for confidentiality of each item and vote to agree not to share with others, including their constituents, before receiving a presentation or report from the Director or other officers.

APPENDIX B

1. Schools Forum 20 June 2015

Sets the original terms of reference as reviewing the strategic issues, including funding bands applied to EHC plans, nominate members to serve on the group.

DECISION

Schools Forum agreed:

2.1 To establish a Task and Finish Group of school and academy members to meet the commitment to review the strategic issues identified in the report to Schools Forum on 14 January 2015 and repeated in paragraph 1.2 of this report.

2.2 The commitment to consider the balance between SEN school based formula funding and centrally retained HNB funding (including any impact of Free schools on HNB expenditure) will require the Task and Finish group to review the current funding bands applied to Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs).

2.3 To nominate school and academy members to serve on the Task and Finish Group and to nominate other stakeholders to be invited to the Group.

1.2 *The increasing trend in need for Special Educational Needs (SEN) places and consequent pressure on High Needs Block (HNB) funding raises the following strategic issues which will be looked at in time for the 2016-17 financial year:*

(a) The balance between SEN school based formula funding and centrally retained HNB funding including any impact of Free schools on HNB expenditure

(b) Forecast need for mainstream based SEN provision (Special Resourced Provision etc) and the balance between this and special school provision

(c) Review of expenditure on support services and how these could be delivered in the future

(d) Monitoring and quality assurance processes

Schools Forum 16 September 2015

Adds: continues to explore issue of pupils in mainstream schools that are not SEN

To hold further meetings to make informed decisions to make recommendations for 2017-18

Schools Forum agreed:

2.1 Schools Forum makes the following recommendations to the Local Authority (LA) when it sets the notional SEN in the Schools Block budgets and the distribution of funding in the High Needs Block for 2016-17, that:

2.1.1 The factors used in the calculation of notional SEN in the local funding formula remain unchanged.

2.1.2 The proportion applied in the calculation of notional SEN on the targeted pupil support factors should remain unchanged in each phase.

2.1.3 The proportion applied in the calculation of notional SEN on the additional pupil support factors remains unchanged in each phase.

2.1.4 The LA makes recommendations on the distribution of the High Needs Block based on its awareness of local demand and need for high needs funding.

2.1.5 The High Needs Task and Finish Group continues to explore the issue of pupils in mainstream schools with a range of high needs that are not necessarily related to

SEN and so not meeting criteria for additional support funding. The Group will formulate a proposal for addressing this issue for consideration by the Schools Forum at the next meeting in November 2015.

2.1.6 The High Needs Task and Finish Group continues to hold further meetings to make informed decisions with a view to further considering recommendations for changes to be implemented for 2017-18.

11 November 2015: reports that Inclusion Group looking at underspends

3.5 The HNB Inclusion Group, comprising wide representation by head teachers from Schools Forum is closely examining this and previous underspends to establish a strategic direction. The Group's recommendations will be presented as part of a later report to Schools Forum.

13 January 2016: Decides £3.732 million to be determined by Inclusion Group

2.2.9 £3.732m to be determined by Inclusion Group including the use of contingency and further support for pupils with High Needs. £0.214m of this has been agreed on a one year basis to allocate to cover the increase in expenditure on the Schools Block as a result of the EFA requirement to increase the cost of the commission PRU place element from £8k to £10k.

Meeting / Date	SCHOOLS FORUM 12 December 2018	Agenda Item	10
Report Title	Consultation on Scheme for Financing Schools: Maintained Schools Only		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Information		
Report Author/ Contact details	Phil Herd Interim DSG Accountant 020 8496 3703 Phillip.Herd@walthamforest.gov.uk Alternative Contact - Omon Edgal (Senior Accountant) 020 8496 4354 Omon.Edgal@walthamforest.gov.uk		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report explains the procedures for consulting on an update on the Scheme for Financing Schools.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Schools Forum to note:

- 2.1. The consultation process and timelines.
- 2.2 Maintained schools should refer to the DFE model scheme prior to responding to the consultation.

3. REASON

- 3.1 It is a statutory requirement under the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 for LAs to have an up to date Scheme for Financing Schools. The scheme sets out the governance arrangements between maintained schools and local authorities.
- 3.2 All maintained schools must be consulted on the scheme prior to an updated version being forwarded to the DFE.

4. CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 4.1. All maintained schools must be consulted on the proposed changes to the Scheme and this will begin on 17 December 2018. Schools will have until 31 January 2019 to respond to the consultation. Please send responses to EducationFinance@walthamforest.gov.uk. If there are any queries please contact Phillip.Herd@walthamfroest.gov.uk 020 8496 3703 or Omon.Edgal@walthamforest.gov.uk 020 8496 4354.

- 4.2 The Scheme was discussed at a Schools Business Managers meeting on 19 November 2018. There has not yet been any major feedback from that meeting. A further meeting is to be held on 12 December where any verbal feedback will be taken.
- 4.3 An e-mail including the draft scheme document will be sent to every maintained school on 17 December 2018 and also posted onto the Hub.
- 4.4 A report on the consultation responses will be given to Schools Forum on 13 February 2019.
- 4.5 The updated scheme will come into effect from 1 April 2019.

5. CONTENTS OF THE SCHEME

- 5.1. The Scheme covers various governance arrangements to ensure that maintained schools manage their resources effectively. It also places various conditions on the Council to ensure it abides by its statutory obligations with regard to maintain schools.
- 5.2. The majority of what is contained within the scheme is covered by statute. The DFE have a model scheme which has been adopted in updating it. It would be helpful if schools referred to this prior to responding. The web address is:<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schemes-for-financing-schools>