

Direct Dial: Katrina Cope 01522 552104

E-Mail [katrina.cope@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:katrina.cope@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

**COMMITTEE NAME:** Lincolnshire Schools' Forum  
**MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, 14 January 2015  
**MEETING TIME:** 2.00 pm  
**LOCATION:** Council Chamber, County Offices, Newland, Lincoln LN1 1YL

## AGENDA

Item	Title	Pages
1	<b>Apologies for Absence/Replacement Members</b>	
2	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2014</b>	3 - 18
3	<b>Declarations of Members' Interests</b>	
4	<b>School Funding Arrangements 2015/16</b>  <i>(To receive a report from Tony Warnock, Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provides the Schools Forum with a brief on school funding arrangements for 2105/16, and seeks support for the Local Authority's proposals relating to a number of centrally held budgets)</i>	19 - 28
5	<b>Outreach Support Service</b>  <i>(To receive a report from Catherine Southcott, Commissioning Officer, which provides the Schools Forum with an update on the current position of Outreach Services)</i>	29 - 48
6	<b>School Collaboration on Resource Efficiency (SCoRE) Update</b>  <i>(To receive a report from Douglas Robinson, Sustainability Team Leader, which provides the Schools Forum with an update on recent activity)</i>	To Follow

- 7 Universal Infant Free School Meals** 49 - 52
- (To receive a report from Richard Cumbers, Children's Health Programme Manager, which provides the Schools Forum with an update on the progress of the Universal Infant Free School Meal Offer in Lincolnshire)*
- 8 Sector-Led School Improvement Model Update** 53 - 58
- (To receive a report from Andrew McLean, Children's Services Manager – Commissioning, which provides the Schools Forum with an update with regard to Sector Led School Improvement)*
- 9 The School and Early Years Finance Regulations for 2015/16** 59 - 62
- (To receive a report from Tony Warnock, Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which advises the Schools Forum of the publication of the School and Early Years Finance Regulations for 2015/16)*
- 10 Scheme for Financing Schools** 63 - 64
- (To receive a report from Tony Warnock, Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which highlights to the Schools Forum the outcome of a recent consultation with maintained schools regarding a proposed amendment to the Scheme for Financing Schools to increase the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% of budget share)*
- 11 2014/15 Section 251 Benchmarking Information** 65 - 74
- (To receive a report from Tony Warnock, Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provides the Schools Forum with the latest Section 251 benchmarking data published by the Department for Education in September 2014)*
- 12 Academies Update** 75 - 78
- (To receive a report from John O'Connor, Children's Service Manager –Education Support, which provides the Schools Forum with information on the latest number of academies and pupils in academies)*
- 13 Information Pack** 79 - 84



## LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM 8 OCTOBER 2014

### **PRESENT: TERL BRYANT (CHAIRMAN)**

David Bennett (Governor, Horncastle Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School), Graham Burks (Headteacher, Kesteven and Grantham Girls School), Professor Ken Durrands CBE (Governor, The Kings School, Grantham), Roger Hale (Headteacher, Caistor Grammar School), Jonathan Maddox (Headteacher, Bourne Grammar School), Richard Thomson (Headteacher, Rauceby Church of England Primary Academy), Joanne Noble (Headteacher, Gainsborough Nursery School), Roger Hewins (Governor, Corringham Church of England Primary School), Mr Craig Vincent Miller (Governor, All Saints Church of England Primary School, North Hykeham), Patricia Ruff (Headteacher, Dunholme St Chads Church of England Primary School), Bridget Starling (Business Manager, Church of England, Diocesan Education Centre), Dave Thompson (Pupil Referral Unit), Linda Houtby (Principal and Chief Executive, Grantham College), Christine Horrocks (Headteacher, Walton Girls' High School and Sixth Form), Jeremy Newnham (Headteacher, Caistor Yarborough Academy), Michael Pichel-Juan (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School), Scott Healey (Assistant Headteacher De Aston School, Market Rasen), Allan Lacey (Headteacher, St Christopher's School) and Richard Linnel (NUT).

Keith Howkins (Funding Reform Team, Education Funding Agency) attended the meeting as an observer.

Officers in attendance:-

Debbie Barnes (Executive Director of Children's Services), Elizabeth Bowes (Team Leader, Schools Finance Team), Katrina Cope (Team Leader Democratic and Civic Services), Jonas Gibson (Commissioning and Development Manager), Mark Popplewell (Assistant Head of Finance Children's & Specialist Services), Catherine Southcott (Commissioning Officer), Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager) and Paula Whitehead (Manager, Team Around the Child).

### 15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS/NEW MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Michael Follows MBE (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School, Boston), Bridget Robson, (Headteacher, Fortuna Primary School, Lincoln), Vicky Cook (Headteacher Welbourn C of E Primary School, Welbourn), Ian Wilkinson (Headteacher, Deeping St James Community Primary School), Ellenor Beighton (Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) and John Beswick (Governor, Stickney C of E Primary School).

Members were advised that Michael Pichel-Juan (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School), Allan Lacey (St Christopher's School, Lincoln), Scott

## 2

### **LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM 8 OCTOBER 2014**

Healey (Assistant Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) had attended the meeting on behalf of Michael Follows MBE (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School, Boston), Bridget Robson (Headteacher, Fortuna Primary School, Lincoln) and Ellenor Beighton (Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) respectively, for this meeting only.

The Schools Forum were advised that a resignation letter had been received from Sharron Close (Tall Oaks Academy Trust).

Following the election held during August/September 2014, the Forum were advised that two Academy members had been elected they were Jeremy Newnham (Headteacher, Caistor Yarborough Academy) and Christine Horrocks (Headteacher, Walton Girls' High School and Sixth Form).

It was reported that the Schools Forum was still carrying some vacancies and that they were in the following groups:-

- Primary Head Teachers – one vacancy
- Secondary Head Teacher – one vacancy
- Primary Academies – two vacancies

It was highlighted that there had been a poor response overall during the election period, and that the nominations received had only received a small number of votes.

#### 16 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2014

Confirmation was given that with regard to minute item 10 Pupil Premium for Looked After Children (LAC), the termly allocation of £300 related to 1/3 of a year.

Also, with regard to Looked After Children, the Operations and Financial Advice Manager advised that he would find out further information relating to the issue of free school meals in readiness for the next meeting.

It was also highlighted that there was some disappointment from officers a National Fair Funding formula had not yet been introduced.

#### RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Lincolnshire Schools Forum from the 25 June 2014 be agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 17 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Note: Mr Terl Bryant wished it to be recorded that he had an interest in agenda item 4, as a Governor of Stamford Queen Eleanor Community School who had pupils from within Peterborough where funding had been retained.

#### 18 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SEN FUNDING 2015/16

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which outlined to the Schools Forum the Local Authority's (LA) proposals to change the schools funding for primary and secondary schools from 2015/16, to ensure compliance with the DfE's regulations.

In guiding the Forum through the report, particular reference was made to the steps the LA had taken to arrive at the proposals in the report which were set out at Appendix 1. Paragraphs 1 to 8 on pages 18/19 of the report summarised the position taken. It was noted that the LA would have to reduce funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. The DfE's Regulations assumed that schools already had £6,000 available within their budgets to meet the initial costs of pupils with statements, including those at Bands 6 to 8. Officers had reviewed the formula and the results had shown that the LA was able to demonstrate that primary and secondary schools had, respectively, only £3,233 and £2,450 of notional SEN within their current budgets. This was clearly short of the £6,000 that schools were expected to have to meet the initial costs of Band 6 to 8 pupils. The shortfall equated to £1.136m for primary schools and £1.264m for secondary schools giving a total of £2.400m. And as a result of the difference, the LA had come up with a 'best fit' remodelling formulaic approach which would minimise the losses to individual schools.

It was reported that from September 2014, government regulations required statements of special educational needs to be replaced by Education, Health and Care Plans where appropriate. It was noted that Band 6 to 8 statements would disappear and would be replaced by new plans. That under the new system the funding assigned to each child would be to meet their specific needs. Schools would need to demonstrate that they had used £6,000 of their budget to meet the initial costs. It was highlighted that the £6,000 threshold was lower than the LA had been operating since the delegation of funding for Bands 1 to 5 in 2010/11. It was highlighted further that there was a risk that over time this would increase the demands upon the Higher Needs block, and to safeguard this it was proposed that £2m was set aside within the Higher Needs block from 2015/16 to meet any such potential costs. This amount equated to approximately one sixth of the current funding for Band 6 to 8 pupils.

The report also provided information relating to implications for schools where pupils belonged to other LAs, as some LAs had contested the Band 6 to 8 funding rates that Lincolnshire currently applied and had argued that under DfE rules, £6,000 should be deducted because schools were required to meet the first £6,000 from their notional SEN budget, which had led to the non-payment of some schools' invoices. It was noted that the proposal presented in Appendix 1 should help to resolve the issues.

The next steps were that the views expressed by the Schools Forum would be considered and that the final decisions would be reflected in the Authority Proforma Tool that had to be submitted to the Education Funding Agency by 31 October 2014. All schools would then be notified of the detail and the proposed changes and the likely impact upon their budgets for 2015/16 and beyond.

**4**  
**LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM**  
**8 OCTOBER 2014**

In conclusion, the Forum were advised that the LA was required to comply with the DfE's regulations, which included ensuring that Band 6 to 8 statements were correctly funded, and that there will be no impact upon individual pupils with SEN.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- How the proposed remodelling as detailed on page 19, at 5a and 5b would work. The Forum were advised that the proposals ensured that the LA complied with the DfE regulations, that schools were funded fairly; and that the proposals minimised the immediate and long term impact upon individual schools budgets;
- The effect of the gains and losses on primary and secondary schools. Officers advised that paragraph 5 on page 25 provided figures as to the review of projected gains and losses and that at the bottom of page 25 and, top of page 26 were details of the targeted funding which would reduce both the number of schools that would otherwise suffer significant losses and the value of those losses;
- If the LA knew who the students were, could it not be done by on a pupil by pupil basis? Officers advised that it could be done separately, but the LA was trying to make sure that a status quo was maintained; and
- Concern was expressed as to using the £2m underspend from the DSG and a question was asked as to how long the allocation was going to run for. The Forum were advised that it would be for a temporary basis of two years and then released back into the system if it was not required. It was noted further that Headteachers were aware of the proposals and that they were happy with the £6,000.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the report presented be noted.
2. That support be given to the proposals set out in the report including:
  - a. The net reduction in funding for Band 6 to 8 pupils;
  - b. The redistribution of those funds through the factors described in the report;
  - c. The provision of targeted support; and
  - d. The introduction of transitional protection for one year.

**19**     **REVISED SCHOOLS BUDGET 2014/15**

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which advised the Schools Forum of the revised Schools Budget for 2014/15 and sought support for the proposed use of the underspending from 2013/14.

The Assistant Head of Finance, Children's and Specialist Services guided the Forum through the report making reference to:

- The carry forwards for 2012/13, which included the total underspending on the DSG as at 31 March 2013 totalling £16.688m; the commitments against the sum totalling £9.550m; the setting aside of £3m to cover uncertainties; and the recommendation that the £4m balance of the underspending was to be distributed to all county schools. It was noted that this was completed on 1 April 2014;
- It was reported that the underspending carried forward at 31 March 2014 was £15.454m. An explanation of the movement between the opening and closing carry forwards were as follows:- funds earmarked as being commitments payable in 2013/14 £3.565m; the centrally held DSG budgets underspent in 2013/14 of £5.844m (A full explanation of these were detailed in Appendix 1 to the report); and the DfE's adjustment to the 2013/14 Early Years' block increased the DSG by £0.487m;
- The Forum was advised that the current commitments total was £6.846m. Full details were contained within Appendix 2 to the report;
- Appendix 3 provided the Forum with details of proposed developments to use some of the DSG underspending from 2013/14. These totalled £2.055m; and
- It was noted that the uncommitted sum, after the existing commitments and proposed developments had been deducted, was £6.553m. An explanation as to the proposed use of the uncommitted sum was detailed on page 31 of the report. The Forum were advised that it was proposed that c.£2.5m of the DSG underspending for the last year were to be set aside to finance any pressures that emerge as a result of uncertainties relating to the centrally held Dedicated School Budgets. It was the intention of the LA to repeat the approach of the last two years and distribute the remaining balance (£4m) to schools in a way that mirrors as far as possible the DfE's Devolved Formula Capital distribution mechanism.

A discussion ensued, from which the following issues were raised:-

- Some concern was expressed as to the amount of money put aside for sector led development and what that development might look like going forward. It was noted that school improvement needed to change. The current contract was due to end in 2017. The LA had a statutory duty to account for performance across the county. At the moment the LA was working with Headteachers to develop ideas and plans for new imaginative ways of securing school improvement in the medium term. The Forum were advised that by 2015 the LA would need to be clear of what it wanted to do with regard to school improvement;
- Cost of using consultants;
- The cost of the carbon management projects. Some concern was expressed as to whether this represented good value for money, as there had been little evidence as to how much money had been saved. It was suggested that funding needed to be targeted to those schools that needed it most. However, it was noted that the DSG was for the benefit of all schools as was the carbon management initiative;
- The underspend relating to the birth to five staffing;

## 6

### LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM 8 OCTOBER 2014

- School re-organisation, including new schools and closures, the effect of section 106 and CIL; and
- Support was given to the amount of uncommitted funding to be distributed to schools being increased from £4 million to £5 million.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the report be noted.
2. That support be given to:
  - a. the developments, as set out in Appendix 3; and
  - b. the use of the uncommitted sum, as outlined in paragraphs 9 and 10 above, but that the amount distributed to schools being increased from £4m to £5m.

#### 20 FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING FOR 2015/16

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided an update on the DfE's latest announcement on Local Authority (LA) funding for schools from April 2015, and set out the LA's proposal for the use of the additional funding that would be provided.

The report highlighted the background behind the 'Fairer Schools Funding in 2015/16' consultation, and the implications for Lincolnshire, and that on 17 July 2014, the DfE had announced its response to the consultation exercise. The key points to note from the consultation were detailed on pages 39 and 40 of the report presented.

It was highlighted that it was implicit in the DfE's consultation and its calculations that the additional funding was intended for the primary and secondary sectors. However, this matter could not be considered in isolation as there were wider issues affecting the DSG, which had been captured in the earlier report 'Revised School Budget 2014/15'. There were also issues arising from the requirement for the LA to comply with the DfE's regulations relating to SEN funding, which were also captured in the earlier report 'Proposed Changes to SEN funding in 2015/16, which had been considered by the Forum earlier in the agenda.

Having considered all the issues the LA proposed to:

- Transfer £2m in to the Higher Needs block to cover the potential growth in the base budget for SEN, as a result of the DfE's requirement for the LA to delegate some of the funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. This requirement reduced to £6,000 the current threshold at which additional special educational needs funding is provided; and
- Allocate the remaining £2.5m equally between primary and secondary schools (all schools) by uplifting the awpus by the same percentage.

The Forum noted that the final decision on the use of the £4.5m funding needed to be reflected in the LA's Authority Proforma Tool submission to the DfE on 31 October 2014.



During discussion, the following points were raised:

- That for the Schools Block element of the DSG, Lincolnshire had the 40<sup>th</sup> lowest per pupil funding rate of the 152 LA's in 2015/16;
- There was concern raised that the nursery school budget was not going to increase, but the nursery schools still had the same budgetary needs. It was reported that there was an Early Years Premium coming in and that the LA had the discretion to move the money between blocks;
- Concern was expressed that Appendix 1 to the report which highlighted that Lincolnshire was below the minimum awpu rates and that Lincolnshire had been given £4.5m, but was only planning to spend £2.5m; and
- It was highlighted that it was regrettable that there had been a cap on the lump sum, and that the sparsity factor in Lincolnshire did not work. The Forum was advised that the lump sum would remain, but further support would not be given to smaller schools.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the report be noted.
2. That support be given to the Local Authority's proposals for use of the £4.5m increase in DSG from 2015/16, as set out in paragraph 7 of the report and detailed below:-
  - a. Transfer £2m in to the Higher Needs block to cover potential growth in the base budget for SEN as a result of the DfE' requirement for the LA to delegate some of the funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. This DfE requirement reduces to £6,000 the current threshold at which additional special educational needs funding is provided. The LA will be monitoring the response of schools to this change in funding arrangements, and to the introduction of Education, Health and Care plans from September 2014. However, this could create a significant risk to the DSG given school practices in the decade prior to the delegation of Band 1 to 5 statements in 2010/11. If such pressures do not materialise over the next two years as these new systems bed in, this funding would be released.
  - b. Allocate the remaining £2.5m equally between primary and secondary schools by uplifting the awpus by the same percentage.

#### 21 DE-DELEGATION OF MAINTAINED PRIMARY SCHOOLS BUDGETS 2015/16 & 2016/17

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which sought the maintained primary school representatives' approval to the Local Authority's proposal for the de-delegation of the budgets in 2015/16 and 2016/17.

The report provided information as to the background to the proposal; the current financial position; and the proposals the LA intended to implement, these were shown in paragraphs 1 to 5 on pages 44 and 45 of the report presented.

It was reported that the impact of the proposal was to reduce the total budget requirement for all of the services mentioned in the report from £1.439m in 2014/15 to £1.115m p.a. in 2015/16 and 2016/17. That would then create a budget requirement for the two years of £2.230m. After the projected underspending (£1.080m) is deducted, the sum to be de-delegated would be £0.575m for each of the two years. This amount was a significant reduction in the proposed charges to the current year.

Appendix 1 to the report provided details of the current service provision.

#### RESOLVED

That the maintained primary schools representatives supported the proposals for the de-delegation of the budgets for the period 2015/16 and 2016/17 as set out in the report and detailed below:-

1. The services for which funds are de-delegated are primarily staffing based and so for planning purposes, it would be helpful to have more advanced notice of the maintained schools' plans for future de-delegation. Maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum are therefore asked not only to support de-delegation, but to do so for two years commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. The LA proposes that a similar report to this one is produced each year, not only to report on progress and to seek feedback, but also to seek agreement to extend the existing agreement by a further year. This would mean that providing mainstream school representatives are content with the services being provided, the relevant services would always be able to plan with the certainty of two years' further funding.
2. As indicated earlier in this report, it is possible that the budgets de-delegated each year may underspend and it is important that this is earmarked for the benefit of the schools that contribute to those. Unfortunately, recent government regulations prevent certain in-year payments being made to schools by the LA. Furthermore, it could become very confusing for schools, and complicated to administer, if partial refunds are issued to schools on the 1<sup>st</sup> April each year. The LA therefore proposes to adjust the sum that it proposes to de-delegate each year, to take account of the previous underspendings. This way, maintained schools will benefit from any underspendings on their de-delegated budgets by paying reduced amounts in the following financial year. A consequence of this approach, however, will be that the per pupil amounts de-delegated for each service will vary from year to year, but the sums involved should be relatively modest.
3. In light of the 2013/14 actual and 2014/15 projected underspend on the Termination of Employment budget, it is proposed to reduce the budget

requirement from £0.467m to £0.250m p.a. for the next two years. This will be kept under review.

4. It is proposed that the budget requirement for Interim Headteachers is reduced from £0.401m to £0.291m p.a.
5. It is proposed that the funding level for Inclusion and Attendance (Ethnic Minority and Traveller Education Team (EMTET)) is set at £0.188m. A modest increase in budget (c.£0.005m) would therefore be needed to offset the modest reduction in funding that would have arisen from recent academy conversions.

## 22 TEAM AROUND THE CHILD (TAC) IN LINCOLNSHIRE

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Manager, Team Around the Child, which provided an update on Team Around the Child in Lincolnshire, in particular the use of Schools Forum funding; and sought to obtain approval for continuation of the existing funding arrangements.

In guiding the Forum through the report, particular reference was made to multi agency approach to provide Early Help for the young people in Lincolnshire.

The report highlighted that there was an increase in the number of initiations, and open TACs in Lincolnshire. Full details on the Early Help consultant Activity from April to July 2014 were contained in the report, which clearly indicated that there was an increase in activity. In addition the consultants had continued to provide briefing sessions on a single and multi-agency basis, and had also attended Health Team and Schools Cluster meeting on request.

The feedback received from the support provided had been very positive. A snapshot of opinions received following the first four months of the service were detailed in the report presented, but overall, 72% had been positive and 22% had not used the service yet. It was however highlighted that the take up of the offer of Administrative support had been very low. Only 27 requests had been received and dealt with, and these were all requesting invites to be posted out for initial TAC's.

The report detailed the original funding breakdown for the developments. It was noted that the project timescales had been met, and as a result the funding would be used by the year end according to the profile. As a result of the actual usage of the service, and the feedback received, a suggested funding profile was detailed in the report on page 62 to take to service forward.

In conclusion, although the team had only been in place for six months, feedback and evidence had suggested that the team was providing the support that schools and academies required from Early Help Consultants. As a result additional capacity was required in this area and a request was made for the funding to be realigned to enable the number of consultants to double, two per locality and that the that the funding was provided on a permanent basis; and that regular updates were received by the Schools Forum on the impact and needs of the team.

Some concern was expressed as to the wording of the fourth bullet point at the top of page 60, as it implied that the LA was failing 75% of children. Clarification was given that this was meant as a positive statement which identified that the service was improving as a result of the work of the team.

Work was also ongoing with regard to the provision of health visitors and school nurses and that provision would be commissioned in April 2015.

Some concern was expressed as to the costs and what part of the educational budget the funding would be taken from. Officers explained that the funding would come from the Higher Needs block in the DSG.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the update report be accepted.
2. That agreement be given to the continued funding of the team on a permanent basis.
3. That the revised allocation of funding to better meet the need, as detailed below be agreed.

<b><u>Full Year Costs 2015/16</u></b>	<b><u>LCC Costs</u></b>	<b><u>Schools Forum Costs</u></b>	<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>
Team Manager/Practice Supervisor	£59,467*	0	<b>£59,467</b>
TAC Administrators	£125,484	0	<b>£125,484</b>
Early Help Consultants	£97,373	£154,285	<b>£251,658**</b>
Non-staffing costs	0	£18,670	<b>£18,670</b>
Schools Administration	0	£46,692	<b>£46,692</b>
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>£282,324</u></b>	<b><u>£219,647</u></b>	<b><u>£501,971</u></b>

**23      OUTREACH SUPPORT SERVICE**

The Schools Forum gave consideration to a report from the Commissioning Officer, which provided an update on the Outreach Service and provided a Final Report and Recommended Model for the delivery of Outreach Services.

The report identified schools receiving Outreach support; sources of the review held during April and August 2014. It was highlighted that the review had shown that there was a clear demand for the service and that stakeholders on the whole were very positive about accessing the service and the outcomes available as service users.

Full benefits and risks of all the five models considered were contained within Appendix 1 to the report presented.

Considering the key findings, benchmarking and stakeholder engagement, the recommended model to deliver Outreach Services was for a Multi-disciplinary approach (excluding physical disabilities) with single providers covering each of the Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries to deliver the service countywide.

Some concern was expressed that there was a need for special schools to analyse the document and come up with some responses to the proposal. Officers advised that a considerable amount of time had been given to this proposal, at the request of the Forum. The outreach service had been looked at in great detail, and on behalf of the schools had presented this report as providing the best value for outreach services in Lincolnshire. It was noted that the expectations of the model would be streamlined management costs, consistency of approach across the county, improved tracking and measuring of outcomes and greater accountability.

The Special School representatives felt that accepting the recommendation would mean adopting a model that could not provide what was required. Others member felt that delaying the vote on the recommendations as detailed in the report would have an impact on delivery for September 2015.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the contents of the final report and the proposed model in Appendix 1 be noted.
2. That the Multi-disciplinary approach model be agreed and that the next steps be as follows:
  - a. Developing a timetable for the procurement process
  - b. Invoking the extension agreed at Schools Forum in June 2014 until the end of the academic year to allow for an implementation period
  - c. providing updates to key stakeholders
  - d. Begin consulting with the market place

#### 24 SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which sought approval from the maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum to make an amendment to the Scheme for Financing Schools, i.e. to increase the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% of budget share.

The Assistant Head of Finance Children's and Specialist Services presented the report and made reference to the background to the report and that the Local Authority believed that there was a strong case for increasing the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% budget share, as a result of the introduction of the Early Years Single Funding Formula and that the increase would retain the core aims of the carry forward policy as detailed in the report.

**12**  
**LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM**  
**8 OCTOBER 2014**

It was noted that as part of this exercise the LA had considered whether carry forward limits for other sectors should be changed and has concluded that there was no compelling reasons to alter the limits for other sectors, which had been in place since 2004/05.

If the proposal was agreed the LA would be required to consult all maintained schools on the planned changes to the Scheme, and if the proposal was to be widely supported, the change would be applied to nursery school carry forwards from 31 March 2015.

**RESOLVED**

That the maintained school representatives:

- a note the content of the report; and
- b that in advance of a consultation with all maintained schools, approve the LA's proposal for the carry forward limit for nursery schools to be increased from 8% to 10% budget share with effect from 31 March 2015.

**25**     SCHOOL CARRY FORWARDS 2013/14

The Schools Forum gave consideration to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided information regarding Lincolnshire maintained schools' carry forwards at 31 March 2014.

The Team Leader, Schools Finance Team guided the Forum through the report highlighting the School Carry Forwards for 2013/14; the Carry Forwards as a % of the Budget Share; School Deficits; and the Local Authority's perspective in relation to carry forwards, all of which was detailed in the report presented.

Detailed at Appendix 1 to the report was a list of School Carry Forwards as at 31 March 2014.

A short discussion ensued, from which the following issues were raised:-

- An explanation relating to figures shown for Boston Pilgrim School and South Ash Villa School. The reasoning behind the figures was that these were hospital schools with low fluctuating pupil numbers. Boston St Nicholas and Boston St Thomas C E Primary Schools were under the same umbrella; and
- Expenditure on staffing costs, i.e. performance related pay and how that would affect costs.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

**26**     SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD (SFVS)

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided an update on the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS).

The Team Leader, Schools Finance Team, in guiding the Forum through the report made reference to the introduction of SFVS. It was noted that Academies and Free Schools were not required to complete the SFVS as it would duplicate their financial monitoring and assurance requirements. It was noted that the current position was that four primary schools and one special school had failed to submit the completed form by the due date.

It was reported that the schools' SFVS returns had provided the LA with little information to make sound and reliable judgement as to the effectiveness of school financial management, and as a result, the LA would not be placing significant reliance on them. Instead the LA would continue to review schools' budget returns and medium term finance plans at the start of the year. Also the LA would perform high level monitoring of school finances throughout the year; and work closely with those that had overspent to help recover their position; and provide advice on a day-to-day basis. It was also highlighted that from April 2015, the finance service to schools would be provided by the LA, and not Mouchel.

Concerns raised were that Academies were not reporting to the County. The Forum was advised that it was not the LA responsibility to monitor Academies. Also, that maintained schools had plenty of checks and balances to avoid schools going into deficit. It was reiterated that it was up to the LA to work with governors to help achieve good financial management in schools.

#### RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

#### 27 DFE CONSULTATION ON THE SCHOOLS AND EARLY YEARS FINANCE REGULATIONS 2014

The Operations and Financial Advice Manager presented a report which advised the Schools Forum of the DfE's consultation on proposed changes to the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014.

A summary of the proposed changes to the regulations was detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

It was reported that the proposed changes would come into effect from 1 January 2015 and would be applied to the 2015/16 financial year.

It was noted that Officers planned to present a report on the final regulations to the Schools Forum at their January 2015 meeting.

**14  
LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM  
8 OCTOBER 2014**

During consideration of the Appendix 1, particular reference was made to Regulation 3, in light of the difficulties highlighted with recruitment to the Schools Forum to Regulation 14, the removal of the transitional provision with regard to special school sixth form; Schedule 2, Paragraph 14 that early year's expenditure held centrally had been extended and cannot relate to an excluded provider, and that the wording of the paragraph seem to be confusing.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

**28     EARLY YEARS PUPIL PREMIUM AND FUNDING FOR TWO YEAR OLDS**

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which advised the Schools Forum of the recent announcement by the government regarding the introduction of the Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) and changes to the funding for two year olds.

The report detailed the two key proposals for consultation.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

**29     SCHOOL COLLABORATION ON RESOURCE EFFICIENCY (SCORE)  
UPDATE**

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Sustainability and Climate Change Team Leader, which provided an update on recent activity relating to School Collaboration on Resource Efficiency.

Early on in the agenda the Forum had expressed their concerns as to the whether investment in this area represented good value for money. Also, the Forum requested more detailed analysis to ascertain how much money had so far been saved.

RESOLVED

1. That the report presented be noted.
2. That a further report be presented to the January 2015 meeting.

**30     ACADEMIES UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report from the Head of Service, Education Services, which provided information on the latest number of academies and pupils in academies.

RESOLVED



That the report be noted.

31     INFORMATION PACK

RESOLVED

That the contents of the information pack be noted.

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	School Funding Arrangements 2015/16
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Tony Warnock
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553250
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS THE REPORT EXEMPT?</b>	No
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purposes of this report are to:

1. brief the Schools Forum on school funding arrangements for 2015/16; and
2. seek support for the Local Authority's (LA) proposals relating to a number of centrally held budgets.

### DISCUSSION

#### Background

Members of the Schools Forum will recall that the government introduced radical reforms to school funding arrangements in 2013/14 and made a number of refinements in 2014/15. The government is not proposing to make any major changes to school funding arrangements for 2015/16.

Nevertheless, at the meeting of the Schools Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014, the LA proposed changes to special educational needs (SEN) funding for 2015/16. The report entitled 'Proposed changes to SEN funding in 2015/16' explained that these were to deal with a residual issue from the 2013/14 reforms and were necessary to ensure the LA's compliance with the DfE's regulation 11(3). That requires schools to finance the first £6,000 of a pupil's SEN from their existing budgets, before being allocated further funding by the LA. The report to the Schools Forum made a number of proposals including: a

reduction in funding for Band 6 to 8 pupils; the redistribution of some of those funds through specific formula factors to compensate for the underfunding of notional SEN; the provision of targeted support for schools with unusually high numbers of Band 6 to 8 statements, and; the introduction of transitional protection for one year to prevent any losses to school budgets arising in 2015/16. These proposals (and one relating to the setting aside of £2m of the projected increase in Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2015/16 to help manage any increase in Education, Health and Care plans) were supported by the Schools Forum.

Since that meeting, the LA has:

1. Obtained formal approval for the proposals from the LA's Executive member for Children's Services, Cllr Mrs Bradwell (22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014).
2. Completed and submitted the DfE's Authority Proforma Tool (APT) reflecting these changes and outlining the LA's overall proposals for the funding of mainstream schools from April 2015 (31<sup>st</sup> October 2014).
3. Advised the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee of the proposals relating to SEN (28<sup>th</sup> November 2014). The members supported the proposals and expressed their gratitude for the efforts that had been made to minimise the impact upon individual school budgets and children with high levels of SEN.
4. Requested DfE approval for the planned one-off allocation from the 2013/14 DSG underspend to be excluded from future calculations of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). Schools Forum members will recall that at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014, the Schools Forum also received a report entitled 'Revised Schools Budget 2014/15' in which the LA proposed to allocate £4m of the 2013/14 DSG underspend to all schools. The Schools Forum supported the proposal, but asked that consideration be given to increasing the sum by £1m (and reducing correspondingly the sum set aside to finance a number of pressures that may emerge during the remainder of the 2014/15 financial year). In light of that request, the LA subsequently decided to increase the allocation to schools to £5m. In mid-October 2014, the DfE gave approval for the allocation from the 2013/14 DSG underspend to be excluded from the MFG calculation for next year.
5. Submitted a return to the DfE, outlining a number of material changes to the number of planned places in LA Special Schools and Alternative Provision for 2015/16 (17<sup>th</sup> October 2014).
6. Reviewed the DfE's 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014 announcement on DSG block allocations for 2015/16.
7. Reviewed and proposed provisional DSG centrally held budgets for 2015/16, as set out in this report.

A significant amount of further work remains to be undertaken up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 before school budgets can be published.

### **School funding announcements**

The information published by the DfE on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014 can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dedicated-schools-grant-dsg-2015-to-2016>

The information confirms that the operation of the DSG will remain largely unchanged:

1. The DSG remains a ring-fenced grant that can only be used in accordance with the DfE's regulations.
2. The DSG will continue to be set out in three blocks: an early years block; a schools block, and; a higher needs block.
3. The underlying budget will be kept cash flat for 2015/16. However, 69 of the least fairly funded LAs will receive an increase in their schools block from 2015/16.
4. The MFG will continue to apply and will again be set at minus 1.5% per pupil.
5. The schools block will continue to be based primarily on the preceding October census, but an uplift will be made to ensure that no LA loses out as a result of a child's deferred entry to reception.

6. The Early Years block will again be updated after the start of the financial year. For 2015/16, the block uses data from the January 2014 census, but this will be updated in 2015/16 for the January 2015 census (5/12ths) and for the January 2016 census (7/12ths).
7. The LA's Chief Finance Officer will continue to be required to confirm that the DSG has been deployed in support of the Schools Budget. This duty will be discharged via the s.251 outturn statement and by appending a note to the LA's statements of account.

However, some changes have been made by the DfE and these include:

1. Funding for non-recoupment authorities is being transferred in to the LA's DSG in 2015/16. The main reason for this is to reduce bureaucracy at the EFA which would otherwise continue to operate a dual system for a small number of schools. As a result, LAs will now have to calculate the budget share for all academies in their area, including those previously funded by the EFA as non-recoupment academies. To compensate for this, there will be a transfer of funds in to the DSG, which is intended to be cash neutral for LAs.
2. The early years block includes the early years' premium for which provisional allocations were announced in October 2014. In due course, it will include funding for disadvantaged two year olds which will in future be based on actual participation.
3. The higher needs block for LAs includes any increases in places for the 2015/16 academic year that have been approved by the EFA as a result of their 'exceptions' process, and a share of a £47m top-up fund which has been distributed according to the 2-19 aged population in each LA (this is intended to provide LAs with additional capacity).
4. The DfE has extended the list of licences covered by a single national licence. LAs will be able to continue to hold this funding centrally but, due to the increase in the number of licences now covered and the inclusion of nursery schools and non-recoupment academies, the amount charged by the EFA is expected to increase by two-thirds.

### **Education Support Grant announcement**

The DfE also announced that in line with its announcements in the summer of 2014, it will be reducing the funding for the Education Support Grant (ESG) by £200m from the £1.02bn allocated in 2014/15.

The ESG provides funding for the additional responsibilities that academies acquire upon conversion. The general funding rate will fall from £113 to £87 per pupil in 2015/16. The retained duties rate that LAs receive for all pupils (regardless of whether they are educated at maintained schools or academies), will remain unchanged at £15 per pupil.

In keeping with its stated intention in 2013, the DfE intends to change the protection arrangements for academies, so that their ESG rates converge with those for local authorities. There will be no top-up for academies in the 2015/16 academic year (£27 per pupil was provided in 2014/15), but revised protection arrangements will be introduced. The protection will operate in tapered bands. Academies currently receiving relatively low levels of ESG will not suffer a reduction of more than 1% of their total funding (including post-16). Academies receiving relatively high ESG payments could see a fall in their total funding of up to 3%.<sup>1</sup>

The multipliers for alternative provision and special schools will remain at 3.75 and 4.25 respectively.

Further information on the ESG can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-services-grant-2015-to-2016>

### **Pupil premium announcement**

The funding for the pupil premium in 2015/16 will be:

---

<sup>1</sup> It is anticipated that schools converting to academies after 31 August 2015 will receive only the general funding rate, i.e. £87 per pupil.

1. £1,320 per primary pupil who is currently eligible for free school meals (FSM) or has been eligible for FSM in the past 6 years (£1,300: 2014/15).
2. £935 for secondary FSM 'Ever 6' pupils (£935: 2014/15).
3. £1,900 for looked-after children. Eligibility criteria includes those pupils who: have been in care for one day or more; have been adopted from care, or; have left care under a special guardianship order, a residence order and a child arrangement order (£1,900: 2014/15).
4. The service premium is expected to remain at £300.

Further details are available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings>

A report to the Schools Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 entitled 'Early Years Pupil Premium and funding for two year olds' outlined the government's intention to introduce from April 2015 a new Early Years Pupil Premium for three and four year olds, with £300 a year paid for every eligible child who takes up the full 570 hours of free education entitlement. This is intended to complement government-funded early education entitlement by providing nurseries, schools, and other providers with additional funding for each eligible child.

### **2015/16 DSG allocations**

The DSG allocations announced by the DfE on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014 are set out below.

Table 1: Lincolnshire's 2015/16 DSG block allocations

<b>Block</b>	<b>Lincs £m</b>	<b>Lincs £ per pupil</b>	<b>England £ per pupil</b>
Schools Block	399.265 <sup>2</sup>	4,371.82	4,612.11
Early Years block	24.527 <sup>3</sup>	3,974.07	4,282.61
High Needs	62.313 <sup>4</sup>	n/a	n/a
Additions for non-block funding	0.137 <sup>5</sup>	n/a	n/a
Total	486.242	n/a	n/a

It is clear from Table 1 that there remain significant differentials between Lincolnshire's per pupil funding rates and the national averages. Both the local and national per pupil rates for the early years block remain unchanged from last year. Lincolnshire's per pupil funding for the schools block has increased by £42.72 from £4,329.10 last year. This is as a result of the government's decision to allocate extra resource in 2015/16 to the 69 least fairly funded LAs. However, the national average has also increased by £61.57 from £4,550.54 in 2014/15.

Overall, Lincolnshire's DSG will increase by 1.6% in 2015/16.

### **DSG School Budgets 2015/16**

As highlighted earlier in this report, the LA's main proposal for change to the 2015/16 school funding formula related to SEN and Band 6 to 8 statements. The proposal was supported by the Schools Forum on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and this was reflected in the LA's APT submitted to the DfE on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014.

The other proposed change to the school funding formula relates to the government's increase in the LA's DSG funding for 2015/16 referred to above. Members of the Schools Forum will recall that a

<sup>2</sup> This includes a £1.360m transfer for non-recoupment academies that the LA will fund for the first time from 2015/16. £0.599m relates to Boston Pioneers Free Academy and £0.761m relates to Lincoln University Technology College.

<sup>3</sup> This includes £0.472m indicative allocation for the early year's premium.

<sup>4</sup> This includes a £0.581m share of the £47m additional funding provided nationally by government for the higher needs block.

<sup>5</sup> As happened in 2014/15, this provides schools with a share of a £10.2m national sum and is to help them to fund the induction of newly qualified teachers.

report entitled 'Fairer Schools Funding for 2015/16' was presented on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014. It explained that the government planned to make changes to LA funding for schools in 2015/16, to begin to address the unfairness of the current system and to provide some help to LAs that are least fairly funded. The report stated that to determine whether a LA would qualify for funding, the DfE had calculated the overall minimum funding level by setting minimum funding levels for five pupil and two school characteristics / formula factors. The government had decided to allocate an extra £390m to qualifying LAs in 2015/16. Lincolnshire's share was estimated to be £4.5m, or 1.2% of its 2014/15 DSG. The report proposed that £2m of the increase be transferred to higher needs block to cover potential growth in the base budget for SEN as a result of the DfE' requirement for the LA to delegate some of the funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. It also proposed that the remaining £2.5m be allocated equally between primary and secondary schools, by uplifting the awpus by the same percentage. The proposals were supported by the Schools Forum and were subsequently reflected in the LA's APT submitted to the DfE on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014.

At the time of writing this report, work is underway to check the budget allocations to individual schools and to identify and address any anomalies that might arise, particularly with respect to the MFG calculations.

### **DSG Central budgets 2015/16**

As stated in previous years, it is important that the LA takes a prudent approach to the setting of central budgets within the DSG. This is necessary because:

1. Since 2013/14, the LA has been able to retain far fewer budgets centrally and so there will inevitably be lower levels of underspendings in future years, and therefore less capacity to respond to any significant emerging issues.
2. There are a number of budgets that are difficult to estimate and control (e.g. SEN related budgets, including out of county placements and for post-16 students with higher needs, and; the demand led early years budget).
3. Under current DfE's regulations, for an overspending on the DSG to be written off in the following year, approval from the Schools Forum would be required. That could be a major problem for the LA, as its non-DSG funding will suffer very significant further reductions over the next four years. There will therefore be no scope for the LA to fund a DSG overspend or supplement it in any way.

The LA has conducted its annual, detailed review of the DSG central budgets. The following table summarises the most significant planned changes.

Table 2: Main changes proposed to DSG central budgets

<b>Budget</b>	<b>Proposed change to the current budget Increase / (decrease) £</b>	<b>2015/16 Proposed budget £</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Broadband	(£0.161m)	£1.617m	This budget was significantly reduced following the introduction of the new KCom contract in October 2012. The planned reduction for 2015/16 reflects the ending of the VLE maintenance costs.
Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils (Stamford Endowed)	(£0.268m)	£0.658m	The contract provides for a phased reduction in the number of places purchased.

schools)			
SEN Out of County	£2.000m	£7.290m	The increase in Out of County expenditure is largely as a result of the rise in the number of young people with Autistic Spectrum Disorders. Presently, the county's schools are unable to meet their needs. ISOS has been appointed to undertake a detailed review of young people in out of county provision, with a view to identifying how such provision can be made within the county's schools. Two special schools have expressed an interest in assisting with these pupils' more challenging and complex needs. Other local opportunities are also being explored.
Funding for significant pre-16 growth	£0.500m	£2.000	This budget is essential for the LA to fulfil its statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for pupils. In the report for last year, the LA enclosed a copy of its policy for funding an increase in places. Demand has continued to grow and in order to fulfil its statutory duty to provide sufficient school places, further funding is required.

The DfE regulations contain a number of provisions in relation to the setting of central budgets within the DSG:

1. The Higher Needs block and central licences negotiated by the Secretary of State can be retained by the LA before allocating the DSG to school budgets. Schools Forum approval is not required.
2. Funding for significant pre-16 growth to meet basic need, and places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils can be retained centrally with the agreement of the Schools Forum.
3. Budgets for Admissions and servicing of the Schools Forum can be retained, but no increase in expenditure from 2012/13 levels is permitted. The Schools Forum is required to confirm the amount for each budget line.
4. Capital Expenditure from the Revenue Account (CERA) and termination of employment costs can be retained centrally. No new commitments or increase in expenditure above 2012/13 levels are permitted. The Schools Forum is required to confirm the amount for each budget line.

In light of these regulations, Table 3 below sets out the budgets requiring Schools Forum approval.

Table 3: Budgets requiring Schools Forum decisions

Budget	Key points	Proposed budget 2015/16 £
	<i>Under DfE regulations, the following budgets can be set at any monetary value.</i>	
Funding for significant pre-16 growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This matter was referred to in Table 2.</li> <li>• This budget is essential for the LA to fulfil its statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for pupils.</li> <li>• There has been major pressure on reception places for the last four years and this looks set to continue.</li> <li>• Funding is allocated in accordance with the LA's policy. This is when, as part of its strategic planning of places, the LA needs to ask a school</li> </ul>	£2.000m



	<p>to take in additional pupils above its planned admission number (PAN) temporarily or permanently. The policy was attached to last year's report and has not changed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will continue to be the case that funding could be allocated to maintained schools or academies.</li> <li>• The number of new school places required and their location is uncertain and difficult to predict. The circumstances and hence the costs will vary from school to school. It is therefore important that a prudent budget is set. Based on current commitments and expected growth next year, which is difficult to predict, it is estimated that a prudent budget of £2.0m is required, i.e. this represents an increase of £0.5m on the 2014/15 budget. Any underspend on this or the rest of the DSG will be considered by the Schools Forum in October 2016.</li> </ul>	
Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils (Stamford Endowed schools)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This matter was referred to in Table 2.</li> <li>• The LA has a contractual agreement to purchase these places in Stamford.</li> <li>• The contract provides for a phased reduction over time in the number of places purchased.</li> <li>• The budget requirement is therefore due to decline by £0.268m next year and will continue to decline thereafter.</li> <li>• Without this budget, the LA would be unable to meet its contractual liabilities and it would remain the LA's responsibility to make education provision for these young people.</li> </ul>	£0.658m
	<i>For the following items, LAs can propose budgets only up to the value committed in 2012/13</i>	
Broadband	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is explained in Table 2 above.</li> <li>• The budget requirement is £0.161m lower than 2014/15.</li> </ul>	£1.617m
Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LA has a statutory duty to operate the admissions arrangements in county schools.</li> <li>• Without this budget, the LA would be unable to fulfil its statutory duties.</li> <li>• The budget proposed for next year is the same as that set for 2014/15.</li> </ul>	£0.449m
Servicing of the Schools Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historically, the cost has been very modest.</li> <li>• Without this budget, the Schools Forum would find it difficult to operate effectively.</li> <li>• It is proposed that the same budget for 2014/15 is set for 2015/16.</li> </ul>	£0.020m
Central expenditure from revenue (CERA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This funds the costs of the capital investment made by the LA in schools over previous years, and the PFI contractual commitments for the seven schools built under PFI a decade ago.</li> <li>• Without this budget, the LA would be unable to finance the on-going costs of these historic, contractual commitments. The proposed budget is slightly lower than that for 2014/15 (£5.126m).</li> </ul>	£5.045m

Schools centrally funded termination of employment costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bulk of the 2012/13 budget had to be delegated to all schools from 2013/14, but a commitment remained for the Redeployment officer who continues to help schools avoid redundancy costs by redeploying staff in other schools wherever possible.</li> <li>• Without this funding, this post could not be retained and schools would probably pick-up significantly greater costs from redundancies than would otherwise be the case.</li> </ul>	£0.045m
--	--	---------

The budgets proposed above are prudent and have been determined following a detailed review.

Some minor refinements to these budgets may be necessary in light of officers' on-going work, but material changes are not expected. In accordance with established practice, the LA will report to Schools Forum in April 2015 the final budgets for 2015/16, as set out in the s.251 budget statement which has to be published by 31 March 2015. Any material changes from the figures reported here will be communicated to the Schools Forum at that time.

Members from the relevant sections of the Schools Forum agreed the de-delegation of a number of budgets at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014. Those decisions will be reflected in the Authority Proforma Tool that will be submitted to the DfE in January 2015.

### **The financial outlook for schools, the Council and Children's Services**

School budgets have been protected by the government over the last four years. The DSG has remained 'cash flat', but significant additional funding (£2.5bn) has been added via the pupil premium. The DSG for 2015/16 is also protected in cash terms and, as indicated above, some LAs, including Lincolnshire, will see an increase in DSG funding in 2015/16. The position beyond 2015/16 is not known, but the new government may seek to protect school budgets from 2016/17.

The Council has for some time been anticipating having to reduce the £476m non-DSG budgets by c.£90m over the next four financial years. However, due to uncertainty associated with local government funding (partly because of the forthcoming general election and radical changes to Adult care funding), the Council is planning to set only a one year budget in 2015/16. The position will be reviewed when the new government announces details of its Comprehensive Spending Review next autumn.

The provisional local government finance settlement for 2015/16 was announced by the government on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014. There are four main components of the Council's non DSG funding: local retention of business rates; Revenue Support Grant (RSG); other grants, and; council tax. The reduction in the RSG component in 2015/16 is **£33.6m** or 26.3%, which will leave the Council's 2015/16 RSG at £93.7m. Clearly, this represents a major reduction in funding for 2015/16 and comes on top of the major reductions suffered in the previous four years. Although the Council has identified savings of £30m for 2015/16, it is facing budget pressures of £29m, most of which relate to Adult Care. The Council therefore plans to use £32m of one-off reserves in 2015/16 (these have been built up over the last few years for this specific purpose) as a temporary measure to balance the budget. Further significant permanent savings will nevertheless have to be found for the period beyond 2015/16 and total savings of c.£90m over the next four years may still be required.

The situation for the Council obviously has a major bearing on Children's Services budget. In the four year period 2010/11 to 2014/15, the Directorate has successfully delivered £30.2m of savings. This figure is significant in the context of its non-DSG budget which currently stands at £102m. Children's Services contributed to the corporate budget setting process in 2014, and £39m of budgets (mainly relating to children's social care), were considered high priority and warranted protection in future years. This protection is important because, like other LAs, Lincolnshire has been managing

significant and growing pressures on those budgets in recent years. The pressures are perhaps best illustrated by the fact that between November 2013 and November 2014, the number of looked after children rose from 571 to 641. The consequences for children's social care budgets are very significant. The challenge of contributing to the Council's savings target is much more difficult for Children's Services in Lincolnshire, given that the home to school / college transport budget is significant (£25m p.a.) and much greater than almost all other LAs. Nevertheless, plans have been developed that will contribute £4.257m towards the Council's savings target for 2015/16. So, in conclusion, Children's Services has been successful in delivering very significant savings over the last four years, whilst continuing to deliver a high standard of services over that period. However, the Council faces very significant challenges beyond 2015/16 and this is likely to have a major impact upon Children's Services budgets in future years.

### **Next steps**

Checks will be made against the DfE's new School and Early Years Finance Regulations published in December 2014, to ensure full compliance.

The revised proforma for mainstream school budgets is due to be sent to the EFA by 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015. It will reflect the proposals reported to and supported by the Schools Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014.

Under new DfE regulations, the LA is required to publish mainstream schools budgets (excluding sixth form funding) by the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015. The budgets for all schools must be published by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 for them to be included in the s.251 budget statement. The LA will however endeavour to publish all budgets as early as possible.

Since April 2014, the Schools Finance Team has been employed by the LA. The LA is planning to introduce a new finance system in April 2015 and 96% of maintained schools have elected to use the new system. The Schools Finance Team will therefore be providing extensive additional support to those schools over the coming months.

The LA will keep the school funding formula under review and will bring forward to Schools Forum any proposals for modifying the formula.

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
------------------------

The Schools Forum is asked to:

- a. Note the content of the report.
- b. Support the LA's proposals for the setting of the central budgets shown in Table 3 above.

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>
--------------------------

The following reports were relied upon in the writing of this report.

PAPER TYPE	TITLE	DATE	ACCESSIBILITY
Report	Proposed changes to SEN funding in 2015/16	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln
Report	Revised Schools Budget 2014/15	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln

Report	Fairer Schools Funding for 2015/16	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln
Report	Early Years Pupil Premium and funding for two year olds	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln

<b>APPENDICES</b>
None

## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Outreach Support Service
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Catherine Southcott
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Tony Warnock
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553250
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

On 8<sup>th</sup> October, Schools Forum gave agreement to a report outlining the current position of Outreach services, reviewing the risks and benefits of alternate models of future delivery and recommending a future delivery model.

It was agreed that funding for the existing model would continue, in order to allow for an Expression of Interest process and a sufficient implementation period.

Currently, Outreach Support is delivered by a number of different Schools including:

- Spalding Special School Federation: The Garth and The Priory
- Gosberton House School
- Lincolnshire Wold's Federation: St Bernard's School
- St Christopher's School
- John Fielding School
- Gainsborough Federation: Warren Wood Community School
- The Eresby School

- Phoenix School
- Sincil Sports College
- St Francis School

Since the October Schools Forum a number of actions have been completed including:

- Presentations at Primary and Secondary Headteacher Briefings across the county including attendance at Boston, Lincoln, Spalding, Grantham and Woodhall Spa.
- Updates have been provided to all Schools and Academies as part of ongoing Stakeholder Consultation plan. This update which can be seen at Appendix A included:
  - an overview of events
  - an overview of the final report and recommendations
  - an overview of recommended model and anticipated benefits of the model
  - an update on performance data
  - clarity around next steps and assurances on some of the issues raised at the October Forum
  - an update of the Termly Performance Indicators sought from existing Providers
- Consultation meetings with existing Providers
- A Provider Engagement Event held on 21<sup>st</sup> November at Horncastle College. The event covered an overview of the existing service and work taken to date, an explanation on the Expression of Interest Process and reviewed the proposed model and anticipated benefits
- Service Specifications have been drafted and shared with Project Board members, including a representative from Schools Forum
- An Outreach leaflet on current model has been shared with all Schools and Academies
- Meeting with relevant internal stakeholders including Finance, Special Educational Needs & Disabilities and Educational Support colleagues.
- All existing Providers have confirmed their commitment to continue to deliver Outreach until the end of the Summer Term 2015

Following on from the Provider Engagement Event, action has been taken to respond to a number of the queries raised. This has included:

- Consultation with Human Resources, Legal Services and the Lincolnshire Research Observatory:
- Three Sponsor Board meetings, with discussion and action plans for queries raised through the Event:
- Input has been sought from the Lincolnshire Research Observatory to review how best the funding can be divided across the County. It is anticipated that the funding formula will take population and deprivation into account. The funding formula shall be confirmed by 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2015:
- Advice has been sought from Legal Services who have confirmed that whilst the School/s delivering Outreach may not be the same, there will be no change in service (albeit an enhanced service) for Pupils and Schools in receipt of the support, therefore there is no need to consult further;
- Advice has been sought from Legal Services regarding implications for existing staff. A request for TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings Protection) information has been sent to schools currently delivering Outreach in order to identify those staff who would potentially be part of a transfer if a new school was taking over the delivery of the service. Further advice will also be shared the schools.
- The definition, regulation and accountability of term the "Specialist" has been discussed with Special Educational Needs & Disabilities Colleagues, and the revised definition will be reflected within the Service Specification.
- A Question and Answer document has been shared with all Schools and Academies, which is included at Appendix B.

### **Next steps**

- A further progress report to be presented at the next Schools Forum;
- Ongoing attendance at Project Sponsor Boards;
- Refinement of Service Specifications including input from Special Educational Needs & Disabilities and a representative from Schools Forum;
- Refinement of funding apportionment working with the Lincolnshire Research Observatory;
- Ongoing Contract Management Meetings with existing Providers including data gathering and analysis;
- Ongoing stakeholder engagement;
- Ongoing delivery of current model - all current Schools have agreed to continue to provide the service until the end of the Summer Term 2015.

- Preparation of Expression of Interest documents - An indicative timescale of the Expression of Interest process is shown below;

<b>Indicative Timescales</b>	
EOI Document released and Tender box opens	30 <sup>th</sup> January 2015
EOI Tenderbox closes	31 <sup>ST</sup> March 2015
Evaluation	1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2015
Award of Contract	6 <sup>th</sup> April 2015
Implementation Period	w/c 6 <sup>th</sup> April – 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2015
New Contracts begin	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015

## **DISCUSSION**

Paper for information only.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

To note the contents of the report and the further progress made with this review.

## **APPENDICES - these are listed below and attached at the back of the report.**

Appendix 1 – Project Update Outreach Review

Appendix 2 – Provider Engagement Event – Question and Answer Session



## Project Update Outreach Review

---

**Project Name:** Outreach Review  
**Department:** Children's Commissioning Team  
**Last Updated:** 13<sup>th</sup> October 2014  
**Author:** Catherine Southcott

---

### Overview of events

#### Schools Forum

On 8<sup>th</sup> October, there was a Schools Forum meeting and following debate, the Forum agreed to pass the recommendations within the final Report and to support the proposed Model. An overview of the model is enclosed within this update.

Alongside the model, the Forum agreed with proposed next steps including:

- Developing a timetable for procurement process
- Invoking the extension agreed at Schools Forum in June 2014 to extend existing Outreach provision from 1<sup>st</sup> April - 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 to allow for a sufficient implementation period (letter to follow shortly)
- Continue to provide updates to key stakeholders
- Continue to consult with the marketplace

#### Final Report and Recommendations

The review has concluded that there is clear demand for the service and that stakeholders are on the whole, very positive about accessing the service and the outcomes that it can bring to Service Users. It is imperative that the future model maintains the good work achieved, including county wide accreditation.

The report recommends:

- 12 High Level findings for continuous improvement
- Internal Promotion of the Service
- A clear pathway to be established and maintained
- That the service continues to be accessed as part of a holistic package of support and that the review continues to take into account the impact of concurrent reviews, such as the ongoing CAMHS Review.

### Recommended Model

Five potential models were considered:

- Multi-disciplinary
- Solo Provider
- Hub and Spoke Framework
- Locality Hubs
- Current Provision Hybrid

The full benefits and risks of all five models are contained within the Final Report.

Considering the key findings, benchmarking and stakeholder engagement, the recommended model is for a Multi-disciplinary approach (excluding Physical disabilities) with (potentially) single providers covering each of the Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries to deliver the service countywide.

In Lincolnshire there are four NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) of General Practices. The Lincolnshire CCG's are Lincolnshire East, Lincolnshire West, South Lincolnshire, and South West Lincolnshire. The boundaries of the Groups are shown in the map below.



Schools will bid to provide Outreach services for one of the four Group areas; East, West, South or South West. Providers may bid to support more than one area if they wish.

The lead Provider in each area shall be the single point of contact for the Outreach Service and that School shall provide support for the full breadth of Outreach specialisms including Autism, Moderate to Severe and Profound Learning Difficulties, Behavioural, Emotional and Socially Challenging Behaviours, Sensory Impairment and Social Communication Challenges which impact on cognitive development and learning potential.

Physical Disabilities shall be provided separately. The funding for providing the Physical Disabilities service should be excluded from this new provision. Schools will bid to provide Physical Disabilities Outreach support through an Expression of Interest process.

### Benefits of Model

The expectations of this model shall be streamlined management costs, consistency of approach across the County, improved tracking and measuring of outcomes and greater accountability.

The benefits of this model will ensure equality of service provision across the County, which is something that has been raised through meetings with Schools, through the Project Sponsor Board and through stakeholder feedback as a concern. The driver for equity does not just apply to those Service Users accessing Outreach but should also apply to those delivering.

This model also suggests that the Service is run for a minimum of three years, with a further roll out extension of two years. This timescale is in response to concerns raised by Schools as an ongoing issue. The model is very flexible, it allows for one School or a number of Schools to join together to say that they will provide cover for an area. It is recognised that not all Schools are able to provide the breadth of Outreach services, so it is anticipated that Schools will work together.

The model also calls for more parity of funding across the County, as opposed to onward extending funding from various funding streams. Indicative funding shall be based on the geographical spread, demand and existing Census data on pupils with additional needs.

The competitive process should be made internally available to all Schools in Lincolnshire.

### Schools Forum – Issues raised

We have taken on board the comments raised during the Forum and as always, we are really keen to work with existing Providers – and other Schools and Academies, should they wish to engage in delivering the Service – in ensuring that we deliver a Service which can support Children and Young People across the county. Within the coming weeks, we will begin engagement with current Outreach Schools. We will also hold a Provider day on the 21<sup>st</sup> November 2014 to talk through the Expression of Interest process.

### Performance Data

- Ongoing performance monitoring shall continue, as agreed by Schools Forum, until the implementation of the new model in September 2015.
  - Performance shall be sought on a termly basis – we have listened to your views and want co-production of data to be about joint working and not burdensome
  - I shall be the only Lincolnshire County Council staff member collating Performance data
  - Data is required in line with the expectations set out in the Memorandum of Understanding and will help inform the Service going forward. This process is also a really important way for us to hear your views and to make sure you are

- able to feed into the ongoing review
- Performance monitoring can be submitted through electronic completion of the Outreach template or, if you wish, we can have a meeting at your School
- Please find enclosed within the email the updated template for Term One – Autumn Term 2014. **Please can you return the completed form by 9<sup>th</sup> January 2015**
- If you feel there are additional questions it would be useful to add, please let me know

**Leaflet**

- The Communications Team are re-drafting the Outreach letter and a final draft shall be ready by Friday 17<sup>th</sup> October. It is intended that this shall be shared with Schools week commencing 27<sup>th</sup> October. Many thanks to all those who provided feedback, all recommended changes have been made

**Outreach Review – Next steps**

<b>Event</b>	<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Indicative Timescales</b>
Engagement meetings	Existing Outreach Schools	Explore the recommended model in more detail	Early November
Provider Day	All Schools and Academies	Explain the Expression of Interest process	Late November
Attendance at Headteacher Briefings	N/A	To provide updates at the November 2014 Headteacher Briefings across the County	Mid – Late November

**Updates will continue to be provided to Schools and invitations for engagement activities will follow shortly.**

## APPENDIX B

# Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event Question and Answer Session

**Date:** 21st November 2015

**Location:** Horncastle College

**Attendees:** Over 30 attendees from Lincolnshire Schools and Academies

**Chair:** Jonas Gibson and Catherine Southcott

### Section One

Please see below a copy of the Questions raised during the session. Some of the responses have been produced following the event, in conjunction with support from Legal, Finance and Lincolnshire Research Observatory colleagues.

There shall be three streams of Outreach delivery across Lincolnshire, each with their own service specification, contracting and funding arrangements. The individual streams are:

#### **Autism, Social Communication Challenges and Learning Difficulties (ALD) Outreach.**

The model divides the county into four sections and each section will have an identified Lead. This lead shall be responsible for providing a breadth of Outreach support across the allocated area. Support shall include responding to queries on Autism, Social Communication Challenges which impact on cognitive development and learning potential and Learning Difficulties (**ALD Outreach**).

#### **Physical Disability Outreach**

Alongside ALD Outreach, there shall be a contract delivering county wide Physical Disability Outreach, with one identified Lead. This lead shall be responsible for providing support to those pupils with Profound and Multiple Physical Disabilities, Cognitive Disabilities and Life Limiting Conditions and Sensory Impairment (**PD Outreach**).

#### **Behavioural Outreach**

There shall also be a third and final countywide Outreach Service, delivering support for those Pupils with Behavioural issues, including Emotional and Socially Challenging Behaviours.

The Service Specifications for all three streams of Outreach are currently in development.

It is anticipated that these areas should work together to provide a holistic package of support to achieve the best outcomes for the pupils of Lincolnshire.

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

Funding and Finance	
What is the total funding?	<p>The total funding will be divided across the three Outreach streams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ALD Outreach</b> - £617,500* <i>To be split across 4 areas</i></li> <li>• <b>PD Outreach</b> - £140,436* <i>1 countywide provider</i></li> <li>• <b>BES Outreach</b> - £TBC <i>1 countywide provider</i></li> </ul> <p><i>*per year</i></p>
How has this total been arrived at?	The total funding pot for Outreach has been agreed with Finance and Schools Forum.
Will the amount of money reflect the amount of work a Provider is required to do?	Contract Management will monitor the delivery and usage of the service and through ongoing open dialogue between both parties; we will be able to determine where there are additional pressures and agree action plans accordingly.
How will the funding be split?	The original proposal for funding was based on evidence submitted by the existing Providers and diagnosis rates per Clinical Commissioning group recorded within the Joint Strategic Needs Analysis. Providers have queried whether this will capture the volume and distribution of those Pupils with undiagnosed need. In response to this, Commissioning have subsequently sought the input of the Lincolnshire Research Observatory to propose an alternate means of dividing funding across the County. It is likely this funding formula shall take population and deprivation into account. The final formula shall be clarified within the Service Specification.
What happens if there is a change of circumstance and there isn't enough money to cover the cost of the service?	Pressures (whether financial or deliverable) will be raised through Contract Management meetings. It is anticipated that Schools submitting a bid, should consider how they will make their proposal sustainable across a minimum of a three year duration.

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

Outcomes	
What will be the benefits for the School delivering Outreach?	The School delivering Outreach will contribute towards; supporting Pupils and upskilling staff (thereby contributing to a legacy of improved outcomes for Children and Young People) strengthened community ties and School to School support (reducing bureaucracy) and developing a model which will be a benchmark of good practice
How will performance be measured?	Performance will be measured through termly Contract Management meetings. The Service shall be rated in terms of its quality of delivery and any risks/issues. These ratings will be shared with Senior Management Team and by exception, any ongoing issues will be shared with Schools Forum.
What if there are great outcomes and the School is overwhelmed with requests?	If this were to happen, it will be raised and addressed through Contract Management meetings.
How will we improve the existing service with no more money?	Whilst the existing funding envelope remains the same, it is anticipated that through this revised model, services will be improved by ensuring consistency of delivery across the county, improved support during transitions, robust Contract Management to monitor and resolve issues, extended contract duration to a minimum of three years, allowing Providers to confidently invest in the contract and improved tracking of outcomes and greater accountability.

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

<p>What's wrong with the current model?</p>	<p>The current model does not offer consistency across the county, as some Schools are delivering a range of services that would not be accessible on the other side of the county. There is a disparity between the volume of work being delivered. There is a disparity between the Value Added Extras being delivered. There is not sufficient evidence of work being delivered nor is there sufficient evidence to show the positive outcomes achieved by service users across the county. There is not parity of CPD training to Teaching staff.</p> <p>In acknowledgement of the above however, we would reiterate that there remain pockets of excellent delivery.</p>
<p>What are the anticipated outcomes?</p>	<p>The anticipated outcomes will be listed within the Service Specification. An overview includes;</p> <p>Service Outcomes and Service User Outcomes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs will be more effectively met within the locality</li> <li>• Increased confidence and capacity amongst front line staff in Schools</li> <li>• Signposting to local services and agencies More effective partnership working between Schools</li> <li>• Pupils should have a more comprehensive overview as to how their needs will be met longer term</li> <li>• Pupils will be able to access more personalised support with a clearly defined offer</li> <li>• Pupils remain in their communities</li> </ul> <p>The above list is not exhaustive.</p>

Expression of Interest Process	
Who can Express an Interest?	All Schools and Academies within Lincolnshire can submit an Expression of Interest (EOI).
What are the timescales?	Please see Section 2.



## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

Who will sit on the evaluation panel?	Panel representatives shall include Finance, Exclusions, SEN&D, Children's Commissioning and a representative from Schools Forum
How will Schools identify the Specialist within their Staff?	It is up to Schools to identify the skill set within their staff and nominate accordingly.

Service Specification	
How have you prepared for a service that may need to work with additional and undiagnosed needs?	This will be covered through the Service Specification
Are Hearing Impairment/ Visual Impairment included?	Sensory Impairment support will be provided by Physical Disability Outreach
Have you considered other models?	<p>Five models were considered within the report presented to Schools Forum. A risk:benefit matrix was included reflecting on each alternate model, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hub and Spoke</li> <li>• Locality Based</li> <li>• Current Provision Hybrid</li> <li>• Multi-disciplinary</li> <li>• Solo</li> </ul> <p>The matrix showed that the Multi-disciplinary model would bring the most anticipated benefits. This model was agreed at Schools Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014.</p>
What is the length of the Contract?	The Contract will be a minimum of three years with a possible extension of a further two years
Will birth-five be included?	No
Can you share the models used by other Counties?	As part of the stakeholder engagement process, 10 statistical neighbouring Local Authorities were contacted, in order to understand how Outreach equivalents were delivered. Some of the information provided was commercially sensitive and as such, it cannot be shared
Can you share the report and the data gathered?	The data gathered is commercially sensitive and cannot be shared. The report is available to Schools Forum representatives

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

<p>How will splitting the County into four, work?</p>	<p>ALD Outreach will split the county into four. BES and PD shall be delivered countywide. The anticipated benefits of splitting the county into four for ALD Outreach includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduction in travel costs and therefore more money apportioned to direct delivery</li><li>• Improved transitions between Primary to Secondary School fostered by good local knowledge</li><li>• Encouraging innovation from the marketplace</li><li>• Encouraging collaborative working</li><li>• Increasing School to School working and reducing bureaucracy</li><li>• Increased consistency of approach</li><li>• Single point of access in each area making it clearer to service users how they can access the service</li><li>• Increased accountability</li><li>• Easier to track and monitor impact of Service to enable effective benchmarking</li><li>• Division works with Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries enabling comparative data as one of many considered factors in looking at the trends of Lincolnshire's young people</li><li>• Providers will need to respond to all Outreach queries within their allotted area thereby removing the option for Providers to determine that users do not meet service thresholds and re-direct service users, delaying support</li><li>• Maintaining pre-existing networks and working relationships</li><li>• Retaining countywide skills and experience</li><li>• Supporting training programme for staff (reduced travel time for them to engage in CPD)</li><li>• Ensure capacity to meet demand</li><li>• Accountability to support when Pupils are undergoing transitions (eg moving home)</li></ul>
---	---

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong end-to-end process</li> <li>• Consistency for service users</li> </ul>
How will the split ensure consistency?	Consistency will be ensured because all Leads will be working to the same Service Specification and there will be greater accountability for ensuring that this is delivered, through robust - and termly - Contract Management.
What will be the definition, regulation and accountability of "Specialist"	<p>The provider would be expected to have substantive experience and be suitably qualified in those areas of specific difficulty, for example, in the case of queries regarding:</p> <p><b>Dyslexia</b> - they would be expected to hold Qualified Teacher status with Associate Membership and practising certificate from AMBDA and/or PATOSS of the British Dyslexia Association          – AMBDA and/or hold Qualified Educational Psychologist status</p> <p><b>Sensory Impairment</b> - they would be expected to hold the national mandatory Qualified Teacher status with HI, VI and/or MSI qualification at least to Diploma level</p> <p><b>Autism</b> – have QTS and an additional accredited (by a university) qualification in Social Communication/ Autism. This should be at Diploma level ie 2 years study.</p>

Stakeholder Engagement	
What will happen to existing staff?	The advice of HR has been sought, and will be shared with stakeholders once received.
Will Parents be consulted?	Advice has been sought from our Legal Team and Parents will not be consulted. This is because the service to schools and pupils isn't changing. Whilst the school delivering the Outreach may not be the same, the service itself should hopefully be enhanced.

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

<p>Will Parents be informed once Accreditation from Pathfinder disappears?</p>	<p>Each Lead across the four areas will be expected to have, or be working towards, Accreditation. It is recognised that Accreditation provides a benchmark to show excellent practice and is important to stakeholders. Key findings, including positive feedback from the Independent National Autistic Society Autism Accreditation Review Report 2012 and the National Autism Accreditation Report 2014 were included within the final report.</p> <p>The Service Specification shall also make reference to the upcoming All Age Autism Strategy.</p>
<p>What will be the terms for dismissal, redundancy and resignation?</p>	<p>The advice of HR has been sought, and will be shared with stakeholders once received.</p>
<p>Have we identified interested Schools?</p>	<p>All Schools and Academies have been invited to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Partake in Stakeholder Engagement</li><li>• Attend Provider Engagement Event</li></ul> <p>and have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Been informed of the Review</li><li>• Received a copy of this Question and Answer briefing paper which includes a copy of the attendees at the Engagement Event</li></ul> <p>Timescales have allowed for a two month period for Schools to speak to each other to develop a proposed model of delivery.</p> <p>There is some expectation that the market will need to develop itself and that Schools who are interested in delivering Outreach will need to look to speak to other Schools.</p>

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

<p>Have you carried out any consultation?</p>	<p>Stakeholder Engagement to date has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires shared with             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Headteachers</li> <li>- Educational Psychologists</li> <li>- SENDSAP</li> <li>- STAPS</li> <li>- Youth Offending Services</li> <li>- SENCOs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Through contract management meetings existing Providers had the opportunity to state the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to improve the Service</li> <li>• Benchmarking was undertaken with 10 statistical neighbouring Local Authorities, including: Northamptonshire, Cumbria, Dorset, Shropshire, Nottinghamshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, Staffordshire, Worcestershire and Derbyshire</li> </ul>
<p>What will happen to the work currently delivered by the post holder based at Sturton-by-Stow</p>	<p>The post holder in this role is not retiring and has left her post through Voluntary Redundancy. Therefore the post will not be replaced.</p> <p>Schools currently in receipt of support from this role will need to contact their nearest alternate Outreach provider.</p> <p>The Outreach leaflet (attached to email) has a list of current Outreach Schools, including specialisms and contact details.</p>

Contract	
<p>What happens if an Academy / Maintained School is awarded?</p>	<p>If a Maintained School is awarded the lead for an Area, they will need to enter in to a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council. If an Academy is awarded the lead, they will need to enter into a Contract with the Council. The Memorandum of Understanding and the Contract have different Terms and Conditions but the Service Specification within both will be the same.</p>

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

Can there be a core offer and then purchasable extras?	The Service Specification will list the services to be delivered; those outside of this remit may be provided but it is up to individual Schools who need additional services to decide the best way to go about obtaining any additional requirements.
What is the difference between support for challenging Behavioural issues and the package offered by Lincolnshire Teaching and Learning Centre	Please see introductory notes for update on Behavioural element of Outreach support.
Would Leads have a tier basis system depending on expertise / how will they apportion funding to the Schools they work with?	It is up to the Lead School to work with other Schools within its collaboration to determine how funding and service delivery will be divided.
How will queries be dealt with?	It is up to the Lead School to work with other Schools within its collaboration to determine how funding and service delivery will be divided.
Can there be a change of circumstance where the money is withdrawn?	Schools Forum have committed to the funding for delivery of this provision for a further three years.

#### Section 2

##### Next Steps:

- Progress report presented to Schools Forum on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014
- Ongoing attendance at Project Sponsor Boards
- Refinement of Service Specifications including input from Special Educational Needs and a representative from Schools Forum
- Refinement of funding apportionment with key direction from Lincolnshire Research Observatory
- Preparation of Expression of Interest documents for January 2015 release
- Ongoing Contract Management Meetings with existing Providers including data gathering and analysis
- Ongoing stakeholder engagement
- Ongoing delivery of current model - all current Schools have agreed to continue to provide service until end Summer Term 2015

Indicative Timescales – ALD Outreach	
EOI Document released and Tender box opens	30 <sup>th</sup> January 2015
EOI Tenderbox closes	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2015
Evaluation	1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2015

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event Question and Answer Session

Award of Contract	6 <sup>th</sup> April 2015
Implementation Period	w/c 6 <sup>th</sup> April – 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2015
New Contract begins	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015

Indicative Timescales – PD Outreach	
EOI Document released and Tender box opens	30 <sup>th</sup> January 2015
EOI Tenderbox closes	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2015
Evaluation	1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2015
Award of Contract	6 <sup>th</sup> April 2015
Implementation Period	w/c 6 <sup>th</sup> April – 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2015
New Contract begins	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015

Indicative Timescales – BES Outreach	
EOI Document released and Tender box opens	TBC
EOI Tenderbox closes	TBC
Evaluation	TBC
Award of Contract	TBC
Implementation Period	TBC
New Contract begins	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015

#### Section 3

Please note: not all attendees gave their name

Attendees of Engagement Event	
Name	School
Rachel Creasey	Staniland Academy
Helen Wyn Joyce	Carton Road Academy
Sue Morrison	John Fielding School
Anthony Bowen	John Fielding School
Andy Richards	John Fielding School
Emily Wood	St Michaels School
Nicky Holmes	Westgate Academy
Lorraine Kirsopp	Pilgrim School
Nick Homey	Sir Robert Pattinson Academy
Bridget Robson	Fortuna School
Chris Armond	Lady Jane Franklin School
Dawn Bradshaw	Huntingtower Academy
Mark Anderson	Huntingtower Academy
Helen Clayton	Acorn Free School
Jerry Tucker	Acorn Free School
David Bennet	Schools Forum

## APPENDIX B

### Outreach Service - Provider Engagement Event

#### Question and Answer Session

Kathryn Livsey	LTLC
Angie Waplinton	Hemswell Cliff Primary School
Charlie Jenkins	Hemswell Cliff Primary School
Pam Jenkinson	Morton Trentside Primary School
Dave Thompson	LTLC
Michelle Bunn	Fortuna

Please pass any comments, queries or feedback to Catherine or Jonas, contact details as below.

<b>LCC Contact Details</b>	
Catherine Southcott	<a href="mailto:catherine.southcott@lincolnshire.gov.uk">catherine.southcott@lincolnshire.gov.uk</a>
Jonas Gibson	<a href="mailto:Jonas.gibson@lincolnshire.gov.uk">Jonas.gibson@lincolnshire.gov.uk</a>



## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2014
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Universal Infant Free School Meals
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Richard Cumbers Children's Health Programme Manager
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Richard Cumbers
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 554192
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	Richard.cumbers@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS THE REPORT EXEMPT?</b>	No
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to give the schools forum an update on the progress of the Universal Infant Free School Meal Offer (UIFSM) in Lincolnshire.

### DISCUSSION

#### **Background**

The Universal Infant Free School Meal Offer (UIFSM) offer was announced in September 2013 by Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg with an implementation date of September 2014. The UIFSM proposed free school meals for all Key Stage One children across the country. Nationally, the UIFSM was met with scepticism because of the tight timeframe for implementation and the lack of detail provided from the national team. Locally in Lincolnshire, the challenge was exacerbated by the lack of one central catering team, a shortfall of school kitchens and the sparse geography of our county.

To facilitate and fund the new UIFSM offer central government gave the County £1.2m funding for capital projects on top of which small schools with less than 150 pupils will be able to gain extra transitional funding of up to £3000 from the DFE as well as a flat rate of £2.30 per meal – schools are expected to make up any deficit in revenue.

## **Progress to date**

The UIFSM has proved particularly challenging within Lincolnshire; the implementation has been facilitated by the Food in Schools Team managed by the Children's Public Health Team offering weekly updates to the Children's DMT team.

Despite the problems posed by the UIFSM the Food in Schools Team have worked tirelessly in conjunction with a wide range of local and national partners to see the offer successfully rolled out in the county. A RAG rating was carried out in April 2014 of the counties hot school meal provision and 60 schools came out with a red rating which meant no hot school meal provision, by September 2014 every school in the county bar 2 received hot school meals with the other 2 receiving a free cold option which will move to hot meal provision in 2015.

Initially the £1.2m capital funding was top spliced to recruit one full time programme officer for a fixed term 18 month period; the programme officer currently sits within the Food in Schools Team and is in current contract until 31<sup>st</sup> October 2015, £1000 advertisement costs have also been top sliced. The remainder of the £1.2m pounds have been allocated on a need based application process. Schools without kitchen or catering facilities and working in partnership with one another received a greater weighting than those with less need. No funding was allocated to buy small items such as cutlery or small pieces of equipment. 84 funding applications from maintained schools have been approved or are pending approval to date. In certain circumstances, clusters of maintained schools have bid into the fund to pay for adaptations to academy schools from which they are served, for example, a cluster of Lincoln Primary School collectively bid for £75k in order to pay for adaptations at William Farr Secondary. In general bids from maintained schools ranged from £500 for electrical adaptations right through to the afore mentioned cluster bid of £75k.

A further £55k was allocated to the project to fund a temporary Environmental Health Officer (EHO). The £55k was the funded from the Children's Services 1% carry forward from 2013/14 upon the request of the Director of Children's Services. The EHO was in post June – December 2014 to help facilitate the implementation of the UIFSM as many schools did not have the correct knowledge or skills involved in serving hot meals on site.

At present all key stage one pupils are receiving free school meals in the county. A number of 3 schools are receiving cold provision whilst maintenance work is being carried out on sites. The authority has submitted a number of funding applications to the DfE which total £3m, this application, if successful will see over 20 sites funded to build or improve their existing kitchen facilities and thus increase their hot school meal production capability. The announcement date of successful bids is 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

## **Next steps**

Richard Cumbers is to bring a paper to Children's DMT 30.1.15 offering recommendations for the future of the project and supporting team.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The maintained school representatives of the Schools Forum are asked to:

- a. note the content of the report

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following reports were relied upon in the writing of this report.

<b>PAPER TYPE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>
DfE Guidance	The School Food Plan	July 2013	<a href="http://www.schoolfoodplan.com/plan/">http://www.schoolfoodplan.com/plan/</a>
DfE Scheme Guidance	Universal Infant Free School Meals	September 2014	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/universal-infant-free-school-meals">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/universal-infant-free-school-meals</a>

<b>APPENDICES</b>
None

This page is intentionally left blank

## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Sector-Led School Improvement Model Update
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Andrew McLean (Children's Services Manager - Commissioning)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Andrew McLean
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 554079
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	Andrew.mclean@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS THE REPORT EXEMPT?</b>	No
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

Lincolnshire County Council's contract with the CfBT Education Trust to provide monitoring, challenge and intervention services ends on 31 January 2017 so there is a need for the Council to start to engage with schools to ascertain the nature and required capacity for any new school improvement model for Lincolnshire.

This report highlights the radical change in the education landscape since the contract was signed and the need to develop, in partnership with schools a future model which aligns itself to best practice, which fits the Council's spending powers and which meets the needs of schools whilst ensuring capacity and expertise to enable the Council to meet its statutory duties.

This report summarises the progress that is being made to co-construct with headteachers an alternative model for monitoring, challenging and intervening with schools and academies. It provides an initial opportunity for members to consider the direction of travel which Schools' Forum have agreed in principle to financially support through pump priming the new model. However, it is envisaged that it will form only the first of several updates spanning January 2016 to March 2017 as the task and design group need to consult with Head teachers and Governors before a final business plan can be submitted.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Background

- 1.1. The Lincolnshire School Improvement Service was outsourced to CfBT Education Trust in 2002 following an inspection by Ofsted. The Audit Commission in 2000 found an unacceptably high proportion of schools with identified weaknesses and a high level of underachievement.
- 1.2. The “Core Contract” between Lincolnshire County Council and CfBT Education Trust is the vehicle through which the Local Authority exercises its statutory duties in relation to the monitoring of and challenge to all Lincolnshire state-funded schools. It provides a mechanism for the limited monitoring of the performance of Academies and the reporting of inadequacies to the Department for Education. It also provides targeted support and intervention with maintained schools facing the greatest difficulties. CfBT co-ordinates its support for schools at risk with that from other state-funded agencies such as Teaching Schools and National and Local Leaders of Education (NLE and LLE).
- 1.3. CfBT’s core contract with Lincolnshire County Council comes to an end in January 2017.
- 1.4. However, besides its contracted work, CfBT provides a traded service to schools and academies and increasingly to school partnerships so that any school can buy the additional support it may need. This is independent of the core contract and there are no plans to curtail it. CfBT also provides initial teacher training as well as support for Newly Qualified Teachers to sustain the flow of high quality new teachers into Lincolnshire schools.
- 1.5. As of 30 November 2014, 84% of pupils in Lincolnshire were being educated in a school graded Good or better. This represents 86% of our schools, some 5% above the national proportion. Based on this statistic, Lincolnshire is among the top third of all local authorities.
- 1.6. Nevertheless, there are signs that Lincolnshire has squeezed as much out of the traditional model of school improvement as it can. While outcomes in Key Stage 1 and 2 continue to rise on the whole, the national rate of improvement is now slightly greater and we have slipped just behind the national attainment figures. Outcomes at Key Stage 4 plateaued in the last couple of years. This year they have dropped both locally and nationally, largely because of central government ‘reforms’. Within the county there are pockets of underperformance, particularly in some of our coastal areas and rural South Holland.
- 1.7. As we and our regional partners scan the horizon we find that those areas achieving transformational change have sector-led approaches as a major component of their arsenal. The London Challenge had huge investment and buy-in at every tier of leadership, both professional and political, but schools helping other schools to improve is at its heart.
- 1.8. In Lincolnshire, we have had real success with our Primary Collaborative Partnerships involving about 135 small rural primary schools. Outcomes for schools in these partnerships are starting to look better than for those not working collaboratively.
- 1.9. So much is changing in the field of educational support and, simultaneously, negotiations are currently underway to determine a new model of monitoring, challenge and intervention. A Headteacher Design and Task group was established in September 2014 chaired by Heather Sandy, the Headteacher of Louth Lacey Gardens Junior School. She is supported by a contracted project officer, both funded by Children’s Services. This group of around twenty headteachers is consulting regularly with other headteachers and with governors through scheduled briefings and dedicated workshops. The prime goal of the Design and Task group is to agree a preferred and costed model for monitoring, challenge and intervention in conjunction with officers of the County Council. The period leading up to the end of the contract with CfBT provides an opportunity for phased transition.

- 1.10. 84% of Lincolnshire's 55 secondary schools and 24% of its 285 primary schools are academies. This has resulted in a very significant reduction in resource available to run central services because each academy takes with it a share of the local authority's Education Services budget. When linked to swinging reductions in local authority funds independent of the Dedicated Schools' Budget (DSB) available to support educational activity generally from April 2015, Lincolnshire County Council is unable to continue to invest in monitoring, challenge and intervention at anything like the level it has invested in the past.
- 1.11. The contract with CfBT covers a number of functions that sit outside the monitoring, challenge and intervention remit described above. The extra functions include:
- Headteacher appointments in LA Maintained schools
    - c. 24 days annually
  - Moderation of KS1 assessment and KS2 assessment in primary maintained schools and primary academies
    - Minimum 400 days annually
  - Monitoring of the outcomes for vulnerable groups including SEND
    - c. 360 days annually
  - Meetings and reporting at the behest of Lincolnshire County Council including Headteacher briefings, Schools' Forum, CYPSC, etc.
    - c. 550 days annually
  - Governor Support
 

The Governor Support Service is staffed by LCC employees but managed strategically by CfBT.

    - c. 20 days per year of strategic management
  - Support and Accreditation of Newly Qualified Teachers (NQT)
    - c. 2.5FTE
  - Management and subsidising of the Freiston Centre for Environmental Education
    - 6.7FTE + trading subsidy
  - Educational Visits Approval and Advice Service
    - 0.6FTE
  - Support for LA Inspections/ Accountability
    - Anticipated requirement: 50- 100 days per year.
  - Associated administrative support
    - 2.3FTE
- 1.12. In view of the significant number of state-funded schools that are now academies, and in view of the economies that Lincolnshire County Council must make (£90m per annum reduction in spend to be secured by 2020), it has been agreed that the CfBT core contract value should be reduced by £0.5m in April 2015 and by a further £0.5m pro rata (£0.416m) in April 2016.
- 1.13. There is considerable consensus among the consulted headteachers that placing them, or their representatives, at the heart of decision making in the new system is fundamental. Once information sharing protocols are agreed and terms of reference established, it is anticipated that a Headteacher Board will be able to start operating to help identify Schools and Academies Causing Concern. It is hoped that the Board will be able to take over the role of the Schools Causing Concern officers' meetings by September 2016.
- 1.14. Peer-review has emerged as an essential component of the new model. In time, this will replace the assignment of education advisers to gather information about individual schools with a revised focus on information gathering and quality assuring at partnership level. In the transition phase Lincolnshire County Council wishes to retain some capacity for monitoring individual schools through its contract with CfBT.

- 1.15. Although still very much under discussion, the principal changes that are being considered are:
- a. Schools and academies will be asked to form peer review partnerships of, perhaps, six schools.
  - b. The appraisal of the overall performance of schools and academies will be carried out by headteachers, perhaps in pairs, visiting other schools in the partnership.
  - c. Training in peer review will be secured from local authority approved providers using a one off grant available over a two-year period only. This is proposed to be through a procurement process with funding from the DSB underspend and use of the CFBT / LCC gain-share agreement to pump prime this model – agreement in principle was given at the last School Forum meeting with a full business plan expected to be presented at the next Forum meeting.
  - d. The quality of peer review will need to be assured and communicated to a decision making body. It is envisaged that a limited number of ‘Challenge Advisers’ may be needed to perform this function.
  - e. The decision making body will be a board comprising nominated headteachers and a senior local authority officer.
  - f. The headteacher board will determine which schools and academies need to be designated ‘causing concern’ and recommend how they may be helped. In most cases this will be through the deployment of NLE, LLE and Specialist Leaders in Education (SLE) deployed by the Teaching Schools.
  - g. In a limited number of cases, the extra support may need to be commissioned by the local authority on the recommendation of the headteacher board.
  - h. The local authority will retain ultimate responsibility for monitoring, challenge and intervention but it will be guided, very much, by the headteacher board.
  - i. The local authority is seeking to appoint a senior officer to oversee the arrangement.
  - j. Schools and academies will also be encouraged to continue to participate in mutually supportive school improvement partnerships that may be different to their peer-review partnerships.
- 1.16. The specifics of the model are expected to emerge from workshops involving several hundred headteachers planned for 20 and 21 January 2015 that have been organised by the Headteacher Design and Task group. Even when a model has been determined, considerable work will be needed before appropriate protocols (for sharing information and data, for example) can be finalised. It is hoped that the new model can be trialled with early adopters throughout 2016.

## 2. Conclusion

2.1. Schools Forum members may wish to consider:

- how best to participate in the consultation process with headteachers and governors.
- the extent to which Dedicated Schools Budget should be used to support the sector led models for monitoring, challenge and intervention.
- the extent to which Dedicated Schools Budget should be used to support the sector led models for school improvement.
- how the Schools Forum can exercise an accountability function if DSB monies are to be deployed to support monitoring, challenge intervention or school improvement.

2.2 Schools Forum may wish to be mindful that primary maintained schools currently de-delegate £380k per annum to support additional preventative and intervention strategies for vulnerable schools. The scope for a more holistic intervention fund servicing all types of school should be considered.



<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
------------------------

1. Schools Forum receives the report
2. Schools Forum members consider the suggested queries under 'Conclusion'.
3. Schools Forum considers what further reports it will require to conclude its deliberations about financial support for a sector led model for monitoring, challenge and intervention.

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>
--------------------------

The following reports were relied upon in the writing of this report.

<b>PAPER TYPE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>
None			

<b>APPENDICES</b>
-------------------

None
------

This page is intentionally left blank

## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	The School and Early Years Finance Regulations for 2015/16
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Tony Warnock
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553250
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to advise the Schools Forum of the publication of the School and Early Years Finance Regulations for 2015/16.

### DISCUSSION

In December 2014, the DfE published the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014. The regulations are 44 pages in length and can be found at:  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/id/uksi/2014/3352>

The regulations apply to the 2015/16 financial year. In summary, they define the non-schools education budget, the schools budget, central expenditure and the individual schools budget. They require local authorities to determine budget shares for schools maintained by them and amounts to be allocated in respect of early years provision in their areas, in accordance with the appropriate

formulae. They impose a minimum funding guarantee and requirements in relation to local authorities' schemes.

A report presented to the Schools Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 highlighted the DfE's proposed changes.

The information published by the DfE in December 2014 included the government's response to the consultation exercise, which took place during the autumn. A copy can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/school-and-early-years-finance-england-regulations-2014#history>

It summarised the proposals as follows:

'To a large degree, the 2014 Regulations re-enact provisions in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2013 but we consulted on some changes. These were in relation to schools forum composition; preventing the use of the dedicated schools grant for 19 to 25 year olds in special schools and special academies; the value of alternative provision places; the early years pupil premium; the determination of budgets for new maintained schools and those recently opened who are still adding year groups; and excluded early years providers.'

The DfE stated that the majority of responses to the consultation concerned the amendment relating to early years and the proposal that early years expenditure cannot be paid to an excluded provider. The document states that the government '.... does not believe that it is appropriate to fund early years settings that teach creationism as evidenced based scientific fact....' It added that this '... has no bearing on teaching children about religious beliefs, traditions and festivals. Nurseries and pre-schools continue to be free to tell creation stories, provided they do not assert that these are scientifically based.' Having considered the responses, the government decided to implement the proposal.

The DfE stated that the majority of the remaining responses supported the other proposed changes to the regulations and so it had decided to proceed with implementing them. The key changes are:

- Special academies must be represented on the Schools Forum.
- The Schools Forum must be consulted each year on the higher needs and alternative provision places commissioned by the LA, and the arrangements for paying top-ups.
- The funding for each place in alternative provision will rise to £10,000 from £8,000 (this will be offset by a reduction in the level of top-up funding provided, and so the impact will be neutral).
- New or recently opened schools will be funded on the basis of estimated pupil numbers, with a reconciliation being made between estimated and actual pupil numbers in the following year.

The new regulations are expected to come in to force on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2015. LA officers will ensure compliance with them before the new funding arrangements for 2015/16 become operational.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Schools Forum is asked to note the content of the report.

## **APPENDICES (If applicable) - these are listed below and attached at the back of the report.**

None.

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>			
<b>PAPER TYPE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>
Report to Schools Forum	DfE consultation on The School and Early Years Finance Regulations 2014	8 October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln, LN1 1YQ
Statutory Instruments	School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014	December 2014	<a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/id/uksi/2014/3352">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/id/uksi/2014/3352</a>
DfE report	School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 Government consultation response	December 2014	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/school-and-early-years-finance-england-regulations-2014#history">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/school-and-early-years-finance-england-regulations-2014#history</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Scheme for Financing Schools
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Tony Warnock
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553250
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS THE REPORT EXEMPT?</b>	No
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to highlight the outcome of a recent consultation with maintained schools regarding a proposed amendment to the Scheme for Financing Schools, i.e. to increase the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% of budget share.

### DISCUSSION

The Schools Forum received a report on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 setting out the Local Authority's (LA) proposal to seek approval from the maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum to make an amendment to the Scheme for Financing Schools. The proposal was to increase the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% of budget share.

The report explained that:

- Schemes for Financing Schools were first introduced under the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.
- The LA is required to publish a Scheme for Financing Schools.
- The Scheme sets out the financial relationship between the LA and the schools it maintains.
- Any amendments to Schemes must be consulted on with all maintained schools and be approved by the Schools Forum.
- The Scheme is not relevant to academies, as they have their own arrangements with the EFA.

The report explained why the LA proposed to amend the Scheme. It highlighted that nursery school budgets are relatively small and yet they have become much less predictable since the government introduced the early years single funding formula (EYSFF) in April 2011. It was noted that the power to carry forward a larger percentage of the budget should help nursery schools to deal better with fluctuations in annual income. It was stated that nursery schools would be able to carry forward between c.£0.063m and c.£0.037m if the 10% level was adopted.

The maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum supported the proposal in advance of a consultation with all maintained schools. That consultation took place just before Christmas. Due to extreme work pressures associated with the move to a new finance system in April 2015, schools were not afforded a great deal of time to respond. That, together with the fact that the proposal only affected the 5 nursery schools, may account for the response rate being lower than usual. Nevertheless, all 15 schools (6%) that responded supported the proposal.

In terms of comments received from those schools that responded:

- Two primary schools that operate close to military bases stated that they too would benefit from having a greater percentage carry forward, due to their very high turnover of pupils and the corresponding unpredictability in their funding.
- A special school highlighted the greater difficulties that special schools have had with projecting their funding, since the government introduced place and top-up funding in 2013/14.

Officers will reflect on these comments before deciding whether to bring forward any further proposals.

In light of the response to the consultation, the LA intends to implement the proposal and therefore allow nursery schools to carry forward 10% of their budget with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015. The LA will publish a revised Scheme before April 2015 and will advise maintained schools accordingly.

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
------------------------

The Schools Forum is asked to note the content of the report.

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>			
The following reports were relied upon in the writing of this report.			
<b>PAPER TYPE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>
Report to Schools Forum	Scheme for Financing Schools	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln.

<b>APPENDICES</b>
None





## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	2014/15 Section 251 Benchmarking Information
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Tony Warnock
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553250
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to share with the Schools Forum the latest s.251 benchmarking data published by the DfE in September 2014.

### DISCUSSION

All Local Authorities (LA) are required to publish, prior to the start of the financial year, a statement showing their planned expenditure on Children's services. Lincolnshire traditionally presents a copy of its s.251 budget statement to the Schools Forum in April each year.

The statement is prescribed by the DfE and requires LAs to set out in a common format their planned spending on children's services for the forthcoming financial year. This has enabled the DfE to publish since 2003/04, comparative information for LAs and Schools Forum to consider. The latest s.251 benchmarking information was published by the DfE in September 2014 and is available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authority-benchmarking-tables-2014-to-2015>

A copy of the benchmarking data from the LA Table of s.251 is attached at Appendix 1.

This information is very useful, but it is important to note the following points:

1. Despite extensive DfE' guidance on how to complete the s251 budget statement, LAs are likely to interpret the guidance differently and that can account for some of the apparent variations in planned spending between LAs.
2. The DfE has used different divisors when calculating the per pupil funding figures. For example, in some cases the DfE has used total pupils aged 3 – 19 for maintained schools only, and in others it has used the total pupils for pupil aged 3 – 19 in maintained schools *and* academies. In many cases, the divisors do not take account of specific cohorts, such as the actual number of early years children placed in independent settings, or the number of children actually transported to and from school, etc. Care is therefore needed when interpreting the figures.
3. Variation between LA's spending plans can arise due to differences in approach to delegation of services, or the way that corporate overheads are assigned to budgets.
4. The Schools Forum's principal role is to focus on the use of the Dedicated Schools Grant, i.e. those lines up to 1.6.1 or Column 40. The other budget lines and columns beyond that will nevertheless be of interest to the Schools Forum, because they support schools and, more broadly, children's services across the county.

This report looks mainly at the 27 Upper Tier authorities (i.e. counties), because they are similar in character to Lincolnshire. The report considers the key subtotals within Appendix 1 and highlights a number of key issues relating to them.

Table 1

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
1	Individual Schools Budget	4,016	4,080	=18 <sup>th</sup> highest	4,300

Comment: This budget line represents the funding delegated to schools, i.e. school budget shares. These figures are not surprising and are directly influenced by the fact that the DSG funding received by Upper Tier LAs from the DfE is the lowest in the country.

Table 2

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
11	De-delegated items	28	26	12 <sup>th</sup> highest	28

Comment: This budget line represents the funding that was de-delegated from maintained schools. De-delegation was introduced for the first time in 2013/14 as part of the DfE's school funding reforms. It is evident from the figures in Appendix 1 that LAs and Schools Forums across the country have taken very different approaches. Some LAs are de-delegating significantly greater sums than Lincolnshire which has traditionally been a high delegator and one that gives schools greater freedom to procure services directly. The table shows that Lincolnshire's total sum for de-delegation is equal to the national average. However, it is likely to fall below the average next year, as a result of recent underspendings and the decisions made by the Schools Forum at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014.

Table 3

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
24	High Needs budget	285	265	9 <sup>th</sup> highest	293

Comment: This budget line represents the top-up funding for special educational needs (SEN) that is given to special and maintained schools, the Teaching and Learning Centre and independent providers. It also includes various SEN support services. Lincolnshire's figure is between the Upper Tier average and the England average.

Table 4

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
40	Total Schools Budget	4,554	4,596	19 <sup>th</sup> highest	4,918

Comment: This budget line represents the total for those lines preceding it. It essentially represents the total DSG funding that each LA receives from the DfE and the earlier budget lines simply demonstrate how each LA uses it. Lincolnshire's relative position is not surprising because the county continues to receive one of the lowest levels of DSG funding in the country. This position is unlikely to change significantly in 2015/16 when an additional £4.5m (1.2%) is added to the LA's DSG.

Table 5

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
52	School transport - SEN	70	75	=19 <sup>th</sup> highest	70

Comment: This budget line shows the cost of home to school transport for pupils with SEN. Although s.251 requires LAs to separate SEN transport, it may not always be easy to do that accurately. Lincolnshire's spending is below the Upper Tier average and equal to the national average.

Table 6

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
53	School transport	174	74	2 <sup>nd</sup> highest	17

Comment: Lincolnshire also receives a relatively low level of government funding for services that sit outside of the DSG. As previous reports to the Schools Forum have highlighted, the county has to fund a much greater transport cost per pupil than many Upper Tier authorities. The differential with the England average is even greater. So, not only does the county receive less funding than most other LAs, it also has to use a significantly greater element of its funding to pay for school transport.

This means that there is less funding available to provide other support services to schools and children.

Table 7

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
78	Looked After Children	146	219	27 <sup>th</sup> highest	281

Comment: This line sums a range of services relating to children's social care, including fostering, adoption and residential care. The table indicates that not only is Lincolnshire's spending on these pupils the lowest of all the Upper Tier authorities, the level of spending is considerably below the levels of most other Upper Tier authorities. Despite this, a number of these services in Lincolnshire are judged to be outstanding.

Table 8

Col	Budget line	Lincolnshire's funding per capita £	Upper Tier average funding per capita £	Lincolnshire's rank for Upper Tier authorities	England average (median) per capita £
79	Total Safeguarding	159	140	8 <sup>th</sup> highest	169

Comment: This line sums a range of services relating to safeguarding. The table indicates that Lincolnshire's spending is between the Upper Tier average and the national average.

Further comparisons can be made by referring to Appendix 1.

The s.251 benchmarking data will continue to be used by the LA each year to inform its future spending plans.

Once again, Lincolnshire's overall position has not changed significantly since last year. The government's funding of the DSG and other budgets has not changed in a way that would materially alter any LA's position. The relatively minor changes in per capita spending and the ranking of LAs will be due to the modest re-alignment of budgets within LAs as they seek to respond to reduced government funding and their own priorities and local service pressures. Lincolnshire's DSG funding remains low and as indicated in Table 4 above, the 'per pupil' spending on the Schools Budget is £364 less than the England average (median). This adverse situation continues to be compounded by the fact that Lincolnshire also spends £157 per pupil more on school transport than the England average (median). This situation is unlikely to alter significantly next year, despite the government's plan to increase Lincolnshire's DSG by £4.5m, as this represents an increase of only 1.2%.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Schools Forum is asked to note the content of the report.

## APPENDICES - these are listed below and attached at the back of the report.

Appendix 1 - 2014/15 Section 251 benchmarking data for Upper Tier Authorities (LA Table - net)

LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities  
To print use the buttons below.

	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13	Col 14	Col 15	Col 16	Col 17	Col 18
	1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget (before Academy recoupment)**	1.1.1 Contingencies*	1.1.2 Behaviour support services*	1.1.3 Support to UPEG and bilingual learners*	1.1.4 Free school meals eligibility*	1.1.5 Insurance*	1.1.6 Museum and Library services*	1.1.7 Licences/subscriptions*	1.1.8 Staff costs – supply cover excluding cover for facility time*	1.1.9 Staff costs – supply cover for facility time*	DEDELEGATED ITEMS*	1.2.1 Top up funding - maintained providers*****	1.2.2 Top-up funding – academies, free schools and colleges*****	1.2.3 Top-up and other funding – non-maintained and independent providers*****	1.2.4 Additional high needs targeted funding for mainstream schools and academies*****	1.2.5 SEN support services*****	1.2.6 Hospital education services*****	1.2.7 Other alternative provision services*****
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>£4,361</b>	<b>£9</b>	<b>£6</b>	<b>£6</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£3</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£6</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£34</b>	<b>£130</b>	<b>£30</b>	<b>£69</b>	<b>£4</b>	<b>£34</b>	<b>£3</b>	<b>£10</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>£4,300</b>	<b>£5</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£28</b>	<b>£123</b>	<b>£25</b>	<b>£66</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£31</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£6</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>£3,720</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£12</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>£6,851</b>	<b>£76</b>	<b>£57</b>	<b>£125</b>	<b>£10</b>	<b>£40</b>	<b>£11</b>	<b>£29</b>	<b>£26</b>	<b>£8</b>	<b>£200</b>	<b>£344</b>	<b>£168</b>	<b>£207</b>	<b>£99</b>	<b>£110</b>	<b>£46</b>	<b>£53</b>
<b>Average (median)</b>	<b>£4,080</b>	<b>£8</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£26</b>	<b>£112</b>	<b>£23</b>	<b>£67</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£32</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£7</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>£3,720</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£56</b>	<b>£9</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£13</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>£4,517</b>	<b>£24</b>	<b>£13</b>	<b>£22</b>	<b>£3</b>	<b>£32</b>	<b>£8</b>	<b>£26</b>	<b>£24</b>	<b>£5</b>	<b>£78</b>	<b>£164</b>	<b>£56</b>	<b>£138</b>	<b>£35</b>	<b>£77</b>	<b>£10</b>	<b>£32</b>
825 Buckinghamshire	£3,720	£9	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£1	£11	£164	£48	£122	£0	£50	£2	£8
873 Cambridgeshire	£3,811	£2	£0	£22	£0	£13	£0	£2	£5	£1	£46	£104	£51	£67	£1	£43	£0	£32
909 Cumbria	£4,220	£13	£0	£0	£0	£12	£8	£1	£16	£5	£55	£125	£22	£77	£5	£14	£0	£0
830 Derbyshire	£4,176	£10	£0	£0	£0	£15	£2	£0	£10	£3	£40	£137	£13	£52	£3	£49	£1	£15
878 Devon	£3,961	£13	£12	£8	£0	£0	£0	£1	£16	£2	£53	£102	£14	£75	£21	£36	£2	£7
835 Dorset	£4,068	£8	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£2	£15	£113	£15	£124	£5	£22	£1	£0
845 East Sussex	£4,264	£12	£9	£14	£1	£6	£0	£0	£1	£0	£43	£104	£19	£58	£0	£39	£0	£9
881 Essex	£4,113	£16	£7	£2	£3	£0	£0	£18	£0	£2	£48	£82	£38	£60	£3	£46	£0	£10
916 Gloucestershire	£3,917	£23	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£3	£26	£113	£40	£90	£14	£32	£10	£4
850 Hampshire	£4,250	£1	£13	£8	£0	£0	£0	£1	£1	£2	£27	£87	£31	£36	£1	£13	£1	£0
919 Hertfordshire	£4,115	£4	£0	£0	£1	£0	£0	£2	£0	£1	£8	£112	£19	£40	£6	£34	£5	£1
886 Kent	£4,101	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£136	£23	£70	£5	£24	£0	£9
888 Lancashire	£4,517	£8	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£1	£2	£2	£14	£115	£19	£62	£0	£18	£2	£17
855 Leicestershire	£3,771	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£56	£56	£116	£7	£28	£3	£1
925 Lincolnshire	£4,016	£24	£0	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28	£119	£31	£51	£35	£26	£0	£3
926 Norfolk	£4,142	£9	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£24	£0	£35	£119	£26	£67	£5	£18	£0	£0
815 North Yorkshire	£4,141	£16	£3	£10	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£31	£118	£14	£45	£10	£17	£1	£31
928 Northamptonshire	£4,075	£8	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£9	£112	£34	£38	£0	£47	£6	£0
891 Nottinghamshire	£3,946	£1	£0	£4	£1	£0	£0	£0	£3	£0	£9	£121	£19	£68	£0	£16	£0	£6
931 Oxfordshire	£4,016	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£1	£66	£43	£46	£0	£56	£0	£3
933 Somerset	£4,002	£0	£0	£0	£0	£15	£0	£26	£16	£0	£57	£124	£12	£90	£2	£40	£2	£12
860 Staffordshire	£4,127	£6	£5	£10	£0	£32	£0	£7	£17	£2	£78	£100	£10	£51	£1	£29	£1	£2
935 Suffolk	£4,131	£12	£10	£2	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£25	£75	£29	£0	£0	£77	£0	£8
936 Surrey	£4,061	£4	£12	£6	£0	£0	£0	£4	£0	£2	£29	£121	£19	£138	£6	£40	£2	£18
937 Warwickshire	£3,971	£5	£1	£8	£1	£0	£0	£0	£1	£3	£18	£78	£25	£121	£0	£36	£0	£26
938 West Sussex	£4,164	£4	£0	£6	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1	£11	£109	£9	£92	£0	£24	£2	£17
885 Worcestershire	£4,080	£4	£0	£11	£0	£0	£0	£0	£2	£2	£18	£83	£50	£54	£2	£19	£5	£0

1) Pupil Divisors Used.  
\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools only.  
\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools and recoupment academies only.  
\*\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools & all academies.  
\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.  
\*\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.

2) The national mean is calculated as the Total Budget (£)/ Total Pupils.  
3) The median shows an average LA amount of spending (£).  
4) England figures do not include data for City of London or Isles of Scilly.

LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities  
To print use the buttons below.

	Col 19	Col 20	Col 21	Col 22	Col 23	Col 24	Col 25	Col 26	Col 27	Col 28	Col 29	Col 30	Col 31	Col 32	Col 33	Col 34	Col 35	Col 36	
	1.2.8 Support for inclusion ****	1.2.9 Special schools and PRUs in financial difficulty*****	1.2.10 PFI/ BSF costs at special schools and AP/ PRUs*****	1.2.11 Direct payments (SEN and disability)*****	1.2.12 Carbon reduction commitment allowances (PRUs)*****	HIGH NEEDS BUDGET*****	1.3.1 Central expenditure on children under 5****	1.4.1 Contribution to combined budgets**	1.4.2 School admissions**	1.4.3 Servicing of schools forums**	1.4.4 Termination of employment costs**	1.4.5 Falling Rolls Fund**	1.4.6 Capital expenditure from revenue (CERA)**	1.4.7 Prudential borrowing costs**	1.4.8 Fees to independent schools without SEN**	1.4.9 Equal pay - back pay**	1.4.10 Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes**	1.4.11 SEN transport**	
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	£13	£0	£0	£0	£0	£293	£33	£25	£9	£1	£5	£1	£14	£4	£1	£2	£20	£3	
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	£7	£0	£0	£0	£0	£293	£25	£15	£8	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£14	£0
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£81	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	£74	£7	£12	£36	£3	£575	£177	£117	£42	£27	£41	£19	£159	£69	£51	£56	£115	£49	
<b>Average (median)</b>	£10	£0	£0	£0	£0	£265	£18	£18	£8	£0	£2	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£12	£0	
<b>Minimum</b>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£174	£3	£0	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Maximum</b>	£43	£2	£3	£2	£0	£418	£56	£117	£17	£2	£16	£4	£65	£22	£9	£56	£30	£26	
825 Buckinghamshire	£23	£0	£0	£0	£0	£418	£17	£34	£17	£0	£2	£0	£49	£0	£0	£0	£6	£0	
873 Cambridgeshire	£21	£0	£0	£0	£0	£319	£3	£54	£5	£0	£0	£0	£18	£0	£0	£0	£17	£0	
909 Cumbria	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£247	£18	£18	£12	£1	£11	£0	£31	£8	£0	£11	£0	£0	
830 Derbyshire	£17	£0	£0	£0	£0	£286	£14	£25	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£19	£1	
878 Devon	£6	£2	£0	£0	£0	£265	£9	£57	£3	£0	£9	£3	£0	£0	£0	£0	£12	£0	
835 Dorset	£2	£0	£0	£0	£0	£281	£8	£5	£9	£1	£7	£3	£0	£0	£0	£0	£11	£26	
845 East Sussex	£23	£0	£0	£2	£0	£254	£15	£117	£5	£1	£0	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£22	£0	
881 Essex	£9	£0	£0	£0	£0	£249	£16	£19	£8	£0	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£22	£0	
916 Gloucestershire	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£302	£42	£0	£9	£2	£0	£0	£4	£14	£0	£0	£21	£7	
850 Hampshire	£6	£0	£0	£0	£0	£174	£14	£13	£5	£0	£4	£1	£37	£0	£1	£56	£28	£0	
919 Hertfordshire	£18	£1	£1	£0	£0	£237	£6	£7	£11	£0	£0	£2	£23	£0	£0	£0	£24	£0	
886 Kent	£37	£0	£0	£0	£0	£304	£24	£15	£10	£1	£16	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£29	£0	
888 Lancashire	£7	£0	£3	£0	£0	£245	£24	£10	£5	£1	£3	£0	£0	£1	£0	£0	£8	£0	
855 Leicestershire	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£269	£22	£3	£3	£0	£7	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
925 Lincolnshire	£21	£0	£0	£0	£0	£285	£9	£0	£5	£0	£1	£0	£65	£0	£9	£0	£14	£0	
926 Norfolk	£28	£0	£0	£0	£0	£264	£49	£12	£4	£1	£1	£0	£0	£0	£1	£0	£7	£0	
815 North Yorkshire	£43	£0	£0	£0	£0	£278	£33	£28	£10	£0	£0	£4	£19	£0	£0	£0	£2	£0	
928 Northamptonshire	£0	£0	£1	£0	£0	£238	£28	£25	£8	£0	£7	£0	£42	£0	£0	£0	£13	£0	
891 Nottinghamshire	£15	£0	£0	£0	£0	£244	£56	£21	£8	£0	£8	£0	£3	£0	£0	£0	£6	£15	
931 Oxfordshire	£10	£0	£0	£0	£0	£224	£43	£13	£6	£0	£0	£0	£50	£17	£0	£0	£7	£7	
933 Somerset	£3	£1	£0	£0	£0	£286	£6	£112	£4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£2	£3	£0	£12	£0	
860 Staffordshire	£13	£0	£0	£0	£0	£209	£54	£18	£6	£0	£11	£0	£19	£8	£0	£0	£5	£2	
935 Suffolk	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£188	£19	£78	£1	£0	£10	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£12	£0	
936 Surrey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£344	£21	£13	£13	£0	£0	£1	£0	£0	£0	£0	£30	£0	
937 Warwickshire	£13	£0	£0	£0	£0	£299	£20	£9	£10	£0	£9	£0	£0	£3	£0	£0	£7	£0	
938 West Sussex	£25	£1	£0	£0	£0	£278	£7	£20	£8	£1	£4	£0	£0	£22	£3	£0	£18	£6	
885 Worcestershire	£6	£0	£0	£0	£0	£219	£13	£19	£9	£1	£2	£2	£13	£0	£0	£0	£2	£0	

1) Pupil Divisors Used.  
 \* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.

The national mean is calculated as the Total Budget divided by the total population aged 3-19.  
 The median shows an average LA amount of spend per pupil.  
 England figures do not include data for City of London.

LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities  
To print use the buttons below.

	Col 37	Col 38	Col 39	Col 40	Col 41	Col 42	Col 43	Col 44	Col 45	Col 46	Col 47	Col 48	Col 49	Col 50	Col 51	Col 52	Col 53	Col 54
	1.4.12 Exceptions agreed by Secretary of State**	1.4.13 Other Items**	1.5.1 Other Specific Grants**	1.6.1 TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET (before Academy recruitment)**	2.0.1 Therapies and other health related services*	2.0.2 Central support services*	2.0.3 Education welfare service*	2.0.4 School improvement*	2.0.5 Asset management - education*	2.0.6 Statutory/Regulatory duties - education*	2.0.7 Premature retirement cost/Redundancy costs (new provisions)*	2.0.8 Monitoring national curriculum assessment*	2.1.1 Educational psychology service***	2.1.2 SEN administration, assessment and coordination and monitoring***	2.1.3 Parent partnership, guidance and information***	2.1.4 Home to school transport: SEN transport expenditure(0 - 25)***	2.1.5 Home to school transport: other home to school transport expenditure***	2.1.6 Supply of school places***
	£1	£2	£0	£4,996	£2	£8	£14	£32	£12	£44	£6	£1	£15	£12	£2	£70	£49	£3
ENGLAND - Average (mean)	£1	£2	£0	£4,996	£2	£8	£14	£32	£12	£44	£6	£1	£15	£12	£2	£70	£49	£3
ENGLAND - Average (median)	£0	£2	£0	£4,918	£0	£5	£14	£29	£6	£42	£0	£0	£14	£12	£2	£70	£17	£2
ENGLAND - Minimum	£0	£0	£0	£4,234	£0	£-10	£0	£0	£0	£-11	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
ENGLAND - Maximum	£92	£41	£45	£8,165	£43	£78	£200	£217	£120	£437	£51	£13	£48	£39	£19	£163	£229	£29
Average (median)	£0	£3	£0	£4,596	£0	£5	£10	£32	£5	£22	£4	£0	£14	£12	£2	£75	£74	£3
Minimum	£0	£0	£0	£4,234	£0	£0	£0	£9	£0	£2	£0	£0	£0	£1	£0	£39	£34	£0
Maximum	£3	£5	£0	£4,978	£10	£40	£18	£70	£120	£135	£49	£2	£25	£23	£4	£140	£229	£17
825 Buckinghamshire	£0	£4	£0	£4,513	£0	£0	£10	£47	£3	£40	£0	£0	£25	£7	£2	£89	£88	£0
873 Cambridgeshire	£3	£0	£0	£4,488	£0	£2	£11	£50	£11	£19	£3	£0	£14	£9	£2	£83	£100	£4
909 Cumbria	£0	£3	£0	£4,739	£0	£2	£18	£65	£0	£8	£0	£0	£18	£21	£0	£76	£170	£3
830 Derbyshire	£3	£0	£0	£4,724	£1	£12	£2	£18	£5	£10	£2	£0	£12	£9	£2	£69	£47	£0
878 Devon	£0	£3	£0	£4,525	£5	£0	£9	£32	£3	£39	£0	£0	£19	£9	£3	£75	£141	£2
835 Dorset	£0	£4	£0	£4,574	£0	£5	£3	£24	£33	£37	£0	£0	£15	£9	£4	£87	£67	£2
845 East Sussex	£3	£0	£0	£4,903	£0	£12	£7	£56	£4	£28	£11	£0	£15	£9	£4	£87	£67	£2
881 Essex	£2	£5	£0	£4,639	£0	£1	£16	£70	£120	£7	£19	£0	£13	£14	£1	£55	£62	£3
916 Gloucestershire	£0	£3	£0	£4,476	£0	£2	£11	£25	£3	£16	£6	£0	£13	£13	£4	£70	£95	£5
850 Hampshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,739	£0	£7	£12	£27	£17	£67	£0	£0	£18	£11	£1	£91	£59	£2
919 Hertfordshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,561	£2	£16	£11	£30	£1	£26	£6	£0	£17	£22	£3	£75	£34	£11
886 Kent	£3	£0	£0	£4,696	£0	£2	£5	£23	£0	£18	£4	£0	£10	£10	£2	£80	£56	£0
888 Lancashire	£0	£0	£0	£4,978	£10	£0	£11	£11	£4	£20	£9	£0	£11	£17	£3	£87	£52	£3
855 Leicestershire	£3	£0	£0	£4,234	£0	£10	£0	£24	£9	£38	£13	£0	£17	£7	£2	£74	£63	£5
925 Lincolnshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,554	£2	£14	£15	£63	£3	£64	£0	£0	£17	£12	£2	£70	£174	£4
926 Norfolk	£0	£3	£0	£4,693	£2	£15	£14	£28	£7	£22	£49	£1	£15	£11	£2	£76	£140	£3
815 North Yorkshire	£3	£0	£0	£4,706	£6	£3	£8	£49	£3	£3	£0	£0	£13	£1	£2	£56	£74	£17
928 Northamptonshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,596	£0	£40	£0	£9	£8	£2	£32	£0	£13	£1	£2	£56	£74	£17
891 Nottinghamshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,466	£0	£21	£2	£32	£5	£7	£0	£0	£0	£8	£1	£39	£51	£9
931 Oxfordshire	£0	£3	£0	£4,574	£1	£19	£10	£30	£2	£46	£6	£0	£9	£9	£2	£61	£121	£4
933 Somerset	£0	£3	£0	£4,659	£8	£0	£10	£31	£16	£11	£0	£2	£9	£9	£2	£57	£146	£5
860 Staffordshire	£3	£0	£0	£4,657	£0	£3	£13	£40	£4	£18	£30	£0	£23	£18	£4	£74	£47	£4
935 Suffolk	£0	£3	£0	£4,586	£0	£19	£7	£64	£16	£135	£3	£0	£13	£14	£2	£60	£130	£0
936 Surrey	£0	£3	£0	£4,794	£0	£9	£18	£59	£9	£55	£4	£2	£19	£19	£2	£140	£66	£3
937 Warwickshire	£0	£5	£0	£4,512	£0	£6	£17	£33	£1	£24	£22	£1	£10	£11	£2	£81	£115	£3
938 West Sussex	£0	£2	£0	£4,715	£0	£0	£6	£27	£18	£9	£1	£0	£14	£13	£1	£81	£53	£2
885 Worcestershire	£0	£3	£0	£4,504	£0	£0	£10	£38	£18	£59	£4	£0	£8	£14	£2	£72	£74	£5

- 1) Pupil Divisors Used.
- \* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools
- \*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools
- \*\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools
- \*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.
- \*\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.

- 2) The national mean is calculated as the Total Bur
- 3) The median shows an average LA amount of sp
- 4) England figures do not include data for City of Lc



LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities

To print use the buttons below.

	Col 55	Col 56	Col 57	Col 58	Col 59	Col 60	Col 61	Col 62	Col 63	Col 64	Col 65	Col 66	Col 67	Col 68	Col 69	Col 70	Col 71	Col 72
	2.2.1 Young people's learning and development***	2.2.2 Adult and Community learning***	2.2.3 Pension costs***	2.2.4 Joint use arrangements***	2.2.5 Insurance***	2.3.1 Other Specific Grant***	2.4.1 Total Other education and community budget for maintained schools only*	2.4.1 Total Other education and community budget for maintained schools and academies**	3.0.1 Funding for individual Sure Start Children's Centres****	3.0.2 Funding for local authority provided or commissioned area wide services delivered through Sure Start Children's Centres****	3.0.3 Funding on local authority management costs relating to Sure Start Children's Centres****	3.0.4 Other early years funding****	3.0.5 Total Sure Start Children's Centres and Early Years Funding****	3.1.1 Residential care****	3.1.2 Fostering services****	3.1.3 Adoption services****	3.1.4 Special guardianship support****	3.1.5 Other children looked after services****
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	£4	£5	£33	£0	£1	£0	£118	£195	£52	£8	£4	£14	£78	£73	£122	£22	£10	£16
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	£2	£1	£30	£0	£0	£0	£111	£172	£50	£2	£2	£12	£73	£71	£124	£22	£9	£11
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	£0	-£8	£0	£0	£0	-£7	£34	£68	£0	£0	£0	-£67	£11	£14	£53	£2	£0	£0
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	£57	£90	£132	£13	£8	£22	£596	£393	£184	£156	£40	£62	£263	£281	£286	£74	£36	£136
<b>Average (median)</b>	£1	£1	£30	£0	£0	£0	£97	£240	£49	£1	£2	£11	£67	£63	£92	£16	£7	£10
<b>Minimum</b>	£0	-£5	£5	£0	£0	£0	£50	£160	£5	£0	£0	£0	£20	£20	£53	£11	£3	£0
<b>Maximum</b>	£28	£41	£65	£9	£7	£0	£245	£373	£94	£46	£40	£32	£109	£123	£154	£28	£14	£39
825 Buckinghamshire	£4	£15	£30	£0	£0	£0	£100	£260	£45	£11	£2	£30	£88	£59	£72	£16	£5	£10
873 Cambridgeshire	£2	£0	£30	£1	£2	£0	£97	£246	£43	£4	£1	£23	£71	£62	£92	£16	£8	£28
909 Cumbria	£0	£4	£62	£0	£0	£0	£93	£354	£78	£0	£4	£4	£86	£67	£135	£24	£6	£9
830 Derbyshire	£3	-£3	£52	£1	£0	£0	£50	£193	£43	£0	£2	£8	£53	£61	£89	£17	£14	£9
878 Devon	£28	£41	£54	£0	£0	£0	£88	£373	£68	£0	£0	£6	£74	£88	£103	£22	£12	£30
835 Dorset	£0	£0	£33	£7	£0	£0	£103	£312	£50	£0	£5	£21	£76	£88	£64	£12	£4	£1
845 East Sussex	£13	£7	£5	£7	£7	£0	£117	£223	£31	£35	£7	£0	£73	£64	£131	£20	£9	£13
881 Essex	£0	£7	£12	£0	£0	£0	£232	£167	£40	£0	£0	£13	£53	£42	£117	£18	£10	£10
916 Gloucestershire	£0	£3	£47	£0	£0	£0	£64	£250	£49	£0	£1	£1	£51	£29	£96	£19	£12	£14
850 Hampshire	£6	£2	£17	£0	£1	£0	£131	£207	£41	£2	£1	£17	£61	£74	£77	£15	£5	£6
919 Hertfordshire	£1	£0	£26	£0	£0	£0	£92	£188	£53	£2	£6	£11	£72	£58	£86	£18	£7	£29
886 Kent	£3	-£5	£21	£0	£0	£0	£52	£178	£44	£1	£1	£8	£54	£29	£103	£22	£7	£1
888 Lancashire	£0	£1	£65	£0	£2	£0	£65	£239	£78	£3	£3	£13	£97	£63	£126	£13	£8	£20
855 Leicestershire	£0	£0	£27	£0	£1	£0	£95	£196	£50	£0	£2	£7	£59	£56	£53	£11	£3	£4
925 Lincolnshire	£9	£5	£45	£0	£0	£0	£161	£339	£15	£46	£2	£4	£67	£32	£60	£11	£4	£5
926 Norfolk	£11	£1	£10	£1	£0	£0	£139	£269	£81	£0	£0	£27	£109	£123	£154	£20	£4	£36
815 North Yorkshire	£0	£0	£15	£0	£2	£0	£74	£358	£24	£2	£40	£0	£66	£54	£87	£16	£9	£3
928 Northamptonshire	£3	-£1	£5	£1	£0	£0	£91	£170	£60	£0	£0	£7	£67	£77	£65	£19	£9	£21
891 Nottinghamshire	£0	£1	£44	£4	£3	£0	£66	£160	£94	£0	£2	£12	£108	£105	£140	£28	£12	£14
931 Oxfordshire	£0	£13	£41	£9	£0	£0	£113	£282	£60	£2	£4	£7	£73	£40	£57	£15	£5	£17
933 Somerset	£1	£7	£35	£0	£3	£0	£78	£273	£45	£0	£1	£19	£65	£77	£92	£17	£7	£39
860 Staffordshire	£5	£4	£62	£0	£0	£0	£108	£240	£14	£11	£0	£4	£29	£77	£111	£15	£9	£11
935 Suffolk	£0	£0	£13	£0	£0	£0	£245	£231	£49	£5	£0	£12	£65	£59	£85	£28	£5	£3
936 Surrey	£6	£4	£25	£0	£1	£0	£157	£285	£41	£2	£2	£32	£77	£66	£63	£11	£9	£22
937 Warwickshire	£2	£5	£43	£0	£0	£0	£105	£271	£49	£1	£3	£5	£57	£20	£118	£13	£7	£9
938 West Sussex	£1	£0	£17	£2	£0	£0	£62	£184	£55	£0	£3	£24	£81	£74	£84	£14	£8	£0
885 Worcestershire	£0	£0	£6	£0	£0	£0	£129	£180	£5	£0	£2	£13	£20	£67	£152	£13	£5	£0

- 1) Pupil Divisors Used.
- \* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools
- \*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools
- \*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.
- \*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.

The national mean is calculated as the Total Budget divided by the total population.  
The median shows an average LA amount of spend per capita.  
England figures do not include data for City of London.



LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities  
To print use the buttons below.

	Col 73	Col 74	Col 75	Col 76	Col 77	Col 78	Col 79	Col 80	Col 81	Col 82	Col 83	Col 84	Col 85	Col 86	Col 87	Col 88	Col 89	Col 90
	3.1.6 Short breaks (respite) for looked after disabled children****	3.1.7 Children placed with family and friends****	3.1.8 Education of looked after children****	3.1.9 Leaving care support services****	3.1.10 Asylum seeker services children****	3.1.11 Total Children Looked After****	3.2.1 Other children and families services****	3.3.1 Social work (including LA functions in relation to child protection)****	3.3.2 Commissioning and Children's Services Strategy****	3.3.3 Local Safeguarding Children Board****	3.3.4 Total Safeguarding Children and Young People's Services****	3.4.1 Direct payments****	3.4.2 Short breaks (respite) for disabled children****	3.4.3 Other support for disabled children****	3.4.4 Targeted family support****	3.4.5 Universal family support****	3.4.6 Total Family Support Services****	3.5.1 Universal services for young people****
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	£5	£6	£3	£19	£2	£277	£7	£138	£21	£2	£161	£7	£17	£3	£41	£6	£74	£24
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	£1	£4	£2	£19	£0	£281	£3	£140	£16	£2	£169	£6	£17	£1	£37	£1	£73	£25
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£-4	£129	£0	£0	£0	£0	£38	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£21	£0
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	£42	£33	£17	£81	£17	£664	£114	£374	£100	£38	£420	£44	£59	£48	£137	£80	£185	£141
<b>Average (median)</b>	£4	£4	£2	£10	£0	£219	£4	£115	£13	£1	£140	£5	£16	£2	£35	£2	£77	£10
<b>Minimum</b>	£0	£0	£0	£3	£0	£146	£0	£0	£0	£0	£38	£0	£0	£0	£4	£0	£26	£0
<b>Maximum</b>	£20	£16	£8	£51	£5	£384	£27	£201	£56	£12	£213	£20	£40	£25	£117	£71	£146	£41
825 Buckinghamshire	£13	£16	£0	£4	£1	£196	£0	£95	£52	£1	£148	£1	£0	£25	£31	£9	£66	£2
873 Cambridgeshire	£7	£0	£4	£9	£1	£227	£1	£115	£25	£1	£141	£10	£9	£2	£73	£5	£99	£1
909 Cumbria	£14	£8	£0	£9	£0	£291	£8	£146	£56	£2	£204	£8	£23	£16	£35	£0	£81	£24
830 Derbyshire	£5	£0	£0	£29	£0	£223	£5	£95	£4	£1	£101	£6	£33	£3	£35	£4	£81	£12
878 Devon	£0	£0	£3	£11	£0	£270	£5	£190	£7	£2	£198	£20	£6	£2	£65	£0	£93	£24
835 Dorset	£0	£0	£4	£5	£0	£177	£27	£163	£14	£1	£178	£3	£15	£2	£50	£2	£73	£41
845 East Sussex	£0	£4	£2	£7	£0	£249	£16	£146	£12	£12	£170	£0	£33	£0	£29	£14	£77	£6
881 Essex	£7	£3	£1	£9	£0	£219	£2	£146	£0	£1	£147	£7	£0	£2	£53	£0	£62	£0
916 Gloucestershire	£0	£5	£0	£18	£0	£192	£0	£104	£16	£1	£121	£13	£20	£1	£55	£2	£90	£5
850 Hampshire	£8	£10	£3	£5	£0	£203	£8	£81	£2	£1	£83	£4	£12	£1	£33	£1	£50	£2
919 Hertfordshire	£2	£9	£7	£9	£3	£227	£8	£119	£6	£1	£127	£9	£21	£3	£37	£0	£70	£38
886 Kent	£0	£6	£4	£18	£0	£190	£24	£131	£13	£1	£145	£0	£26	£1	£31	£0	£57	£20
888 Lancashire	£1	£5	£2	£3	£0	£240	£0	£71	£19	£1	£92	£7	£24	£3	£66	£1	£102	£28
855 Leicestershire	£5	£0	£8	£20	£2	£163	£17	£88	£13	£1	£102	£6	£14	£5	£22	£0	£47	£0
925 Lincolnshire	£12	£5	£1	£15	£0	£146	£1	£116	£42	£1	£159	£3	£7	£5	£66	£8	£89	£28
926 Norfolk	£15	£0	£1	£31	£0	£384	£8	£0	£56	£1	£57	£3	£16	£0	£11	£71	£100	£26
815 North Yorkshire	£1	£0	£1	£12	£0	£183	£0	£101	£9	£1	£111	£4	£37	£1	£42	£4	£88	£4
928 Northamptonshire	£5	£6	£0	£10	£0	£212	£16	£103	£0	£2	£105	£3	£11	£4	£9	£0	£26	£40
891 Nottinghamshire	£0	£0	£2	£9	£0	£309	£0	£120	£2	£2	£123	£8	£40	£2	£19	£9	£78	£34
931 Oxfordshire	£4	£12	£2	£3	£4	£159	£4	£115	£3	£2	£119	£5	£8	£8	£76	£2	£98	£11
933 Somerset	£8	£0	£0	£51	£0	£292	£4	£95	£13	£5	£113	£4	£8	£0	£18	£0	£30	£9
860 Staffordshire	£20	£5	£0	£35	£2	£298	£0	£171	£15	£1	£186	£6	£5	£2	£4	£15	£32	£31
935 Suffolk	£2	£1	£7	£18	£5	£213	£4	£136	£13	£0	£149	£5	£19	£7	£33	£1	£65	£10
936 Surrey	£0	£10	£3	£10	£1	£195	£2	£158	£8	£1	£167	£7	£23	£1	£17	£3	£51	£9
937 Warwickshire	£0	£11	£3	£8	£1	£190	£7	£201	£11	£1	£213	£2	£16	£0	£19	£1	£39	£0
938 West Sussex	£17	£2	£1	£31	£5	£237	£0	£15	£21	£1	£38	£16	£13	£0	£117	£0	£146	£0
885 Worcestershire	£0	£0	£1	£5	£2	£246	£0	£115	£24	£1	£140	£3	£24	£1	£82	£8	£119	£1

Page 73

1) Pupil Divisors Used.  
 \* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.  
 2) The national mean is calculated as the Total Buc  
 3) The median shows an average LA amount of sp  
 4) England figures do not include data for City of Lc

LA Benchmarking Tables 2012-13  
Per Capita Table (Net)

14-15 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita

Upper Tier Authorities

To print use the buttons below.

	Col 91	Col 92	Col 93	Col 94	Col 95	Col 96
	3.5.2 Targeted services for young people****	3.5.3 Total Services for young people****	3.6.1 Youth justice****	4.0.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Non-schools budget functions and Children's and young people services)****	5.0.2 Total Children and Young People's Services and Youth Justice Budget (excluding CERA)(lines 3.0.5 + 3.1.11 + 3.2.1 + 3.3.4 + 3.4.6 + 3.5.3 + 3.6.1)****	Total Children and Young People's Services and Youth Justice Budget (inc CERA)(lines 5.0.2 + 4.0.1)****
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>£25</b>	<b>£48</b>	<b>£15</b>	<b>£2</b>	<b>£660</b>	<b>£662</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>£21</b>	<b>£49</b>	<b>£13</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£680</b>	<b>£680</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£6</b>	<b>-£13</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£379</b>	<b>£379</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>£87</b>	<b>£180</b>	<b>£61</b>	<b>£51</b>	<b>£1,547</b>	<b>£1,547</b>
<b>Average (median)</b>	<b>£24</b>	<b>£47</b>	<b>£11</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£554</b>	<b>£554</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>£1</b>	<b>£15</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£434</b>	<b>£439</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>£69</b>	<b>£82</b>	<b>£19</b>	<b>£51</b>	<b>£736</b>	<b>£736</b>
825 Buckinghamshire	£45	£47	£9	£0	£554	£554
873 Cambridgeshire	£43	£44	£9	£4	£592	£596
909 Cumbria	£24	£48	£10	£0	£727	£727
830 Derbyshire	£69	£82	£11	£0	£556	£556
878 Devon	£1	£26	£19	£0	£684	£684
835 Dorset	£23	£64	£15	£0	£609	£609
845 East Sussex	£16	£22	£7	£0	£614	£614
881 Essex	£15	£15	£14	£0	£513	£513
916 Gloucestershire	£43	£49	£11	£0	£514	£514
850 Hampshire	£27	£29	£9	£0	£444	£444
919 Hertfordshire	£11	£49	£17	£0	£569	£569
886 Kent	£7	£26	£11	£0	£507	£507
888 Lancashire	£19	£46	£12	£0	£589	£589
855 Leicestershire	£40	£40	£6	£6	£434	£439
925 Lincolnshire	£30	£57	£8	£0	£527	£527
926 Norfolk	£51	£77	£0	£0	£736	£736
815 North Yorkshire	£67	£72	£13	£4	£532	£536
928 Northamptonshire	£9	£49	£11	£51	£486	£537
891 Nottinghamshire	£28	£62	£11	£28	£692	£720
931 Oxfordshire	£34	£45	£5	£0	£504	£504
933 Somerset	£14	£22	£9	£0	£535	£535
860 Staffordshire	£17	£48	£11	£0	£606	£606
935 Suffolk	£40	£49	£19	£0	£564	£564
936 Surrey	£67	£77	£11	£0	£579	£579
937 Warwickshire	£19	£19	£12	£0	£537	£537
938 West Sussex	£21	£21	£5	£0	£529	£529
885 Worcestershire	£16	£17	£7	£0	£548	£548

- 1) Pupil Divisors Used.  
 \* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\* Total pupils aged 3-19 from maintained schools  
 \*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-17.  
 \*\*\*\*\* Total population aged between 0-19.

The national mean is calculated as the Total Bur  
 The median shows an average LA amount of sp  
 England figures do not include data for City of Lc



## REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</b>	Schools Forum
<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b>	14 January 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Academies Update
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	John O'Connor (Children's Services Manager: Education Support)
<b>NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Adrian Clarke
<b>CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:</b>	01522 553216
<b>CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>	adrian.clarke@lincolnshire.gov.uk
<b>IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?</b>	No

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide information on the latest number of academies and pupils in academies.

### DISCUSSION

The Schools Forum asked for an update to be provided to each meeting on the number of academy conversions.

This is the position as at the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014. The pupil figures are based on the October census data (i.e. the latest published).

Since the effective date of the last report (1<sup>st</sup> September 2014) three further Academies have opened bringing the total number to 121 (33.4%) educating 60,079 (58.5%) pupils. This is an increase of 0.8% of schools and 1.4% of pupils.

The Primary Schools that converted are Grantham Sir Isaac Newton Primary School, which became a sponsored academy sponsored by the Community Inclusive Trust and Lincoln Chad Varah Primary, which has become Lincoln St Giles Academy sponsored by the New Dawn Trust. The Secondary convertor is Horncastle Banovallum School, which has converted as a stand-alone academy in partnership with Horncastle Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School.

		Schools			FTE
<b>Nursery</b>					
All		5			430
Maintained		5	100.0%		430 100.0%
Academy		0	0.0%		0 0.0%
<b>Primary</b>					
All		280			53,690
Maintained		211	75.4%		34,984 65.2%
Academy		69	24.6%		18,706 34.8%
<b>Secondary</b>					
All		55			46,667
Maintained		8	14.5%		5,628 12.1%
Academy		47	85.5%		41,039 87.9%
<b>Special</b>					
All		21			1,748
Maintained		16	76.2%		1,414 80.9%
Academy		5	23.8%		334 19.1%
<b>PRU</b>					
All		1			180
Maintained		1	100.0%		180 100.0%
Academy		0	0.0%		0 0.0%
<b>Total</b>					
All		362			102,715
Maintained		241	66.6%		42,636 41.5%
Academy		121	33.4%		60,079 58.5%

By 1<sup>st</sup> June 2015 if conversions and sponsorships proceed according to their target dates the position will be:

#### Projected Six Month Status of All Lincolnshire State Schools

		Schools			FTE
<b>Nursery</b>					
All		5			430
Maintained		5	100.0%		430 100.0%
Academy		0	0.0%		0 0.0%

<b>Primary</b>				
All	280		53,690	
Maintained	209	74.6%	34,902	65.0%
Academy	71	25.4%	18,788	35.0%
<b>Secondary</b>				
All	55		46,667	
Maintained	7	12.7%	5,157	11.0%
Academy	48	87.3%	41,510	89.0%
<b>Special</b>				
All	21		1,748	
Maintained	14	66.7%	1,276	73.0%
Academy	7	33.3%	472	27.0%
<b>PRU</b>				
All	1		180	
Maintained	1	100.0%	180	100.0%
Academy	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>				
All	362		102,715	
Maintained	236	65.2%	41,945	40.8%
Academy	126	34.8%	60,770	59.2%

It is anticipated that there will be a further two primary academies (0.7%) bringing the total number to 71 (25.4%) representing 18,788 FTE pupils (35.0%). The schools expected to convert are, Fulstow Community Primary School and Ingoldsby Primary School as part of the David Ross Education Trust (Ingoldsby will be sponsored).

There is expected to be one further secondary academy (1.8%) bringing the total to 48 (87.3%) representing 41,510 pupils (89.0%). The David Ross Education Trust will also sponsor Kirton Middlecott.

There will be two further special academies. These are Gainsborough Aegir Community School and Gainsborough Warren Wood Community School. Both schools are part of the Gainsborough Federation. This will be an increase of 10.1% and will mean that 472 (27.0%) of pupils with Special educational needs and/or disabilities will be educated within academies.

In total, it is expected there will be five further academies by 1<sup>st</sup> June 2015. This is an overall increase of 1.4% and will bring the total number of Academies to 126 (34.8%). Academies will educate 60,770 (59.2%) Lincolnshire pupils.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Schools Forum is asked to note the contents of the report.

## **APPENDICES - these are listed below and attached at the back of the report.**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 13

Lincolnshire Schools' Forum

14 January 2015

## Information Pack

1.	List of Acronyms	A
2.	Schools Forum Work Plan	B

This page is intentionally left blank



## Document

**Acronyms**

DSG	Dedicated Schools Grant
DSB	Dedicated Schools Budget
ISB	Individual Schools Budget
AWPU	Age Weighted Pupil Unit
MFG	Minimum Funding Guarantee
DfE	Department for Education
SFVS	Schools Financial Value Standard
ESG	Education Support Grant
LA	Local Authority
PVI	Private, Voluntary and Independent providers
EYSFF	Early Years Single Funding Formula
PFI	Private Finance Initiative
CERA	Capital Expenditure from the Revenue Account
MTFP	Medium Term Finance Plan
SEN	Special Educational Needs
DFC	Devolved Formula Capital
HN	Higher Needs
LAC	Looked After Children

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools' Forum Work Programme

DATE	ITEMS
14 January 2015	See today's agenda
22 April 2015	Outreach Support Service Sector Led Improvement S251 Budget Statement 2015/16 Team Around the Child
24 June 2015	
October 2015 (Date to be agreed)	Team Around the Child

This page is intentionally left blank