Dear Colleague

LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM

I would like to invite you to a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum to be held on **Wednesday 5 October 2016 at 2.00 pm** at **Beaumanor Hall** with the room being available from 1.30 pm.

Please see below the agenda for the meeting. Papers for this meeting can be found at

Yours sincerely

Karen Brown Clerk to the Schools' Forum

AGENDA

		Paper
1.	Membership Update	1
2.	Election of Chair and Vice-Chair	
3.	Apologies and Substitutions	
4.	Minutes and Matters Arising	4
5.	2015/16 Maintained School Balances	5
6.	2017/18 School Funding	6
7.	Any Other Business	
8.	Date of Next Meetings:	
	Monday 5 December 2016	
	Thursday 9 February 2017	
	Monday 12 June 2017	
	All dates from 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.	



SCHOOLS FORUM

Membership Update

5 October 2016

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and	Х	Pre School	
Secondary Schools			
Academies	Х	Foundation Stage	
PVI Settings	Х	Primary	Х
Special Schools /	Х	Secondary	Х
Academies			
Local Authority	Х	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	Х

1. This report provides a membership update for the Schools Forum

Recommendations

- 2. That Schools Forum supports the actions of the local authority with regard to membership from September 2016.
- 3. That members seek the views of their groups prior to attendance at the meeting and support the local authority's intention to extend the terms of office

Membership Numbers

4. Schools Forum membership is required to be broadly proportional to the pupil numbers within the local authority area i.e. primary & secondary membership and to

school type i.e. maintained and academy. An assessment is completed annually to ensure appropriate membership, no changes are necessary to membership numbers for 2016/17.

Vacancies

5. A vacancy for a secondary academy governor has become vacant as a result of the resignation of Richard Spurr. Leicestershire Secondary Heads (LSH) has been approached and will seek nominations from interested governors. Currently this group does not have a nominated substitute, should more than one nomination be received it should be possible for a substitute to be appointed.

Term of Office

6. Election to Schools Forum is for a four year period and for some members the term of office is expired. Given the uncertain future of Schools Forum under national funding reform the local authority proposes to extend time expired membership by one year to ensure stability of membership. This affects the following members;

Jean Lewis	Primary Academy Governor
David Thomas	Primary Academy Governor
Heather Sewell	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Karen Allen	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Tony Gelsthorpe	Primary Maintained Governor
lan Sharpe	Leicestershire Diocesan Board

Resource Implications

7. None arising directly from this report

Equal Opportunity Issues

8. None arising directly from this report

Background Papers

None

Officers to Contact

Jenny Lawrence - Finance Business Partner, Children and Family Services Email: <u>jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk</u> Tel: 01163056401 Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum held at Beaumanor Hall on Tuesday 21 June 2016 at 2.00 pm

Present

Nick Goforth	Secondary Academies Headteacher
Callum Orr	Secondary Academies Headteacher
Sonia Singleton	Secondary Academies Headteacher
Suzanne Uprichard	Secondary Academies Governor / PRU
Steve McDonald	Secondary Academies Governor
David Hedley	Secondary Academies Governor
Bill Nash	Secondary Maintained Governor
Jane McKay	Primary Academy Headteacher
Stephen Cotton	Primary Academy Headteacher
Jean Lewis	Primary Academy Governor
David Thomas	Primary Academy Governor
Heather Sewell	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Karen Allen	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Jason Brooks	Special Maintained Headteacher
Chris Davies	Roman Catholic Representative
lan Sharpe	Church of England Representative
Catherine Drury	Early Years Provider
Graham Bett	JCC Representative (for Alison Deacon)

In attendance

Lesley Hagger, Director, Children and Family Services Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources Ivan Ould, Lead Member, Children and Family Services Paul Meredith, Interim Assistant Director, Children's Social Care Chris Connearn, Head of Strategy, Achievement of Vulnerable Learners David Atterbury, Head of Strategy, Education Sufficiency

		Action
1.	Apologies for absence/Substitutions	
	Apologies for absence were received from Richard Spurr, Jo Blackburn, Mark Mitchley, Kath Kelly, Michael Wilson, Alison Deacon and Tony Gelsthorpe.	

5

2.	Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.	The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 22 February 2016 were agreed.	
	Matters Arising	
	The representation of Secondary Academy Headteachers was raised and it was agreed this would be discussed separately.	JL
	Steve McDonald made a comment specifically relating to the perceived use of LA basic need capital funding in supporting age range change across the county in 2015/16, in particular how much had been allocated, to whom and for what purpose. Jenny Lawrence referred Steve McDonald to the information provided to Cabinet which sets out the capital programme and that £1.5m had been spent on year 6 retention in primary schools.	
	LH confirmed that capital had only been used to enable removal of the 10+ system i.e. retention of Y6 in primary schools in areas where secondary age range was progressing for example in Wigston.	
	Callum Orr queried the LA policy and vision and statements regarding reorganising secondary schools. David Atterbury confirmed that the strategy for the planning of school places does not identify the development of all through schools as a priority but states that the LA will seek to support this where there is evidence of basic need growth in the particular area.	
3.	2015/16 Schools Budget Outturn	
	Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which sets out the outturn position and confirms the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Reserve and its intended use.	
	Jenny said that overall the schools budget was overspent and referred to paragraph 6 which sets out the significant variances. Jenny highlighted the high needs block variance which included SEN and the changes in terms of the grant settlement which were the significant areas. The balances for maintained schools were unavailable as the local authority was currently in the progress of collecting financial information. However, initial data suggests the balances may have increased.	
	Paragraph 9 sets out the updated position on the DSG reserve which was presented to Schools' Forum on 22 February 2016. This has slightly increased in order to meet the deficit for maintained schools becoming academies. Fossebrook Primary School opens in September which is an expected new school growth.	
	Jenny referred to the proposed allocation of the reserve set out in paragraph 10 but added with the impact of the Government policy for	

 Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on			
 since its introduction in 2006. The DSG reserve will continue to be monitored and the local authority's position is that there are no additional resources with which to provide financial support. A Forum member commented that paragraph 11 is a crucial paragraph and asked if it was a policy decision from the County Council. Jenny said that it was the local authority. Mr Ould commented that it is the policy as part of the MTFS. Prior to DSG the County Council topped up the government grant but when DSG came in that additional funding was absorbed into the grant. Sonia Singleton asked if that was discussed annually at Cabinet. Mr Ould said it was included in the MTFS process and that the local authority was required to find £20M savings before 2020. Schools' Forum noted that the table in paragraph 10 regarding new school growth should read "No provisionschool funding reform it is expected that local authorities". Schools' Forum noted the financial outturn for the 2015/16 Schools Budget (paragraphs 5-6). Schools' Forum noted the level of DSG reserve and its deployment (paragraphs 9.10). School Funding Issues Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academise and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on 			
and asked if it was a policy decision from the County Council. Jenny said that it was the local authority. Mr Ould commented that it is the policy as part of the MTFS. Prior to DSG the County Council topped up the government grant but when DSG came in that additional funding was absorbed into the grant. Sonia Singleton asked if that was discussed annually at Cabinet. Mr Ould said it was included in the MTFS process and that the local authority was required to find £20M savings before 2020. Schools' Forum noted that the table in paragraph 10 regarding new school growth should read "No provisionschool funding reform it is expected that local authorities". Schools' Forum noted the financial outturn for the 2015/16 Schools Budget (paragraphs 5-6). Schools' Forum noted the level of DSG reserve and its deployment (paragraphs 9.10).		since its introduction in 2006. The DSG reserve will continue to be monitored and the local authority's position is that there are no	
Ould said it was included in the MTFS process and that the local authority was required to find £20M savings before 2020. Schools' Forum noted that the table in paragraph 10 regarding new school growth should read "No provisionschool funding reform it is expected that local authorities". Schools' Forum noted the financial outturn for the 2015/16 Schools Budget (paragraphs 5-6). Schools' Forum noted the level of DSG reserve and its deployment (paragraphs 9.10). School Funding Issues Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; • The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding • Funding age range changes • The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on		and asked if it was a policy decision from the County Council. Jenny said that it was the local authority. Mr Ould commented that it is the policy as part of the MTFS. Prior to DSG the County Council topped up the government grant but when DSG came in that additional	
 school growth should read "No provisionschool funding reform it is expected that local authorities". Schools' Forum noted the financial outturn for the 2015/16 Schools Budget (paragraphs 5-6). Schools' Forum noted the level of DSG reserve and its deployment (paragraphs 9.10). School Funding Issues Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on 		Ould said it was included in the MTFS process and that the local	
Schools Budget (paragraphs 5-6). Schools' Forum noted the level of DSG reserve and its deployment (paragraphs 9.10). School Funding Issues Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; • The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding • Funding age range changes • The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny tated that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on		school growth should read "No provisionschool funding reform	
deployment (paragraphs 9.10). School Funding Issues Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; • The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding • Funding age range changes • The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on			
 Jenny Lawrence introduced her report to the meeting which aims to clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on			
 clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 Jenny reported that this paper contains no new information to reports presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on 	4.	School Funding Issues	
presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been discussed widely. Jenny stated that firstly the local authority must treat all schools equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on		 clarify for schools and Schools' Forum the process behind three aspects of schools funding which are the subject of much debate but often based on partial or incorrect information namely; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding Funding age range changes 	
equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on		presented at different times to Schools' Forum where it had been	
studio schools but not special schools. It was also worth noting that School Funding Formula is the basis for allocating a fixed pot of funding and that governing bodies determine how the funding is spent.		equally; there is no differential between academies and maintained schools. The local authority may treat primary and secondary schools differently usually within the funding rates. Current decisions on schools funding affect maintained schools, academies and the two studio schools but not special schools. It was also worth noting that School Funding Formula is the basis for allocating a fixed pot of	
Allocation of Additional £20.5M in 2015/16		Allocation of Additional £20 5M in 2015/16	

Jenny stated that paragraph 11 states how the allocation methodology was determined. Paragraph 12 sets out how the recommendations were made which schools were widely consulted on. The working group representation was 56% secondary and 36% primary. Paragraph 13 sets out how it was delivered and paragraph 14 sets out the consultation on the proposals.

Nick Gorforth asked why the 2.75% AWPU increase was rejected. Jenny commented it was not supported by Schools' Forum following a very vigorous discussion.

Funding age range changes

Jenny referred to paragraph 16 which confirms that that the local authority has consistently stated that it has no revenue or capital for age range changes. The first group of academies undertaking age range changes did so with the knowledge of the 1 year lag in funding which then resulted in the EFA requiring local authorities to fund such changes by pupil number variations or face the EFA removing the money they thought necessary to fund age range changes from DSG. The local authority worked with schools and the EFA to establish a system whereby expanding schools being funded for estimated September pupils and protection of 80% for falls in pupil numbers in the first year of change, funded from headroom in the overall DSG settlement. Jenny emphasised that no school has ever been or ever will be funded for 100% of its number on roll and this was still the position.

Steve McDonald asked what the method of calculation was for age range changes and when was it shared with secondary schools. Jenny said that it was agreed by Cabinet and the method of calculation was the October 2013 scheme formulated with schools. Steve McDonald commented that there was no indication of the method when the first schools went through age range changes. Jenny reinforced that the local authority did not provide this scheme for the first year of age range change but had to respond to changes in the operation guidance issued by the EFA in year two of change. The scheme was discussed many times and whilst the local authority had a responsibility to inform schools then those schools also had a responsibility to clarify the financial position prior to submitting business cases.

Karen Allen stated that the age range change was discussed at the September 2015 Schools' Forum. If a school was making a change they should be expected to find the information on how this would affect school change. The funding formula does exist and was part of the process.

Sonia Singleton commented that not all schools agreed with the age range protection policy or fully understood its implications and at that time proper consideration had not been given by schools in their business planning.

The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17

	Jenny referred to paragraph 21 which outlines the current system of needs led top-up funding for high needs which was introduced in 2013/14 and since April 2013 the cost of top up funding has increased by 32%.	
	Jenny stated that the high needs costs issue was being contained and the funding gap was closed through allocation of headroom, savings set for SEN services and reduced AWPU. For 2015/16 the overspend had been met from reserves.	
	David Thomas commented that paragraphs 23 to 26 indicated considerable uncertainties. Jenny said that there were lots of uncertainties some of which she outlined to the meeting.	
	The meeting discussed getting better value from placements and more effective commissioning. Paul Meredith said that there was a similar issue in social care which is now being managed. Paul said that he would present some ideas at the September meeting.	PM/JL
	Graham Bett set out his view that schools were now being made to pay for past inactions of the local authority to control expenditure and that that schools do not have a shared responsibility for the overspend.	
	 Schools' Forum noted the local authority position and process for determining the approach to; The allocation of the additional £20.5M school funding in 2015/16 Funding age range changes The 1% AWPU reduction in 2016/17 	
5.	School Funding Update	
	Jenny Lawrence introduced the report which sets out the outcome of the financial survey undertaken with primary schools and academies, sets out the current situation for funding age range changes and provides an update on 2017/18 school funding.	
	Jenny commented that the survey was summarised in paragraphs 12- 16 which has been discussed many times. The survey was slightly out of line with school balances and Jenny said that work was being carried out on this.	
	The local authority met with a group of secondary schools. There was a consistent view that the current scheme should not be changed but that the term estimate should be redefined and pupil growth removed from the adjustment.	
	Jenny commented that a concern has been raised with the EFA on the impact of school funding reform and retaining the funding in the formula used for protection for schools with falling rolls as a result of age range changes, as a local authority we do not get additional funding and therefore might lose £2.5M.	

	Sonia Singleton asked if the Schools' Forum could make the EFA aware of their concerns regarding the announcement of the national funding formula. Jenny agreed to assist Sonia with some words to send to the EFA. Schools' Forum noted the contents of the report. Schools' Forum noted and voted to agree with the local authority's preferred option for the 2017/18 school funding	
	formula (paragraph 8) subject to the expected phase 2 consultation on school funding 2017/18.	
6.	High Needs Funding	
	Jenny Lawrence introduced the report which sets out the position in respect of high needs expenditure and actions that are being taken to address increasing costs.	
	David Thomas referred to paragraph 10 and commented that there was a high level of underspend in 2013/14, 2014/15 and then 2015/16 took two elements of an impact. He added that there was a need to change funding from the schools' block.	
	Schools' Forum commented that headteachers should be included in paragraph 18.	
	David Thomas referred to paragraph 20 and asked if as well as a notional SEN budget had there ever been a survey carried out on schools with special needs. Jenny commented that there used to be an exercise where SENA used to collect information from schools on spend.	
	Chris Connearn commented that a group of officers and headteachers met to look at a database in order that schools could benchmark themselves against other schools in mainstream schools.	
	David Atterbury commented that place planning was a less expensive provision out of county but also not said is the free schools agenda. Work was currently underway to reduce revenue expenses.	
	Karen Allen commented that she completely understood that a lot of services that were traditionally not traded needed to become traded but did have a concern with this whole new way of thinking. Schools have an option to buy in or not but we need to be mindful that we have some working together to do.	
	Schools' Forum noted the report.	
7.	Charging for VI and HI Services	
	Chris Connearn introduced the report which sets out the implementation of charging for hearing and vision support services to	

schools.	
Schools' Forum referred to paragraph 12 and asked if British Sign Language would be included in the 'core offer'. Chris confirmed that it would.	
Sonia asked if a hearing impaired unit would be additionally charged from the hearing support service. Chris confirmed they would not because they have children on roll at the school.	
Schools' Forum noted the intention to charge schools for some hearing and vision support services from September 2016.	
Change of Date for September meeting	
The Schools' Forum noted and agreed the change of the next meeting date to Monday 19 September 2016, 2.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.	
Any Other Business	
Support to Schools Steve McDonald asked about support to schools who receive financial notice to improve their financial management. Jenny said that the local authority had no statutory role in that process. The local authority has facilitated a meeting between the Regional Schools Commissioner and the EFA where the financial position of secondary schools was discussed.	
Callum Orr asked about support for academies as maintained schools would receive support. Jenny said that deficit recovery was not funded from the DSG as it was set against school surpluses. Conversations had taken place with the EFA that academies should have that same option. As a maintained school the local authority would see you through a phased plan. Jenny said that these issues are constantly being raised with the EFA.	
David Hedley commented that the answer is given to form a MAT but that was not a solution.	
Date of Next Meeting	
Monday 19 September, 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.	
Future dates:	
Monday 5 December 2016 Thursday 9 February 2017 Monday 12 June 2017	
All dates from 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.	
	Schools' Forum referred to paragraph 12 and asked if British Sign Language would be included in the 'core offer'. Chris confirmed that it would. Sonia asked if a hearing impaired unit would be additionally charged from the hearing support service. Chris confirmed they would not because they have children on roll at the school. Schools' Forum noted the intention to charge schools for some hearing and vision support services from September 2016. Change of Date for September meeting The Schools' Forum noted and agreed the change of the next meeting date to Monday 19 September 2016, 2.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall. Any Other Business Support to Schools Steve McDonald asked about support to schools who receive financial notice to improve their financial management. Jenny said that the local authority had no statutory role in that process. The local authority has facilitated a meeting between the Regional Schools Commissioner and the EFA where the financial position of secondary schools was discussed. Callum Orr asked about support for academies as maintained schools would receive support. Jenny said that deficit recovery was not funded from the DSG as it was set against school supluses. Conversations had taken place with the EFA that academies should have that same option. As a maintained school the local authority would see you through a phased plan. Jenny said that these issues are constantly being raised with the EFA. David Hedley commented that the answer is given to form a MAT but that was not a solution. Date of Next Meeting Monday 19 September, 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall. Future dates: Monday 5 December 2016 Thursday 9 February 2017 Monday 12 June 2017



SCHOOLS FORUM

2015/16 Maintained School Balances

5 October 2016

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and	Х	Pre School	
Secondary Schools			
Academies		Foundation Stage	Х
PVI Settings		Primary	Х
Special Schools /	Х	Secondary	Х
Academies			
Local Authority	Х	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;					
Noting	Х	Maintained Primary School	Х				
		Members					
Decision		Maintained Secondary	Х				
		School Members					
		Maintained Special School	Х				
		Members					
		Academy Members					
		All Schools Forum					

1. This report sets out the position in regard to school balances for all schools that were maintained by the local authority on March 31 2016 and the 2015/16 financial year.

Recommendation

2. That Schools Forum note the position on the 2015/16 school balances for local authority maintained schools.

Introduction

 This report presents the annual position on school balances, it provides that information at individual school level for each school maintained by Leicestershire County Council on March 31st 2016.

- 4. Whilst local authorities are required to report maintained school balances there is no such requirement for the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to do the same for academies, concerns have been raised about the lack of visibility of the financial position of academies. Academies are required however to publish an annual statement of accounts which can be 6 -9 months after the financial year closure. Different financial years for maintained schools and academies do not allow for easy comparison if additional information were to be made available.
- 5. For the 285 schools in Leicestershire this report relates to 137 (48%). This can be broken down into 57% primaries, 4% secondary's, 62% special with the addition of 1 maintained nursery and 1 pupil referral unit.
- 6. With a large number of academies in Leicestershire, and the limited financial information publicly available, it is not possible for the local authority to have an overview of their financial health and the issues affecting their financial position. During 2015/16 the local authority sought high level financial information from both primary and secondary academies, whist this has been informative from a perspective of identifying financial pressures it has not, and could not have, identified the level of reserves within academies.

Background

- 7. School balances are only able to be formally measured by the local authority at the closure of the financial year. Balances are taken from the Consistent Financial Reporting return submitted by individual schools to the local authority.
- 8. Reporting locally is the first stage of publication of school balance information. Once all school returns are consolidated that information is submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) who subsequently publish that information on a national basis at both local authority and individual school level.
- 9. Schools Forum agreed at its meeting on June 20 2013 to remove the mechanism for controlling maintained school revenue balances given no such mechanism exists for academies, however national controls remain on Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) which remains limited to use over three years.

2015/16 School Balances

- 10. The analysis of school balances is shown in Appendix 1. The figures include all schools that were local authority maintained schools for the full financial year i.e. between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016.
- 11. Given the exclusion of balances for converted academies during 2015/16 the balances reported here will not match those reported at the end of 2014/15 but the comparison between years is valid.
- 12. The total level of maintained school balances at 31st March 2016 was £12.24m which shows an increase of £2.35m from the comparative 2014/15 position of £9.9m. The gross revenue position of £11.4m again is an increase from the 2014/15 position of £9.1m.
- 13. Overall 83% of maintained primary schools have balances over 5%. For secondary schools the low number of schools makes any comparison of the financial position in each phase unreliable.

	Primary	Secondary
Deficit	3 (2%)	2
Surplus 0% - 1%	2 (2%)	-
Surplus 1.1% - 3%	5 (4%)	-
Surplus 3.1% - 5%	10 (8%)	-
Surplus 5.1% - 8%	17 (13%)	-
Surplus 8.1% +	91 (71%)	-
Total	128	2

- 13. No percentage figure is available for special schools. National school funding reform implemented in 2013 means that special schools no longer have a fixed budget against which the level of balances can be compared. Special schools are funded at a place rate of £10,000 per place and top-up funding for each occupied place which is dependent on the needs of individual children for the time they are on roll.
- 14. Care needs to be taken when analysing school balances as they only show a position at a single point in time. It is the responsibility of the governing body to set a school budget that does not exceed the funding available, the finance team analyse the budget intention returns from schools to identify whether any of the schools currently reporting a surplus expect to move to deficit and if necessary that those schools are operating with an appropriate and agreed deficit recovery plan. The local authority has limited tools to undertake this type of exercise and is fully dependent upon schools sharing accurate and timely information and responding to requests for information, unfortunately this is often not the case. The local authority however is not responsible for monitoring school budgets, that responsibility is clearly delegated to governing bodies.
- 15. The finance service works pro-actively with schools in, or at risk of, a deficit budget and schools must gain local authority approval for any deficit and within that process must identify the actions to be taken to ensure the school returns to a balanced budget.
- 16. Where a maintained school is in a deficit position the local authority will agree a deficit recovery plan that minimises any negative impact on school performance which may result in a school being in a deficit position for a number of years. In such instances the finance service rigorously monitors the financial position of the school and to ensure the actions agreed to reduce expenditure are implemented, including the issue of a Financial Notice of Concern where appropriate.

Balance Control Mechanism

17. Schools Forum removed the mechanism for controlling schools balances when approving The Scheme for Financing Schools at its meeting on 20 June 2013 given that no such scheme exists for academies. The finance service requested

information from all schools with revenue balances in excess of 10% to determine how they are being used, a number of schools haven't provided information. From the information available schools are stating a number of reasons for holding funding. The largest amounts held are to smooth out cost increases and particularly staffing costs, for land & building works and ICT investments

School Funding and Financial Management

- 18. School balances are unable to be taken into account by local authorities in determining funding arrangements for schools. There is no correlation between the level of balances to any of the funding formula factors, school performance, type of school, location of school, levels of deprivation etc. The reasons for deficits are varied and are unique to individual schools.
- 19. There are some concerns within the finance team on the level of financial information presented to governors upon which financial decisions are based and the level of financial challenge from governors.
- 20. Anecdotal information from secondary schools continues to suggest a worsening financial position across the sector, falling rolls as a result of school re-organisation and the impact of reduced post 16 funding settlements are being reported by a number of secondary schools as having an adverse financial impact.

Conclusions

- 21. Whilst the information in this report is presented to Schools Forum to note, it isn't possible to form any conclusion from it on the financial health of schools in Leicestershire. The data covers less than 50% of schools and contains little information on secondary schools.
- 22. Balance information is a snapshot in time and as such provides no information on how funding will be deployed or whether resources have been accumulated for particular reasons. A school budget provides the resources to provide for pupils over the period for which it is allocated, however schools should at all times plan over a 3 5 year period. Employing effective strategic financial management techniques may therefore result in either a surplus or a deficit that will not be a reflection of financial health.

Resource Implications

23. Resource implications are included throughout this report.

Equal Opportunity Issues

24. Non arising directly from this report

Background Papers None

Officer to Contact Jenny Lawrence Finance Business Partner – Children and Family Services Email; <u>jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk</u> Tel: 01163056401

	2015-16						30						2014-15			
	B01		B03		B06					Total	B01	B02	B03	B05	B06	
	Committed	Uncommitted		B05 Other	Community		Total			Revenue	Committed	Uncommitted	Devolved	Other	Community	
	Revenue		Capital	Capital	Focused	Total	Revenue	0	Deficite	Balance %		Revenue	Capital	Capital	Focused	Balance
	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended	Balance	Balance	Surpluses	Deficits	of S251	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended	
Primary Schools											40					
Kilby St. Mary's Church of England Primary School	0	-8,314	0	0	0	-8,314	-8,314	0	-8,314	-2.0%		-6,632				-6,632
Sherard Primary School & Community Centre	0	-40,941	7,060	0	26,443		-40,941		-14,498			-198,216				-198,216
Swinford Church of England Primary School	0	-529	0		0	-529			-529			-14,404				-9,804
Long Whatton Church of England Primary School	0	47	70	0	0	117		47		0.0%		27,676	3,818	s C	(31,494
Albert Village Community Primary School	0	5,897	0	Ŭ	0	5,897	5,897			0.8%		-34,843) (0 (-34,843
Swannington Church of England Primary School	0	2,084	1,403		0	3,487	2,084			1.1%				6 C	(0 -1,257
All Saints Church of England Primary School	0	11,097	0	-	0	11,097	11,097					77,438			0	0 77,438
Saint Francis Catholic Primary School, Melton Mowbray	10,079	6,264	0		0	16,343	6,264					0 -7,778			, t) -7,778
St Margaret's Church of England Primary School	0	20,314	0		0	_0,0	20,314					0 4,982				4,982
Blaby Thistly Meadow Primary School Greenfield Primary School	0	24,303	0 1,798	-		24,303	24,303 55,240					0 -4,886) -4,886) -49,232
Thorpe Acre Infant School	0	55,240 18,752	1,796			57,038 18,752	18,752) -49,232) 106,077				110,816
Desford Community Primary School	0	27,000	0	-		32,765	27,000					0 46,456) 46,456
St Botolph's Church of England Primary School	0	17,545	12,434			29,979	17,545					31,916		/) 40,430
Croft Church of England Primary School	0	-35,487	13,811	0	37,876		-35,487	2,389				-30,670			28,334	
Warren Hills Community Primary School	0	24,404	14,203	0	0	38,607	24,404					41,213				50,987
Richmond Primary School	2,660		0		0	60,751	58,091	60,751	0				6,270) (() 45,446
Hallbrook Primary School, Broughton Astley	18,387	10,766	7,985	0	0	01,100						7 -24,279	19,426	i C	(0,004
St Peter's Church of England Primary School, Whetstone	0	39,636	0	•	0	,	39,636					26,296) (0 0	26,296
Little Bowden School	0	46,972	0	10,002	0	00,001	46,972) 22,227		0 0	() 22,227
Thorpe Acre Junior School	0	22,303	4,625			02,001	22,303					0 60,593			' (0 65,218
Ellistown Community Primary School	0	44,658	823		0	10,101	44,658					88,188			' (0 101,386
Claybrooke Primary School	850	,	6,439		0	21,000	17,297					0 -10,425			' () -8,987
Church Langton Church of England Primary School Whitwick, St John The Baptist Church of England Primary School	44,088	40,942 30,317	0	-		40,942	40,942 30,317					,	132	/) 72,182) 58,394
Newtown Linford Primary School	44,000	23,839	-1	-		23,839	23,839			5.9% 6.5%		34,656) 37,232
Sharnford Church of England Primary School	0	20,652	-1			20,652	20,652						2,968			27,865
Thythorn Field Community Primary School	0	40,068	6,934	•		47,002	40,068			7.0%	1,010	29,159				36,197
Thurnby, St Luke's Church of England Primary School	6,483		8,584		0	56,377	41,310			7.1%	4,268					16,535
Ravenhurst Primary School	7,999		15,104		C				0	7.2%	4,700			5 C	0	
Sheepy Magna Church of England Primary School	0	34,586	0		0	34,586			i 0			28,231	0) ((==,==:
John Wycliffe Primary School	9,132		3,940		0									- C	0	,
Snarestone Church of England Primary School	8,240		0		0	29,243								0 0	0	27,219
Orchard Church of England Primary School, Broughton Astley	8,524		1,485		0	58,098									0	0 42,078
Heather Primary School	12,506		7,185		0	35,228	15,536									43,759
Bishop Ellis Catholic Primary School, Thurmaston	0	96,302			0	96,302						0 45,365		/) 45,365 40,527
Oxley Primary School, Shepshed Great Glen St Cuthbert's Church of England Primary School	3,588	60,698 63,299	<u>5,585</u> 0		0	66,284 66,887	60,698 63,299					0 46,049 6 25,522		2,742		.0,021
Saint Charles's Catholic Primary School, Measham	0	41,862	0			41,862						20,525		2,742		20,525
Billesdon Parochial Primary School	6,869		5,567	-	0		25,490					18,154				18,596
Woodhouse Eaves, St Paul's Church of England Primary School	0,003		462		0		64,210		-					-	(
Hallaton Church of England Primary School	0	39,510	996		0		39,510							2 0	(28,633
Water Leys Primary School	16,036		16,213		0	115,193		98,980	0			8 83,995	13,055	i C	() 117,522
Sherrier Church of England Primary School	0	102,404	50			113,019	102,404					0 68,488		3,837	(75,109
Thurlaston Church of England Primary School	0	39,592	0	•	0	00,002						38,863			(38,863
St Edwards Church of England Primary School	54,532		4,764		0	59,296		,					10,366		(83,786
Saint Peter's Catholic Primary School, Hinckley	19,269		0	-		69,891	50,622			01270		7,478			(7,478
Foxton Primary School	6,580	36,961	3,222		-5,458			38,083							-1,367	
Newcroft Primary School Martinshaw Primary School, Groby	45,588	30,977 71,320	198 0			76,763 71,320	30,977 71,320) 18,377) 45,954) 18,377) 45,954
Arnesby Church of England Primary School	6,298		4,629	-		32,770	21,843) 45,954) -1,545
Kegworth Primary School	0,230	61,367	4,029			61,367	61,367	61,367		10.0%		50,256		1,497		
Willesley Primary School	25,466		0		1 0	122,651	97,185			10.1%		0 4,536) (() 4,536
Fleckney Church of England Primary School	4,000		0		0	129,919	125,919					76,757				76,757
The Latimer School, Anstey	12,924		5,669		0	110,963	92,370								(0 111,014
Houghton on the Hill Church of England Primary School	55,787	0	10,682		0	66,469				10.7%		,	7,810		(26,978
Highgate Community Primary School	0	85,794	1,602		0	91,887	85,794	85,794	. 0	11.2%		-3,683		20	(0 -2,081
Donisthorpe Primary School	0	80,036	0	-	0		80,036			11.4%		0 103,570) (0 103,570
Buckminster Primary School	0	10,100	0		0	-,				11.070		37,635			` ``	38,084
Seagrave Village Primary School	0	42,595	6,235		0		42,595					0 34,550			0	,
Burbage Church of England Infant School	6,346	107,499	736	0	0	114,581	107,499	113,845	0	11.6%	155,697	40,486	7,131	0	0	203,314

	2015-16					30		2014-15							
	B01	B02	B03		B06				Total	B01	B02	B03	B05	B06	
	Committed	Uncommitted		B05 Other	Community		Total		Revenue	Committed	Uncommitted	Devolved	Other	Community	Total
	Revenue	Revenue	Capital	Capital	Focused	Total	Revenue		Balance %	Revenue	Revenue		Capital	Focused E	Balance
	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended	Balance	Balance	Surpluses Deficits	of S251	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended	
Primary Sahaala										40					
Primary Schools Ullesthorpe Church of England Primary School		48,705	4,239			52,944	48,705	48,705	0 11.7%	40	10,704	536	0	0	11,240
Packington Church of England Primary School	10,056		4,238			52,944	31,886	-	0 11.7%	7,106			0	0	32,990
Badgerbrook Primary School	10,050	158,634	4,417						0 11.8%		27,855		0	0	40,032
Kingsway Primary School	2,820		6,061						0 12.0%				0	0	101,538
Wymeswold Church of England Primary School	46,706		0,001	5,418				-	0 12.3%		34,265		0	0	34,265
Newton Burgoland Primary School		49,905							0 12.4%		40,773		0	0	46,893
Manorfield Church of England Primary School	0	147,326	() (0 12.7%		169,551		7,998	0	177,549
Ashby de la Zouch Church of England Primary School	0	130,846	8,794	1 (,		0 12.7%		63,650			0	72,984
St Denys Church of England Infant School, Ibstock	14,604		16,587						0 13.0%				2,183	0	26,881
Sir John Moore Church of England Primary School	2,650		Ċ) (o c	73,927	71,277		0 13.2%	1,686			0	0	44,717
Woodland Grange Primary School, Oadby	19,090	150,894	C) (o (169,984			0 13.3%	8,545			0	0	123,284
Worthington School	0	44,756	5,038	3 (o (0 13.6%		43,460		0	0	52,889
Old Mill Primary School, Broughton Astley	4,585		12,115	5 (0 0	180,541	163,841		0 13.7%	6,322	61,872			0	77,832
Sketchley Hill Primary School	67,238	121,770	3,870) () (192,878	121,770	189,008	0 13.7%	C	108,980	20,317	0	0	129,297
Barwell Infant School	0	113,588	C) (C (110,000			0 14.1%	C	105,405		0	0	105,405
Ibstock Junior School and Special Unit	12,174	95,994	0) () (100,100			0 14.2%	C	92,012		0	0	92,012
Hugglescote Community Primary School	0	185,098	17,221	() (;• : •			0 14.2%	C	100,001	8,451	0	0	173,543
Westfield Infant School, Hinckley	14,056		0		0 0	,			0 14.5%		27,041		0	0	27,041
Fernvale Primary School	10,519		8,045		0 0		84,951		0 14.6%	5,277			0	0	61,614
St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Hinckley	35,000		1,618	3 (0 0	,			0 14.8%	C	184,334		0	0	184,341
Griffydam Primary School	1,549		C) (0 0	63,777	62,228		0 14.8%	9,390			0	0	73,137
Belton Church of England Primary School	45,000		4,945		0 0	02,000		-	0 14.8%	C	70,169		0	0	70,169
Hathern Church of England Primary School	69,781		10,277			, 00,000			0 14.9%	1,942			0	0	79,524
Breedon on the Hill, St Hardulph's Church of England Primary School	53,042		1			00,040			0 15.6%				0	0	44,268
Dunton Bassett Primary School	11,583		6,474						0 15.7%		36,061	4,300	0	0	40,361
Harby Church of England Primary School	6,298	50,709	12,972			,			0 15.8%		50,151		0	0	61,178 47,866
Hemington Primary School St Bartholomew's Church of England Primary School	55,702		7,322) 51,530) 242,109			0 16.0% 0 16.1%	,	,			0	47,866 184,076
Blackfordby, St Margaret's Church of England Primary School	55,702	176,568 74,843	9,038			74,842		-	0 16.1%		3 145,582 0 48,614		0	0	48,614
Elizabeth Woodville Primary School		· · · · ·	14,055				110,766		0 16.1%		,		0	0	34,183
Congerstone Primary School	2,748		8,117						0 16.3%					0	68,759
Diseworth Church of England Primary School	2,740	43,084	2,140						0 16.4%				0	0	43,814
All Saints Church of England Primary School, Sapcote	5,545		2,140						0 16.7%		42,707		0	0	42,707
Barwell Newlands Community Primary School	50,000		6,903						0 17.0%				0	0	197,449
Orchard Community Primary School	806		17,619						0 17.1%					0	95,589
All Saints Church of England Primary School, Coalville	0	137,860	5,991						0 17.3%				0	0	128,853
Moira Infant School	0	132,445	5,964		o c				0 17.5%				0	0	12,367
Booth Wood Primary School	0	169,566	C		o (0 17.8%				0	0	134,804
Witherley Church of England Primary School	0	72,743	10,017	7 (o (0 17.9%		59,020		0	0	68,978
Burton on the Wolds Primary School	91,058	20,000	9,013	3 (0 0	120,071	20,000	111,058	0 18.5%	C				0	48,423
Woodstone Primary School	2,346	144,558	9,158	3 (0 0	156,062	144,558	146,904	0 18.9%	1,434	72,353	8,041	0	0	81,829
Woodcote Primary School	0	156,483	12,964	4 (0 0	169,447	156,483	156,483	0 19.1%	C	141,270			0	147,839
Belvoirdale Community Primary School	0	229,706	1,881		0 0	201,007	229,706		0 19.1%	C	127,378			0	145,184
Husbands Bosworth Church of England Primary School	5,109		7,391	(0 (C	00,004			0 19.2%				0	0	56,609
Richard Hill Church of England Primary School	0	124,072	C		0 0	,			0 20.1%				0	0	73,004
New Swannington Primary School	0	146,228	12,766		0 0	,		-	0 20.2%				0	0	84,096
Newbold Church of England Primary School	10,952		8,510		0 0	,			0 20.8%				0	0	61,772
Swithland St Leonard's Church of England Primary School	0	81,513	12,789			,			0 20.9%		57,784			0	71,202
The Hall School	5,154		17,585			,	306,967		0 21.0%						244,841
Burbage Junior School	180,000		4,595			,			0 21.1%		246,155			0	246,242
Dove Bank Primary School	3,552		12,381			,	85,774		0 21.4%		82,606			0	89,963
Saint Peter's Catholic Primary School, Earl Shilton		192,149					192,149		0 22.6%		137,523			0	137,523 82,880
Cossington Church of England Primary School Holliers Walk Primary School		97,773 278,246	9,935 15,967			, 101,100	97,773 278,246		0 22.9% 0 23.2%			4,721 7,669		0	222,251
Viscount Beaumont's Church of England Primary School		101,437	15,967						0 23.2%					0	81,408
Stathern Primary School	3,108		1,899	-					0 23.7%			8,720	0	0	86,168
Scalford Church of England Primary School	9,418		9,374						0 24.4%					0	72,694
Long Clawson Church of England Primary School	543		15,205						0 24.4%		70,156		0 0	0	82,027
South Kilworth Church of England Primary School	040	42,993	8,780						0 27.3%				46,391	0	97,488
St Andrew's Church of England Primary School, North Kilworth	0	117,144	0,700		0,230			-	0 28.0%		63,058		0	38,408	101,466
St Mary's Church of England Primary School Bitteswell	24,104		0					-	0 29.5%				0	0	155,334

		2015-16					30				2014-15						
	B01	B02	B03		B06					Total	B01	B02	B03	B05	B06		
	Committed	Uncommitted	Devolved	B05 Other	Community		Total			Revenue	Committed	Uncommitted	Devolved	Other	Community	Total	
	Revenue	Revenue	Capital	Capital	Focused	Total	Revenue			Balance %	Revenue	Revenue	Capital	Capital	Focused	Balance	
	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended	Balance	Balance	Surpluses	Deficits	of S251	Balance	Balance	Balance	Balance	Extended		
Primary Schools											40						
Brookside School	10,388	371,717	18,971	0	0	401,076	371,717	382,105	(30.2%	14,630		12,594	- C		190,551	
Westfield Junior School	60,000	285,815	14,987		-	348,725	,	333,738			,	,				401,289	
Oakthorpe Primary School	3,907	160,396	14,307			164,303		164,303				,			-	131,568	
Newbold Verdon Primary School	0,307	283,003	0			291,174		291,174			,	,			-	249,332	
Hose Church of England Primary School	4,222	119,806	1,784	-		125,812		124,028				,				73,826	
Blaby Stokes Church of England Primary School	300,000		7,960		0	531,002		523,043								356,991	
			.,	-												,	
Primary Total	1,647,643	10,224,059	615,328	103,367	61,875	12,652,273	10,224,059	11,956,918	-23,341	12.8%	1,597,194	8,273,895	634,596	73,640	75,826	10,655,151	
Secondary Schools																	
Hind Leys Community College	0	-259,588	2,802	0	5,694	-251,092	-253,894	0	-253,894	-10.9%	C	-132,321	0) C	7,793	-124,528	
Shepshed High School	0	-99,214	4,242			-95,277		0	-99,519					-	-		
			.,						00,010				,000			0,001	
Secondary Total	0	-358,802	7,043	0	5,389	-346,370	-353,413	0	-353,413	-7.7%	0	-128,991	2,058	6 C	7,972	-118,962	
Mainstream Total	1,647,643	10,174,880	622,371	103,367	67,265	12 615 526	11,889,788	12 266 541	-376,754	11.9%	1,597,194	8,144,904	636,654	73,640	83 798	10,536,190	
	1,011,010	10,114,000	022,071	100,001	01,200	12,010,020		12,200,011	010,104	1110/0	1,001,104		000,001			10,000,100	
Special Schools																	
Ashmount School	0	201,846	0	0	0	201,846	201,846	201,846	C)	C	114,602	2 0	C	0 0	114,602	
Birch Wood School	0	-284,468	0		0	-284,468		0	-284,468	3	C	,		0 0	0	-650,047	
Maplewell Hall School	0	-363,981	0	2,217	0	-361,763		0	-363,981		C			2 C	0 0	-232,442	
Wigston Menphys Centre	0	-13,021	0	0	0	-13,021	-13,021	0	-13,021		C	4,703	0) C	0 0	4,703	
Burbage Menphys Centre		41,927				41,927	41,927	41,927	C)	C	65,917	0	C	0 0	65,917	
Special Total	0	-417,696	0	2,217	0	-415,479	-417,696	243,774	-661,470)	0	-713,490	16,222	· 0		-697,267	
	`	,000		_,	•		,	,									
Nursery Schools																	
Countesthorpe Nursery School	3,850	48,751	95	0	0	52,696	52,601	52,601	C)	C	12,307	5,320) C	0 0	17,626	
PRU																	
Oakfield	0	-24,237	14,160	0	0	-10,077	-24,237	0	-24,237	7	30,000	7,492	9,755	5 C	0	47,247	
		,_01	.,			,			,_07			.,				,	
Grand Total	1,651,493	9,781,697	636,626	105,585	67,265	12,242,666	11,500,456	12,562,916	-1,062,461		1,627,194	7,451,213	667,951	73,640	83,798	9,903,796	
2015/16 Movement	24,299	2,330,485	-31,325	31,945	-16,533	2,338,871											
	27,233	2,000,700	-51,525	51,345	-10,000	2,000,071	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	l	



SCHOOLS FORUM

School Funding

5 October 2016

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;				
Maintained Primary and	Maintained Primary and X		Х			
Secondary Schools						
Academies	Х	Foundation Stage	Х			
PVI Settings	Х	Primary	Х			
Special Schools /	Х	Secondary	Х			
Academies						
Local Authority	Х	Post 16	Х			
		High Needs	Х			

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;					
Noting	Noting X						
		Members					
Decision		Maintained Secondary					
		School Members					
		Maintained Special School					
		Members					
		Academy Members					
		All Schools Forum	Х				

- 1. This report presents an update on 2017/18 school funding, it considers;
 - The Schools, High Needs and Early Years Blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant
 - The funding formula for maintained schools and academies

Recommendation

2. That Schools Forum notes the content of this report

Introduction

3. The Department of education (DfE) consulted in March on school funding reform to be implemented in 2017/18. Two separate consultations considered the allocation of the Schools and High Needs Blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) as well as the way that maintained schools and academies were funded through the introduction of the national funding formula

- 4. Both consultations were stated to be the first of two phases of consultation and considered the overarching principles for the new system. The second phase of consultation was to set exemplify the financial impact of the changes at local authority level, and for the school national funding formula at individual school level, and was expected during the summer.
- 5. In July the Secretary of State issued a statement setting out that the national funding formula would be delayed and announced funding rates, and the requirements of the school funding formula, would be unchanged for 2017/18. The statement suggested a further consultation in the autumn.
- 6. In terms of High Needs no information has been forthcoming on the next steps, it is unclear whether the autumn consultation will include this.
- 7. A consultation on a national early years funding formula was unexpectedly launched in July. This considered both the methodology for funding local authorities and funding from local authorities to providers.

2017/18 Schools Block DSG and School Funding

- 8. The DfE have confirmed that for 2017/18;
 - local authorities will be funded at the same rate per pupil as for 2016/16
 - that movements between the schools and the high needs block will be permissible with an expectation that local authorities should consult with schools and agree any proposals with the Schools Forum
 - that local authorities will have the same framework for their school funding formula as for 2016/17
 - the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) for schools will remain at minus 1.5% per pupil

These factors have allowed the local authority to consider whether any options exist to address the Key Stage 3 funding position where the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) is significantly lower than statistical neighbours.

- 9. It is estimated that headroom of £3m exists within the schools block. This arises from demographic growth in primary pupils, local authorities receive the same rate of funding for all pupils however primary pupils however are funded at a lower rate than secondary pupils.
- 11. In order to ensure that change is measured and sustainable both for schools and the local authority it is the local authorities intention to use the schools block headroom to meet the financial pressures in the high needs block.
- 12. The transfer of headroom to the high needs block will not result in any reduction to school funding for 2017/18, it will however not reinstate the 2016/17 1% AWPU reduction, nor will it allow for key stage 3 funding to be increased. Schools will be funded at the same rates as for 2016/17 other than for some changes that arise as a result of national changes to the IDACI bandings.

Schools Funding Formula Working Group

- 13. The delay in the introduction of the national funding formula has allowed time to undertake a limited review the 2016/17 formula values undertaken through comparison with statistically similar authorities.
- 14. A working group consisting of primary and secondary business managers, headteachers and a Schools Forum representative considered what, if any, options there would be to reduce the key stage 3 funding differential and what any impact would be on schools. At its highest level two options exist 1) no change, and 2) reduce primary school funding to allow an increase to key stage 3 AWPU. Neither option was deemed acceptable to the schools present and option 1 no change as the option to take forward. The local authority was asked to reconsider its position to move all the headroom to high needs and provide funding to go some way to reducing the key stage 3 position. There has been insufficient time to undertake this in advance of publication of this report, any update will be given at the meeting.

High Needs Funding

- 15. Planning for high needs funding is exceptionally difficult given the lack of information over the methodology for the allocation of the 2017/18 grant. It is clear that spending pressures are continuing to grow and that the current grant methodology results in an annual widening gap between financial commitments and the level of funding. Information is now available that shows the financial position in Leicestershire being replicated in authorities nationally, F40 have recently written to the Secretary of State to raise awareness of the issues that local authorities are experiencing.
- 16. It is unclear however whether a change in the calculation methodology will close this gap. The baselining exercise completed nationally which was to be the base for revised 2017/18 local authority calculations only took account of the 2016/17 grant allocations. Many local authorities, including Leicestershire are supporting expenditure from reserves, without a national increase in the funding available, which is exceptionally unlikely, it is essential that significant and sustainable expenditure and volume reductions are necessary.
- 17. Significant financial pressure is expected to remain within the high needs block in the short to medium term as a result of increased cost and demand for SEN placements and other SEN support services. Whilst a number of actions have been taken to reduce placement costs and demand i.e. increased places at Maplewell Hall, the Oakfield Graduated Offer increasing primary capacity to address needs in a maintained setting and reduce the need for specialist placements the action plan to reduce expenditure has been delayed pending the appointment of a strategic lead to lead this high profile piece of work. The retention of the headroom allows space or this to be planned effectively.

Early Years National Funding Formula

- 18. An unexpected consultation was launched by the DfE which recently closed. This considered both the way that local authorities are funded from April 2017, including the extension of early year's education to 30 hours for eligible 3 and 4 year olds.
- 19. The consultation proposed;
 - a change in the manner in which local authorities are funded. This would remove the single funding rate for full time equivalent children to a basis

hourly rate with additional funding for other pupil characteristics such as deprivation and disability.

- the introduction of a framework for local authorities to fund early years providers based on a basic universal funding rate with funding supplementary funding for some pupil characteristics.
- A requirement that following a transition period that all providers would receive the same universal rate of funding. This affects maintained nursery schools where historically costs are higher, a two year transition period is suggested over which costs would need to be reduced.
- A requirement for local authorities to maximise funding to providers by placing a limit on the funding local authorities are allowed to retain. It also asks authorities to consider what, if any, services they currently provide should be delegated
- A recommendation that local authorities establish an inclusion fund linked to the Local Offer to enable access to early year provision for children with SEND. It does however stop short of providing additional funding to allow this to happen.
- 20. Although the consultation sets out a universal rate, the rate of funding local authorities will receive differs significantly, as does the illustrated 'expected rate' for providers.
- 21. It is necessary, in conjunction with providers, to consider what this means in terms of the formula currently in place, any changes that may be necessary and the financial implications for both the local authority and providers.

Conclusions

- 22. The position on the 2017/18 schools block DSG has been clarified, local authorities will receive the same amount of funding as in 2016/17 and with the transfer of funding to the high needs block school funding rates are likely to remain unchanged. The picture post April 2018 is uncertain as is the introduction of the national funding formula, it is hoped that further information will be released shortly.
- 23. The high needs position remains critical, it is essential that the local authority, maintained schools and academies are able to work together to develop a strategy and a sustainable plan to reduce demand and cost. It is unlikely that a movement to a formulaic basis for the grant will offer any solution to the expenditure pressures.
- 24. Change in funding for early years providers is now expected in 2017/18 but the impact of this needs careful modelling of all potential options. It is however unclear whether these funding changes, which the DfE expect to incentivise providers to deliver the extended 30 hours offer, will remove the financial barriers to enable this to happen.

Resource Implications

23. Resource implications are included throughout this report.

Equal Opportunity Issues

24. Non arising directly from this report

Background Papers

27

None

Officer to Contact Jenny Lawrence Finance Business Partner – Children and Family Services Email; jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk Tel: 01163056401