

## **LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM**

The Leicestershire Schools' Forum will be held on **Tuesday, 13 February 2024** at 2pm via **Microsoft Teams**. The primary contact for forum arrangements is as follows:

Antoine Willie (Clerk)

- **Email.** [LeicestershireSchoolsForum@leics.gov.uk](mailto:LeicestershireSchoolsForum@leics.gov.uk)
- **Tel.** 0116 305 1158

Please see below for the agenda for the meeting.

### **Agenda**

<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>Details</u></b>	<b><u>No. of Papers</u></b>
1	<b>Apologies for Absence/Substitutions.</b>	
2	<b>Minutes of the Meeting held on 21/11/2023 (previously circulated) and Matters Arising.</b>  As per the actions of the last forum, Martin Towers penned a letter to the DfE on behalf of the Schools' Forum. Martin's letter and the DfE's response is included after the last forum's minutes.	2
3	<b>De-Delegation for School Improvement.</b>  This report seeks approval from maintained school members for the de-delegation of school improvement funding for 2024/25.	1
4	<b>2024-25 Schools' Budget.</b>  This report sets out the 2024/25 Schools Budget and seeks approval for specific areas of expenditure where decisions are vested in School Forum.	1
5	<b>Any Other Business.</b>	
6	<b>Date of Next Meeting.</b>  The date for the next Leicestershire Schools' Forum is <b>Tuesday, 18 June 2024</b> from 2pm – 4pm.	
7	<b>Appendix.</b>	5

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum  
via Microsoft Teams on Tuesday 21 November 2023.**

**Chair / Vice Chair**

Martin Towers	Academy Secondary Governor
Suzanne Uprichard	PRU Representative & Maintained Primary Governor

**Present**

Jane Moore	Director of Children & Family Services
Alison Bradley	Assistant Director for Education, SEND & Commissioning
Deborah Taylor	Lead Member for Children & Family Services
Jenny Lawrence	Finance Business Partner for Schools & High Needs
Rebecca Wakeley	Education Quality & Inclusion Service
Dan Cleary	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Peter Leatherland	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Simon Grindrod	Academy Secondary Governor
Ed Petrie	Academy Primary Headteacher
Val Moore	Academy Primary Governor
Lauren Charlton	Academy Primary Trustee
Alison Ruff	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Jane Dawda	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Jo Beaumont	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Rebecca Jones	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Carolyn Lewis	Diocese of Leicester Director
Rosalind Hopkins (Substitute)	Maintained Special School

**Apologies**

Beth Clements	Interim Head of Service for Education Quality & Inclusion
Kath Kelly	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Mark Mitchley	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Kelly Dryden	Academy Special Headteacher
Felicity Clark	Academy Primary Headteacher
Jason Brooks	Maintained Special Headteacher
Robert Martin	Maintained Nursery Governor
Lisa Craddock	Post-16 Provider
Beverley Coltman	PVU Early Years Provider
John Pye	RC Representative

1. **Apologies for Absence/Substitutions.**

Apologies provided for Jason Brooks, Kath Kelly, and Kelly Dryden. Rosalind Hopkins has attended the forum as a substitute for Kelly Dryden. Mark Mitchley, Felicity Clark, Robert Martin, Lisa Craddock, Beverley Coltman, and John Pye did not attend.

2. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 12/09/2023 (previously circulated) and Matters Arising.**

Martin Towers discussed the minutes of the last Leicestershire Schools' Forum with forum members, presenting the opportunity to raise any issues or request amendments to the record; no issues of accuracy were raised. Martin has noted a typo on Page 4.

Martin Towers has covered the three action points from the last forum:

1. Martin has made amendments to the self-assessment which was circulated to forum members with the last set of minutes.
2. Jenny Lawrence will be presenting the review of the growth policy and reasonableness of the SEN budget during this forum on behalf of the Local Authority (LA).
3. An induction to Leicestershire Schools' Forum was scheduled for 8 November but needed to be cancelled. A new induction will be organised before the next forum in February 2024; this will be mandatory for new members but will also be offered as a refresher for existing members of the forum.

New members will only be able to attend one forum meeting before needing to attend an induction. It is important that members understand their commitment before budget setting in April 2024.

3. **2024-25 School Funding - National Funding Formula Update.**

The Department for Education (DfE) announced in October 2023 that they had made an error and underestimated the pupil numbers used in the calculation of the 2024-25 indicative National Funding Formula (NFF) allocations. This means a reduction in the schools' NFF increases that they had been advised of in July. Overall, this manifests in a reduction of 1%, although a few primary schools have triggered the minimum funding guarantee meaning they won't see as much of a reduction. These are indicative figures; 2023 school census data will be released to local authorities in December 2023 for the calculation of the actual 2024-25 delegated budgets.

A BBC article suggested that the DfE has launched an enquiry into the miscalculation, but it was unclear whether findings will be released to LAs.

Rebecca Jones noted that this miscalculation and subsequent amendment would have caused schools to plan incorrectly and will impact schools that may be experiencing financial difficulties. Rebecca has questioned whether those schools experiencing difficulties would receive any support from the LA. Jenny Lawrence has

confirmed that the LA has had conversations with some schools regarding some of their financial difficulties, but there have been no direct queries from schools regarding additional support. There is a dedicated finance email address which can be used by schools seeking additional support.

Jane Moore advised that schools struggling with the impact of this miscalculation should raise these concerns with the DfE. There is some concern that the DfE have not fully considered the impact their miscalculation may have on schools that were relying on the initial indication of funding. The LA has raised this with the DfE on behalf of schools, but Jane felt that the concerns may be considered more thoroughly coming from schools directly. **Martin Towers will circulate a template that schools can use to address matters of concern with the DfE.**

On behalf of the LA, Jenny Lawrence recommended that the forum acknowledges the revised NFF for Leicestershire schools.

#### **4. 2024-25 Disapplication Request.**

The DfE are requesting additional information from the LA to continue to make local adjustments to the NFF for schools undertaking and affected by age range change and exceptional funding. The DfE are requiring evidence that these issues have been discussed and supported by the Schools Forum.

Funding for such additional premises can only be applied to less than 5% of schools and can only account for 1% of those schools' budgets. This funding is quite significant to the budget of smaller schools. To apply this funding for 2024-25, the LA must provide the DfE with a copy of all bills the school must pay, including all lease agreements. The LA finance team works with schools to ensure all relevant paperwork is provided, continuing a process that Leicestershire LA has done for a long period of time.

The NFF is designed to take funding decisions away from a LA and to move to a standardised national formula; as a result, it appears the DfE is making the LA's ability to amend the NFF for local schools more restrictive.

Rebecca Jones has questioned whether affected schools will be able to provide their curriculum without the use of additional premises. The disapplication ensures that those schools have the appropriate funding to support their curriculum provided the DfE approves. However, the minimum funding also provides some protection to those schools. Alison Ruff commented that it is important to raise DfE awareness of these impacts on smaller schools. It has been recommended that the forum write to the DfE outlining these impacts and concerns on behalf of represented schools. **Martin Towers will draft a letter addressing the DfE and will circulate amongst forum members for amendments and input.**

Rosalind Hopkins has inquired and received confirmation that special schools won't get funding for additional premises as they are not part of NFF.

Simon Grindrod has questioned whether schools can be funded to purchase premises that they will no longer receive funding to lease. Simon felt that schools

should be afforded the capital to replace premises lost due to a lack of funding. Alison Ruff noted, however, that some of these premises, such as church grounds, may not offer any chance of purchase.

The disapplication of pupil numbers and changes to the MFG are unchanged from that originally introduced in 2013.

On behalf of the LA, Jenny Lawrence recommended that the forum acknowledges and supports the disapplication of finance regulations. This has been agreed by the forum.

## 5. **2024-25 Growth Policy.**

The policy for funding revenue growth in mainstream schools has been revised following DfE changes taking effect from April 2024. Trigger points within the policy will remain consistent and will continue to provide for “bulge” classes in schools or requested expansion for places. The DfE funding rates have been provided to the forum as per the School Growth policy.

Schools that have opened that are still in expansion will remain on the old policy. Any school expansion from April 2024 will be funded on the new growth policy. LA has the option to provide growth fund to schools at the beginning of year or the LA can hold the funding centrally on behalf of the school. The LA has proposed holding funding centrally as per the previous iteration of the policy and will move the funding to schools once places have been agreed. Allocation of funding to new schools opening on new housing developments will likely be brought back to the forum for discussion after February 2024.

Simon Grindrod agreed for the LA to hold funding for school expansions provided that the funding is provided to schools in September. Simon informed the panel of an instance in which funding was not provided to a school within a timely manner. Jenny Lawrence has noted that this is the first time the timeliness of growth funding payments has been raised. Martin Towers has also confirmed that his school has received growth funding without issue. Jenny has requested the details of this instance outside the forum for the issue to be investigated.

An error in the Growth Funding policy has been noted on page 19, paragraph 12 in which “can” should be amended to “cannot”.

Rebecca Jones has questioned circumstances in which the growth of one oversubscribed school might detrimentally impact the financial circumstances of a second smaller school. The first school may receive additional growth funding to support expansion, resulting in spare spaces in the second school. The DfE provided £40mil to support schools with financial difficulties but Leicestershire did not trigger for this funding. Growth funding cannot be used to support growth by popularity, creating a grey area in which growth for popularity can become a school need. A change in one or two pupils can be a big difference to small schools. This is an area that the DfE are continuing to struggle with and will continue to monitor.

The LA gets no revenue funding to expand in specialised schools which is funded by high needs deficit. This is something the LA has raised with DfE.

Val Moore raised concern for schools that are popular and reject additional students, resulting in parents lodging an appeal which is upheld, causing student numbers to increase. Schools must take direction from admissions in these circumstances. This growth policy does not cover instruction to overfill from admissions, meaning that additional funding for the school would not be given until the year following the next census.

Jenny Lawrence informed the forum that growth funding can be used for falling rolls. Criteria for this funding is tight and the LA must submit an annual SCAP return to the DfE, which compares capacity in groups of schools (aggregate) with pupil forecasts. This is used by the DfE to calculate capital funding. LA are being funded for where there is fall in roll if the LA can show on a SCAP return that those places will be needed in 2-3 years; there are no schools currently in this position in Leicestershire.

On behalf of the LA, Jenny Lawrence recommended that the forum approved amendments to the School Growth Policy. There was unanimous approval for the policy on the provision that the policy is amended to include a timeframe of providing growth funding to schools which the LA must adhere to. **Jenny will amend the policy and provide an amended version of the policy for the forum.**

## **6. 2023-24 Notional SEN Review.**

Leicestershire is in the bottom quartile in allocating funding to the Notional SEN Budget and allocates less than other LAs i.e., LAs allocating more funding are likely to have higher expectations of the level of needs met within schools prior to accessing EHCP support.

There is a high correlation of children with SEN and deprivation within the funding system. There are two deprivation measures within funding: deprivation effecting children indices and Free School Meals (FSM) but these do not have a correlation with SEN funding.

The LA continues to measure schools on annual basis for schools that exceed Element 2 which must generate additional funding. Rosalind Hopkins has noted, however, that a school that is good at identifying SEN would have a greater portion of its budget going towards SEN. The DfE and LA struggle to define “Inclusive School” and “disproportionate SEN”. Rosalind expressed her belief that true inclusion is invisible – inclusion is more of a journey that schools should be on rather than a destination. Rosalind has a paper on inclusion that can give clear areas of inclusion identification.

Carolyn Lewis commented that whilst SEN might not follow deprivation it has a significant impact on small schools. Carolyn would like to see more data examining this impact. In addition, Carolyn believed that the Notional SEN Review misses key elements of how the LA’s duty to ensure the outlined provisions of an EHCP trumps the schools’ “best endeavours”. Jane Moore contended, however, that the notional SEN is not the entirety of the SEN budget. Inclusion in SEN and AP work would be

instrumental and inclusion funding should not be conflated with EHCP; the notional SEN is specific on how it needs to be run.

Rebecca Jones has observed a gap in funding that the notional SEN creates regarding children that move from infant to junior schools. Infant schools start support for children with SEN who then move on to juniors; the junior school then receives the notional SEN funding to support the pupil, resulting in a financial loss for the infant school (especially if that school has declining rolls). Rebecca stated that the funding should be provided when the child needs it. Jane Moore acknowledged that this may have the largest effect on infant schools. The TSIL project is working on how quickly needs can be identified and supported, focusing on the youngest children first.

On behalf of the LA, Jenny Lawrence recommended that the LA's approach to funding remains the same as per Paragraph 8 of the 2023-24 Notional SEN Review. This has been agreed by the forum.

## **7. Any Other Business.**

Simon Grindrod had the impression from the June 2023 forum that forum members would get the opportunity to look at how the new TSIL system would operate. Simon looked with a SENCO to identify patterns associated with timescales and process, as well as a rise in rejection in applications, and issues relating to access to professionals. Simon would like the opportunity to share these concerns, patterns, or common problems more formally with Alison Bradley.

The LA hosts regular termly updates for headteachers, school governors, and executive heads of Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) on TSIL. TSIL acknowledges the delays relating to SEN and has investigated what these delays are. Tribunal overrules almost all LA rejections on applications for EHCPs, which raises the question of whether the LA approves all EHCPs or ensure that it sticks to the code of eligibility.

Simon Grindrod also raised that many children never returned to school following the Covid-19 pandemic. Schools are no longer able to provide the safeguarding vigilance for children that they would if the child attended school. Schools or other professionals are not able to continue to monitor welfare and wellbeing of these children. The LA still has a responsibility of vigilance, however. Simon has questioned whether someone from the LA can explain to schools what the process for this vigilance is.

Jane Moore acknowledged that the number of children that are home schooled or missing education has increased nationally following the pandemic. Jane did not feel that this is an appropriate discussion for forum but has acknowledged that the LA does have a duty of care. Jane also agreed that a briefing can be arranged to share this information.

## **8. Date of Next Meeting.**



The date for the next Leicestershire Schools' Forum is **Tuesday 13 February 2024** from **2pm – 4pm**.

**9. Actions.**

1. Martin Towers will circulate a template to forum members that schools can use to address matters of concern with the DfE.
2. Martin Towers will draft a letter to the DfE addressing the impact that changes to the disapplication may have on smaller schools, especially in relation to the use of external premises. Martin will circulate the letter to forum members for amendments and input.
3. Jenny Lawrence will amend the 2024-25 Growth Policy to include timescales in which the LA must provide funding to schools. This will be presented to the forum members.

This page is intentionally left blank

Gillian Keegan  
 Secretary of State for Education  
 House of Commons  
 London  
 SW1A 0AA  
[gillian.keegan.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:gillian.keegan.mp@parliament.uk)

22<sup>nd</sup> December 2023

Dear Gillian Keegan, Secretary of State for Education,

Following a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools Forum, of which I am Chair, all members were very concerned about the recent changes in 2024/25 school funding announced by the Department for Education, following a quite severe reduction in 2024/25 National Funding Formula allocations due to a miscalculation by the Department.

*“The Department first published the 2024-25 NFF in July 2023. Following the discovery of a technical error made by officials during the initial calculations, an update was made to the schools NFF in October 2023. This document reflects that update. The technical error was due to incorrect processing of pupil numbers in the initial calculations. This error meant that the overall cost of the schools NFF was underestimated, and incorrect factor values were published in July.*

*This update contains the new, correct, factor values. No other changes have been made to the structure of the NFF, or the rules governing the local formulae, since July. The total amount of funding in the core schools budget (which includes funding through the schools NFF, high needs NFF, and CSSB) will remain at £59.6 billion in 2024-25.*

*The high needs NFF and CSSB are unaffected by this update.”*

This is because of an error in processing pupil numbers by the department, which were underestimated resulting in the cost of the National Funding Formula exceeding the National Funding Settlement. This means that the minimum per pupil funding has been reduced from £4,665 per primary pupil and £6,050 per secondary pupil to £4,610 and £5,995 respectively.

As we understand it, the DfE have instigated an inquiry over how this error occurred and have apologised for it. However, there is no indication of whether the inquiry into this funding calculation will be made public, and if so when that may be. This error is not one of our schools making and we would urge the department to deliver the funding values for 2024/25 as published in July.

New analysis of school funding, compiled by Schoolcuts.org & ASCL Union, shows that in spite of our schools already being understaffed and physically crumbling, suggests that nationally 92 per cent of mainstream schools face real terms cuts from April 2024.

For Leicestershire schools the position is alarming, particularly given we have a high number of small rural schools. Largely these schools sit on the funding floor, are either have deficit budgets or moving to that position with very lean staffing structures and low non staffing expenditure. As a result of under inflation budget increases these schools are faced with staffing cuts that will reduce the curriculum offer. Many of these schools are moving towards a position of financial unviability despite them being at the heart of their community and essential for the communities they serve.

	Primary		Secondary	
	October	July	October	July
<b>Number of Schools:</b>				
Funding Floor +0.5% per pupil	34	15	6	1
Gains up to 2% per pupil	110	26	32	8
Gains of up to 3% per pupil	32	92	4	28
Gains up to 5% per pupil	36	63	1	5
Gains over 5% per pupil	16	32	1	2
<b>Total Gain £m</b>	<b>£3.270</b>	<b>£5.738</b>	<b>£6.665</b>	<b>£9.018</b>
<b>Overall Movement £m</b>		<b>-£2.468</b>		<b>-£2.353</b>
<b>Overall Movement %</b>		<b>-43.0%</b>		<b>-26.1%</b>
<b>% per Pupil Gain from 2023/24 Baseline</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

Leicestershire schools desperately need more funding. Running costs are soaring, buildings are deteriorating and in desperate need of repair. A further example of the financial pressures on small schools the NFF Formula to contribute towards renting communal spaces for small schools. This currently totals £70k and gives 7, some of which clearly as a result of the National Funding Formula, is exceptional funding for schools needing to rent additional space to allow them to deliver the curriculum. We have provided funding in this way since the introduction of the NFF, for 2024/24 the DfE are putting significant pressure not to provide this and indeed are asking for disproportionate levels of evidence. Overall, these allocations are immaterial to school funding in general but significant to the schools affected. If this is not allowed from April 2024 these schools will not be able to fully provide the curriculum, for many alternative spaces are simply not available and if they were then disproportionate levels of capital would be required to address the shortfall in space which is simply unavailable. We would urge the DfE to approve the submitted disapplication request with some urgency.

Leicestershire Schools Forum feel very strongly about these issues and as the voice of Leicestershire schools we urge the Department to act. All mainstream schools in Leicestershire are doing their best against considerable financial difficulties, the financial position of schools is a significant factor driving the Leicestershire High Needs Dedicated School Grant deficit.

We are especially concerned, as the education of all children is essential to support the UK in retaining its position in the world as a leader. The outstanding education of the UK's population is the only way in which this can be assured.

Something must be done to stop this. Children only have one chance at education and this Government needs to act now to save our schools.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,



Martin Towers

Chair of Leicestershire School Forum  
Finance & Operations Director of Welland Park Academy  
Chair of Governors at Huncote Primary School

Dear Martin Towers,

Thank you for your letter that was received on 22 December 2023.

You wrote the following.

*“Following a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools Forum, of which I am Chair, all members were very concerned about the recent changes in 2024/25 school funding announced by the Department for Education, following a quite severe reduction in the 2024/25 National Funding Formula allocations due to a miscalculation by the Department.*

“The Department first published the 2024-25 NFF in July 2023. Following the discovery of a technical error made by officials during the initial calculations, an update was made to the schools NFF in October 2023. This document reflects that update. The technical error was due to incorrect processing of pupil numbers in the initial calculations. This error meant that the overall cost of the schools NFF was underestimated, and incorrect factor values were published in July.

This update contains the new, correct, factor values. No other changes have been made to the structure of the NFF, or the rules governing the local formulae, since July. The total amount of funding in the core schools’ budget (which includes funding through the schools NFF, high needs NFF, and CSSB) will remain at £59.6 billion in 2024-25. The high needs NFF and CSSB are unaffected by this update.”

*This is because of an error in processing pupil numbers by the department, which were underestimated resulting in the cost of the National Funding Formula exceeding the National Funding Settlement. This means that the minimum per pupil funding has been reduced from £4,665 per primary pupil and £6,050 per secondary pupil to £4,610 and £5,995 respectively.*

*As we understand it, the DfE have instigated an inquiry over how this error occurred and have apologised for it. However, there is no indication of whether the inquiry into this funding calculation will be made public, and if so when that may be. The error is not one of our schools making and we would urge the department to deliver the funding values for 2024/25 as published in July.*

*New analysis of school funding, compiled by Schoolcuts.org and ASCL Union, shows that in spite of our schools already being understaffed and physically crumbling, suggests that nationally 92 per cent of mainstream schools face real terms cuts from April 2024.*

*For Leicestershire schools the position is alarming, particularly given we have a high number of small rural schools. Largely these schools sit on the funding floor, are either have deficit budgets or moving to that position with very lean staffing structures and low non staffing expenditure. As result of under inflation budget increases these schools are faced with staffing cuts that will reduce the curriculum offer. Many of these schools are moving towards a position of*

*financial unviability despite them being at the heart of their community and essential for the communities they serve.*

	Primary		Secondary	
	October	July	October	July
<b>Number of Schools:</b>				
Funding Floor +0.5% per pupil	34	15	6	1
Gains up to 2% per pupil	110	26	32	8
Gains of up to 3% per pupil	32	92	4	28
Gains up to 5% per pupil	36	63	1	5
Gains over 5% per pupil	16	32	1	2
<b>Total Gain £m</b>	<b>£3.270</b>	<b>£5.738</b>	<b>£6.665</b>	<b>£9.018</b>
<b>Overall Movement £m</b>		<b>-£2.468</b>		<b>-£2.353</b>
<b>Overall Movement %</b>		<b>-43.0%</b>		<b>-26.1%</b>
<b>% per Pupil Gain from 2023/24 Baseline</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

*Leicestershire schools desperately need more funding. Running costs are soaring, buildings are deteriorating and in desperate need of repair. A further example of the financial pressures on small schools the NFF Formula to contribute towards renting communal spaces for small schools. This currently totals £70k and gives 7, some of which clearly as a result of the National Funding Formula, is exceptional funding for schools needing to rent additional space to allow them to deliver the curriculum. We have provided funding in this way since the introduction of the NFF, for 2024/24 the DfE are putting significant pressure not to provide this and indeed are asking for disproportionate levels of evidence. Overall, these allocations are immaterial to school funding in general but significant to the schools affected. If this is not allowed from April 2024 these schools will not be able to fully provide the curriculum, for many alternative spaces are simply not available and if they were then disproportionate levels of capital would be required to address the shortfall in space which is simply unavailable. We would urge the DfE to approve the submitted disapplication request with some urgency.*

*Leicestershire Schools Forum feel very strongly about these issues and as the voice of Leicestershire schools we urge the Department to act. All mainstream schools in Leicestershire are doing their best against considerable financial difficulties, the financial position of schools is a significant factor driving the Leicestershire High Needs Dedicated Schools Grant deficit.*

*We are especially concerned, as the education of all children is essential to support the UK in retaining its position in the world as a leader. The outstanding education of the UK's population is the only way in which this can be assured.*

*Something must be done to stop this. Children only have on chance at education and this Government needs to act now to save our schools.”*

Thank you for outlining your concerns regarding the Department’s republication of the 2024-25 Schools National Funding Formula (NFF). Firstly, let us express our sincere apology that this error occurred, and to reassure you the Department worked as quickly as possible to rectify the error when it came to light.

The Government explored all possible routes to address the error, and to minimise the disruption caused to schools. Unfortunately, the NFF factor values published in July over-allocated the Department’s funding envelope. It would not be appropriate to reprioritise significant amounts of public funds on the basis of an error made by officials.

We want to assure you that we have taken this error very seriously. Peter Wyman CBE – chair of the Board of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales – led a comprehensive review into the NFF error. He was supported in his work by an expert panel drawn from outside the Department. On 19 December 2023 Susan Acland-Hood, Permanent Secretary for the Department for Education, wrote to Robin Walker MP, Chair of the Education Select Committee to share a copy of the report produced. Her letter can be read [here](#) and the full report can be found [here](#).

This Government is committed to providing a world class education system for all children and has invested significantly in education to achieve that. In the 2022 Autumn Statement, we announced an additional £2 billion in each of 2023-24 and 2024-25 for mainstream schools and high needs, over and above totals announced at the 2021 Spending Review. In July 2023, we announced an additional £525m this year, to support schools with the teachers’ pay award, and £900m in 2024-25. As a result, next year overall school funding is increasing by over £1.8 billion compared to 2023-24. That means school funding is set to have risen by over £9.8 billion by 2024-25, compared to 2021-22, to more than £59.6 billion, the highest ever level in real terms per pupil. The calculations compiled for the Schools Cuts website are based on speculative assumptions regarding next year’s pay awards for teachers and support staff. The forecast figures for the number of schools with budget deficits based on these assumptions are therefore highly questionable.

We trust schools to manage their own budgets and the vast majority are operating with a cumulative surplus, with only a small percentage having a deficit in the most recent published figures. However, we know that every school’s circumstances are different, and where schools are in serious financial difficulty, they should contact their local authority or the Education and Skills Funding Agency, who can provide advice and support on a case-by-case basis. All schools can also access the [Department’s Schools Resource Management \(SRM\) offer](#). This includes a range of practical tools and information to help schools unlock efficiencies to reinvest in line with their own priorities.

The Government recognises the essential role that small schools play in their communities. The NFF accounts for the particular challenges faced by small rural schools through the lump sum (£134,400 per school in 2024-25 regardless of size)

and sparsity factor (which recognises that some schools are necessarily small because they are remote and do not have the same opportunities to grow or make efficiency savings as other schools). Knowing the significant role schools often play in the rural communities they serve, we made changes to the sparsity factor that saw the total amount allocated through the sparsity factor increase from £42m in 2021-22 to £98 million in 2024-25.

The exceptional circumstances factor is included in the NFF to recognise that there is a need for direct additional funding to a small number of schools with significant additional premises costs, not otherwise taken into account by the NFF. As outlined in the [schools operational guide 2024 to 2025](#), supporting evidence must be provided with the application (for example joint use agreements, lease agreements, service level agreements, licences where premises are being rented). Due diligence procedures aim to ensure that public funds are being spent appropriately where they are needed. A decision regarding Leicestershire's disapplication, will be provided as soon as possible, following ministerial review.

Your correspondence has been allocated reference number **2023-0046644**. If you need to respond to us, please visit: [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus), and quote your reference number.

Yours sincerely,

 Department for Education



## SCHOOLS FORUM

### De-delegation for School Improvement Proposal

Tuesday, 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024

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

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

### 1. **Purpose of Report:**

This report presents the consultation response on the proposal for de-delegation of funding for school improvement functions for Local Authority maintained schools.

### 2. **Recommendations:**

The Schools Forum representatives for maintained schools are recommended to approve:

To continue the de-delegation for Local Authority school improvement functions for maintained schools in 2024/25 at a rate of £18 per pupil.

### 3. **Background** (details in **Appendix A**):

The DfE implemented a policy to reduce the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and to remove it entirely for 2023/24. Instead, it is using the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 to allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school

budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives or by agreement of the Secretary of State.

If no de-delegation of funding is agreed the capacity of the Local Authority to support maintained schools in a systematic and strategic way would be significantly at risk.

No alternative funding stream is available to support this work; therefore, the implications of not continuing would potentially leave schools isolated and solely dependent on the capacity of local leadership and governance. Whilst some higher performing schools may benefit financially in the short term, this approach would conflict with both national policy (for schools to be within strong groups) and local experience (that a proactive approach to school improvement ultimately achieves better outcomes for children alongside better long-term value for money).

Leicestershire Schools' Forum agreed de-delegation for 2023/24 at its meeting on [14 February 2023](#).

#### **4. Consultation:**

A consultation was undertaken with maintained schools over a four-week period. Details of the consultation are shown in Appendix 1.

The results show that of 61 schools who responded:

- 54 strongly agree or tend to agree “that they understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal”.
- 37 strongly agree or tend to agree that the core offer represents value for money, 14 neither agree nor disagree, 9 disagree and 1 did not know the answer to this question.
- For question 8, Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local Authority’s core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2024/25? 50 (83%) respondents agreed, 3 (5%) expressed that they don’t know, 7 (12%) disagreed and 1 omitted a response.

This shows unanimous support for the proposal. Comments received suggest the offer is appropriate and meeting the needs of schools. There was a theme reflecting the financial challenges felt in schools at this time.

The full consultation results are shown in **Appendix B**.

#### **5. Resource Implications:**

No additional resource implications identified.

#### **6. Equal Opportunity Issues:**

None identified.

#### **7. Background Papers:**

[Leicestershire Schools' Forum | 14 February 2023](#)

**8. Officers to Contact:**

Rebecca Wakeley  
(Interim) Senior Education Effectiveness Partner

OR

Jenny Lawrence  
Finance Business Partner – Schools and High Needs  
Email: [Jenny.Lawrence@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Jenny.Lawrence@leics.gov.uk)  
Tel: 0116 305 6401

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCHOOLS FORUM

### 2024-25 Schools' Budget

Tuesday, 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024

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

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

### **Purpose of the Report:**

1. The purpose of this report is to present the 2024-25 Dedicated Schools Grant Settlement for Leicestershire and the 2024-25 Schools Budget.
2. This report builds upon a number of reports presented through the 2023-24 financial year.

### **Recommendations:**

3. That Schools Forum approves the retention of the budget to fund future school growth (Paragraph 17, Item 2).
4. That Schools Forum approve the retention of budgets to meet the prescribed statutory duties of the local authority and to meet historic costs (Paragraph 17, Items 3 & 4).
5. That Schools Forum approve the centrally retained early years funding (Paragraph 17, Item 5).

6. That Schools Forum note the DfE approval for use of the exceptional premises factor in respect of schools that incur rental costs for premises and / or sports facilities and the adjustments made in respect of age range changes (Paragraph 30).
7. That Schools Forum note the actions taken by the local authority in applying Capping and Scaling to the National Funding Formula for the purposes of affordability (Paragraphs 31 - 38).
8. That Schools Forum notes the number and average cost of commissioned places for children and young people with High Needs (Paragraph 58).
9. That Schools Forum notes the Early Years Provider payment rates for 2024-25 (Paragraph 65).
10. That Schools Forum approve the action to be taken in respect of schools where the Special Educational Needs (SEN) notional budget is insufficient to meet the aggregated value of High Needs Funding Element 2 (Paragraphs 72 - 74).
11. That Schools Forum note the average per pupil funding to be taken into account for recoupment for excluded pupils and other purposes (Paragraph 75).

**Background:**

12. This report builds upon those presented to Schools Forum during 2024 and sets out the local authority's Schools Budget for 2023-24.
13. The Schools Budget is the term given overall to the services funded from Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and consists of budget for individual schools, revenue funding for new and expanding schools, prescribed centrally retained budgets held by the authority, early years, and high needs. Local authorities are required to set the Schools Budget at least equal to the amount of DSG received. For 2024-25 the High Needs Block will continue to record a deficit which is required to be carried forward for recovery from future DSG under current legislation. The local authority can make no contribution to DSG without the approval of the Secretary of State, the Schools Budget is therefore set at the level of grant and must contain all its spending pressures within that grant.
14. There is no change to the basic structure of DSG for 2024-25 and remains divided into four separate funding blocks:
  - Schools Block: funds delegated budgets for maintained schools and academies and school growth.
  - The Central Services Block: funds historic costs and other prescribed local authority areas of expenditure including the local authority's statutory duties for all schools.
  - Early Years: funds the free entitlement to early education for 2-, 3- & 4-year-olds. including the extended offer for 2-year-olds from April and September 2024 and a maximum of 5% allocated to meet for the cost of the services that support the early years sector.
  - High Needs: funds provision for pupils with SEN, the PRU and other services for vulnerable children such as the Secondary Education Inclusion Partnerships, Children with Medical Needs and Specialist Teaching Services.
15. The 2024-25 Children and Family Services Budget was considered by the Children and Family Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 January 2024, by

the Cabinet on 19 December and 9 February 2024 and budget proposals will be considered by the County Council on 21 February 2024 and is shown as **Appendix B**.

**Role of the Schools Forum in setting the 2024-25 Schools Budget:**

16. The Central School Services Block holds the retained budgets for several areas of expenditure centrally retained by the local authority through provisions contained within the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations, these budgets are subject to restrictions, and some are subject to some decisions for the Schools Forum.
17. Whilst the DFE have alluded to changes in Schools Forum responsibilities as a result of the introduction of the National Funding Formula (NFF) which restricts local decision making in respect of school budgets, the role of Schools Forum is unchanged. It can be envisaged that the Schools Forum will have a key role in the final stages of the national implementation of the NFF for maintained and academy primary and secondary schools and preparing schools for any changes that may impact upon school funding. The following table sets out the areas of expenditure that through legislation fall to be met through the Schools Budget and with decisions vested in the Schools Forum and which apply to all local authorities for 2024/2:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Approval For</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.	De-delegation from mainstream school budgets	<p>A decision on de-delegation for School Improvement Services for maintained schools is required and is a separate item on the agenda.</p> <p>De-delegation can only be in respect of maintained schools only, all budgets for academies are required to be fully delegated. Only mainstream school members of Schools Forum are able to make de-delegation decisions.</p>
2.	To create a fund for pupil number growth to support the local authority's duty for place planning and agree the criteria for maintained schools and academies to access this fund.	<p>Schools Forum approved the policy for funding school growth from April 2024 at its meeting on 21 November 2023</p> <p>A revenue budget to meet the cost arising from commissioning additional school places required to meet the basic need for sufficient school places. The proposed budget is £2.3m (2023-24 £2.4mm)</p>
3.	<p>Funding for the local authority in order to meet prescribed statutory duties placed upon it.</p> <p>This funding now includes funding for local authority statutory duties for all schools previously funded through the retained duties element of ESG.</p>	<p>The budgets falling into this category are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Servicing the Schools Forum £8,570 (2023-24 £8,570), this budget meets the cost of operating the Schools Forum.</li> <li>• Admissions £366,000(2023-24 £366,000). This meets the local authority's statutory responsibilities for admissions and is funded from the Schools Block.</li> <li>• Local Authority Statutory / Regulatory Duties, Asset Management and Central Support Services £1.9m. This largely consists of recharges from services outside the Children and Families Department that support budgets funded from DSG such as finance, ICT, property. It also includes funding previously allocated as central teacher pension grant.</li> </ul>
4.	Funding for historic costs met by the local authority. Following the baselining exercise undertaken to determine the 2017/18 DSG baselines the Department for Education have set out their expectation that these costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Premature Retirement Costs £674,900 (2023-24 £674,900), these are historic costs relating to school staff where the commitment remains with the local authority and relates to both maintained schools and academies. This appears on the</li> </ul>



	should unwind over time and have begun annual reductions in funding. This may be the case for the element relating to schools causing concern, but no funding will be released from premature retirement for significant periods of time given that the local authority remains supporting such costs arising from pre-1997. The DfE retain a guarantee that funding for premature retirement costs will not fall below DGS commitments	Human Resources line of the budget statement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miscellaneous £248,000 (2023-24 £248,000). This is the commissioning budget for maintained schools causing concern, whilst the number of maintained schools has reduced overall the number of schools requiring LA support is largely unchanged.</li> </ul>
5.	Funding for central early years expenditure, which includes funding for checking eligibility of pupils for an early year's place in addition to the local authority's statutory responsibilities in this area. Centrally retained funding must not exceed 5% of the Early Years DSG. The increased amount for 2024-25 reflects the increase in the early years offer and its administration.	Schools Forum are asked to approve expenditure of £2.3m (2023-24 £1.8m).

18. Where the decision-making power is vested in the Schools Forum, the local authority may seek adjudication from the Secretary of State should approval not be granted. This would be sought should Schools Forum not approve the centrally funded items, there is no other source of funding for the local authority to meet these commitments which are all incurred as a result of the local authority's statutory role in schools. Retention of these budgets is consistent with that of previous years.

19. A further budget for school copyright is held centrally under provisions within the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations. This funds copyright licences within a nationally negotiated contract by the Secretary of State for all academies and maintained schools, as a result of this national contract individual schools no longer meet these costs directly. The local authority 2023-24 cost is determined by the DfE and the cost for 2023-24 has not yet been confirmed, provision has been made for an estimate of £747,000 (2023-24 £604,782).

### **Dedicated Schools Grant:**

20. For 2024-25 the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) remains calculated in four separate blocks as set out below:

<b>Funding Block</b>	<b>Areas Funded</b>	<b>Basis for Settlement</b>
----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

<p>Schools Block Est £521.4m consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School formula funding £518.5m</li> <li>• School Growth £2.8m</li> </ul>	<p>Individual budgets for maintained schools and academies.</p> <p>Growth funding for the revenue costs of delivering additional mainstream school places and to meet the local authority's duty to ensure a sufficient number of school places.</p> <p>DSG is notionally allocated to Leicestershire for all maintained schools and academies. A locally agreed funding formula is applied to this to determine school budgets, for maintained schools these are allocated directly by the local authority, for academies the funding is recouped from the settlement by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) who then directly fund academies.</p>	<p>2024-25 sees further transition to the National Funding Formula (NFF) by the DfE. The NFF continues to attribute units of funding to pupil characteristics. The grant settlement is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the aggregate of pupil led characteristics for each individual school:</li> <li>• a block allocation for school led factors.</li> </ul> <p>These allocations are required to be fully delegated to schools, the only exception being any elements of de-delegated funding for maintained school agreed by the schools Forum following consultation with schools.</p> <p>The NFF means that all local authorities receive the same amount of funding for a number of pupil related characteristics. Differences in funding levels relate to the incidence of pupil characteristics rather than differing funding levels</p> <p>The allocation of funding to support new school growth will be retained to meet the future costs of new and expanding schools.</p> <p>In respect of school formula funding this represents a cash increase of 5.46</p>
<p>Central School Services Block £3.9m</p>	<p>This funds historic financial commitments related to schools such as premature retirement costs, some budgets related to schools that are centrally retained e.g., admissions, servicing the schools Forum and school copyright licences. This block now includes funding from the retained duties</p>	<p>This is distributed through a per pupil allocation basis and is retained by the local authority.</p> <p>The funding allocation for some historic financial commitments is being reduced nationally as the DfE have an expectation</p>

	<p>element of the former Education Services Grant for the responsibilities that local authorities have for all pupils such as school place planning and asset management.</p>	<p>that these financial commitments will naturally expire. As for 2023-24 the DfE will allow local authorities to claim additional DSG if they have insufficient funding to meet school historic premature retirement costs which do not expire.</p>
<p>High Needs Block</p> <p>£108.5m</p>	<p>Funds special schools and other specialist providers for high needs pupils and students, the pupil referral unit and support services for high needs pupils including high needs students in further education provision.</p> <p>As with the Schools Block this includes funding for special academies and post 16 providers which is recouped by the ESFA who then directly fund academies.</p> <p>Confirmation of the 2024-25 grant is not expected until March 2024.</p>	<p>The formula is based upon population of 0–19-year-olds, rather than the 0 -25-year-old population it supports, and proxy indicators for additional educational need including deprivation, ill health, disability, and low attainment. Also included is an element based on historic spend. The formula also includes a funding floor to ensure that local authorities do not receive a funding reduction as a result of the introduction of the formula. Leicestershire receives £2.8 (3%) through this element.</p>
<p>Early Years Est</p> <p>£63.2m</p>	<p>Funds the Free Entitlement to Early Education (FEEE) for 2-, 3- and 4-year-olds and an element of the early learning and childcare service. The entitlement to FEEE expands to 15 hours for 2-year-olds from April 2024 and to under 2's in September 2024</p> <p>The grant is based on the universal hourly base rate plus additional needs measured with reference to free school meals, disability living allowance and English as an additional language.</p> <p>The initial settlement is based on the January 2023 census. The grant will be updated in July</p>	<p>The allocation is based on individual pupil characteristics and converted to a rate per hour of participation.</p> <p>Leicestershire receives the lowest rate of £5.47 per hour for 3- and 4-year-olds and the the 5<sup>th</sup> lowest rate of £7.27 3 per hour for 2-year-olds and £9.86 per hour for under 2's.</p>

	2024 for the 2024 January census and again in June 2025 for the January 2025 census. The final grant will not be confirmed until June 2025.	
<b>£697.0m</b>	<b>2024-25 Estimated DSG</b>	

The 2024-25 MTFS continues to set the overall Schools Budget as a net nil budget at local authority level. However, in 2024-25 there is a funding gap of on the High Needs Block of £16.9m which will be carried forward as an overspend against the grant.

### **Schools Block:**

- 21.21 School funding continues to be delivered by the National Funding Formula (NFF) which funds all pupils at the same rate irrespective of the authority in which they are educated. The NFF uses pupil characteristics each with a nationally set funding rate to generate school level funding to local authorities. Within the NFF only the per pupil entitlement is universal to all. Other factors reflect the incidence of additional needs such as deprivation and low prior attainment. Funding levels between local authorities and individual schools within those local authorities vary as a result of pupil characteristics rather than national funding levels.
22. Local authorities remain responsible for setting their own local funding formula. However, the DfE have established significant restrictions and only minimal movements from the NFF are allowed. The Leicestershire funding formula reflects the NFF with two exceptions, the first being changes to pupil numbers and subsequent pupil funding protections for school affected by age range change and some funding for school required to rent either premises or playing fields. The former of these changes has been approved by the DfE, for the latter approval is contingent on the provision of lease agreements to the DfE.
23. 2024-25 Schools Block DSG settlement is £521.4m, with school being guaranteed a minimum increase per pupil of 0.5%.
24. Additionally, within the Schools Block, but separate to funding for individual schools, local authorities receive funding for the initial revenue costs of commissioning additional primary and secondary school places. The DfE have changed the funding methodology for the grant and introduced minimum funding requirements linked to payment by place rather than by block allocations. This has in turn required a new policy to be adopted which links the payment rates received within the grant allocation to the payments made to schools. The revised policy was considered and approved by the schools Forum on 21 November and will be applicable to schools encountering new growth from April 2024. The grant is £2.8m and will need to meet the costs of school growth currently within the system that is not fully completed, largely new schools not yet with their full contingent of year groups, and school expansions undertaken from September 2024. Once new places for September 2024 have been confirmed this will be combined with revised expectations on when new schools arising from housing growth will open to assess the full call on the grant.

25. It remains possible for local authorities to transfer up to 0.5% of the Schools Block DSG to High Needs following consultation with schools and with the approval of the schools Forum. Secretary of State approval can be sought where Schools Forum do not agree a transfer, where local authorities wish to transfer more than 0.5% and for local variations to some of the technical aspects of the NFF. No such transfer is proposed for 2024-25 although there is growing pressure from the DfE through The Delivering Better Value in SEND (DBV) Programme to consider this for future years.

### **2024-25 School Funding Formula:**

26. The provisional Schools Block settlement was issued in July 2023 and subsequently updated in October 2023 for what the DfE stated as an error in calculating pupil forecasts. This resulted in reduced per pupil allocations for schools, the settlement delivers a minimum per pupil increase of £0.5%. The NFF delivers a minimum amount of funding per pupil, £4,610 for primary and £5,771 for Key Stage 3 and £6,331 per Key Stage 4 pupil.

27. Schools remaining on the funding floor are vulnerable to changes in future levels of DfE protection. 40 schools (17%) remain on the funding floor and at +0.5% per pupil budget allocations do not reflect the current inflationary pressure in these schools which will encounter real terms decrease in funding. As funding protection is at a pupil level, schools with decreases in pupils will see an overall decrease in funding. For many small schools this issue is posing significant financial concerns. Schools will continue to get a grant to provided financial support to meet the costs of the 2023 teacher pay award.

28. Whilst the NFF for schools is based upon the 2023 School Census, funding for local authorities is based upon the pupil characteristics recorded on the 2022 school census. Any increase in pupils eligible for additional funding i.e. Free School Meals, is unfunded and results in it not being possible to meet the cost of fully delivering the NFF from the Schools Block DSG. The national regulations allow for gains for individual schools to be capped and scaled to ensure the formula is affordable. Capping and scaling was required for Leicestershire in 2023-24. The detail of the Leicestershire Funding Formula is shown at **Appendix D**.

29. Local authorities are required to use the DfE produced data to construct their school funding formula which wasn't received until late December meaning that the timescales for constructing budgets and submission of them to the DfE by 23 January is exceptionally challenging and leaves very little opportunity for consultation. Whilst Schools Forum is a significant stakeholder in all decisions on the school formula local authorities have to act urgently to address any funding gap.

30. As presented to Schools Forum on 21 November 2023 a dis-application request was submitted to the DfE for factors additional to the NFF included in the Leicestershire Funding Formula:

- An exceptional premises factor that funds costs incurred in some school on rent for either additional premises and / or sports grounds for 7 schools who receive a total of £84,592
- An adjustment to the pupil count in respect of September pupil movements as a result of schools undertaking age range changes or schools affected by them

together with an adjustment to the Minimum Funding Guarantee to ensure they budgets are not disproportionately affected by the differential between the funding for KS3 pupils and KS4 pupils which is higher. Age range change in secondary schools is almost complete and this adjustment will no longer be required once the process is complete.

The DfE have approved the disapplication requests for 2024-25 but have stated in respect of rent payments that this will only be considered for 2025/26 if lease agreements supporting all payment have been provided to them by 1 April 2024.

31. In processing the 2023 census data an affordability gap between the DSG received and the cost of the 2024-25 NFF of £1.2m was identified, this relates to increased numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals and recorded as having English as a second language, simply the DfE have not provided Leicestershire with sufficient funding to deliver the NFF. At a recent regional finance officers meeting most authorities were also reporting affordability gaps. There is no national data that quantifies a national shortfall within local authority schools block funding to meet the cost of the NFF, DfE data shows that in 2023/14 32 of the 150 England local authorities were required to cap and scale individual school budgets and the national affordability gap was £43m.
32. There are only three options available to address a funding gap all of which were assessed:
  - Provide additional funding of £1.2m. The financial position of the local authority does not allow for this which would also require Secretary of State approval.
  - Reduce values within the school funding formula. Leicestershire has formally adopted the National Funding Formula. Any change to the formula values within could be viewed as a change to the formula which would require full consultation with schools. Additionally, the DfE have now required local authorities to move closer to the NFF values set nationally and may only use factors set out within it which restricts options available.
  - Introduce capping and scaling to the outcome of the NFF. This is the approach the DfE set out to follow to ensure that local formulae are affordable. This is the approach adopted. It should be noted that this was the process followed nationally by the DfE in the first two years of transition to the NFF and in Leicestershire for 2023-24.
33. Irrespective of what methodology is adopted to achieve affordability local authorities are unable to make any adjustments to their formula that results in schools being funded below the nationally set Minimum Per Pupil Funding Levels (MPPL's). It is not possible to adopt an adjustment that results in an even impact across schools. The funding guarantees within the NFF i.e., the MPPL's and the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) may reinstate any reduction in formula factors and protects those schools sitting on or slightly above the funding floor. Capping and scaling impacts on the schools that are the highest in year gainers from the NFF.
  - Capping is applying a maximum percentage of year-on-year funding gain.
  - Scaling is applied to the cap to scale back its impact.
34. It is important to note that capping and scaling is not a reduction in school funding but a limit on the amount of year-on-year funding gain available to an individual school. This action is only necessary as the DSG allocation from the DfE to Leicestershire is lower than the cost of the NFF for Leicestershire Schools. No

funding is being removed to be held centrally and 2024-25 school budgets are set at the level of funding received.

35. Modelling identifies that to limit Leicestershire school NFF allocations to the funding received by the application of only a cap on gains would require that cap to be set at and affect schools. Spreading the impact wider across more schools minimises To minimise the impact as far as the funding regulations allow required a cap of 1.6% with a scaling factor of 50%, this affects 149 schools who will receive a reduced financial gain for 2024-25.
36. The NFF sets guaranteed funding levels through either the MFG or MPPL's and schools with these minimum increases therefore cannot be affected by any reduction in gain.
37. Whilst local authorities are required to apply the cap and scale equally to maintained school and academy budgets, for academies the values may differ from that modelled as the baseline for academy budgets applied by the DfE when calculating GAG may differ from that provided to the local authority.
38. Irrespective of the capping and scaling mechanism all Leicestershire schools will receive the funding guarantees set within the 2024-25 NFF, will receive an increase in per pupil funding and will receive all the funding the DfE have provided for the NFF.
39. The school funding formula has been submitted as required to the DfE for validation against the school funding regulations. Once this has been received budgets for maintained schools will be issued by the local authority in February, the ESFA will issue budgets to academies in March.

#### **De-Delegation:**

40. Following consultation with maintained schools, Schools Forum approved de-delegation for school improvement functions for both 2022-23 and 2023-24 following withdrawal of DfE grant to local authorities. A further request for de-delegation for 2024-25 is a separate item on the agenda for today's meeting.

#### **High Needs:**

41. The structure of the High Needs NFF is unchanged from 2023-24 and the provisional settlement at £108.439m and a 3% increase per head of population. However, it should be noted that the population factor accounts for just £38.7m (36%) of the settlement figure meaning that 63% of the formula is subject to no uplift unlike the schools NFF where all funding factors have been increased for 2024-25.
42. Leicestershire remains at the funding floor i.e., the application of the high needs NFF would generate a lower settlement without this protection. The NFF remains unresponsive to changes in the overall SEN population:
  - £10.1m (9%) of the NFF is driven by the number pupils in special school and independent school places.
  - £31.8m (28%) of the formula relates to historic spend from 2017/18, this was £58.4m compared to a forecast spend of £121.2m for 2023-24.
  - £2.8m (3%) of the formula is from the funding floor.

43. There is no indication of whether the high needs NFF will be reviewed although there is an expectation of national tariffs arising from the SEND and Alternative Provision Action Plan. There is no indication of timescales for any associated funding changes and the only reference within the settlement is "... by the end of 2025, the department [DfE] will have made progress towards introducing a national framework of banding and price tariffs." It is unlikely that any changes to funding structure, and indeed the method by which local authorities are funded, before the 2027 financial year. Additionally given that the NFF for mainstream schools commenced in 2018 and remains unfinished, funding change in this financially and politically sensitive area could be many years away.
44. The Leicestershire Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) classifies any action that reduces cost through a number of actions such as efficiency gains and growth reduction as saving. The High Needs finance plan presented within the MTFS, and through the TSIL Programme, includes the unmitigated cost of SEN placements and represents the forecast cost and number of placements if no cost reduction activities take place.
45. The financial plan makes provision for two levels of savings achieved purely by cost reduction through operational changes delivered through TSIL. Whilst shown as savings, both areas represent reductions in predicted future costs and do not affect the level of provision for pupils which remains driven by ensuring that the right children, have the right support within the provision appropriate for their needs and at the right time:

Additional Local Specialist Places. Overall, over the MTFS period a total of 135 additional places are scheduled to be delivered, which will be achieved through the opening of the Bowman Free School in Shepshed and expansion of current provision in both special schools and resource bases attached to mainstream schools. This is estimated to result in a cost reduction of £2.5m in 2024-25 rising to £13.8m in 2027/28 by meeting pupil needs in local provision without the need for a higher cost independent school. A further special free school is being built by the DfE on Farley Way in Quorn, but its opening is forecast outside the 2024-25-2027/28 MTFS period.

Transforming SEND and Inclusion in Leicestershire. Through reducing the number of starts in specialist provision, improved decision making and consistency in allocation of resources, the TSIL programme is forecast to reduce cost by £3.8m in 24/25 rising to £27.7m in 2027/28. The programme is a seven-year programme with total of £36.5m of cost savings achieved in the seven years to 2028/29. Savings presented assume a cost reduction against a higher cost provision offset against the cost incurred in the alternative placement.

46. The financial benefits accruing from the TSIL Programme are set out below:



	2024/25	2025/26	2026/26	2027/28
Cummulative	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
Reduction in the number of EHCP Needs Assessment Requests	-228	-660	-1,231	-1,778
Reduction in Assessment Conversion Rate	-352	-861	-1,430	-1,918
Reduced Mainstream EHCP Cost	-345	-948	-1,634	-2,315
Reduction in the number of Early Years Specialist Starts	-587	-1,206	-1,839	-2,478
Reduction in the number of Non Early Years Specialist Starts	-1,333	-3,840	-6,721	-9,779
Reduction in Non Early Years Specialist Cost	-1,333	-3,840	-6,721	-9,779
Savings Achieved at Annual Reviews	391	380	380	380
<b>Total - Potential Cost Reduction Savings</b>	<b>-3,788</b>	<b>-10,976</b>	<b>-19,195</b>	<b>-27,666</b>

47. The forecast position on the High Needs element of the DSG over the MTFS period is shown below:

	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
Grant Income	-109,176	-112,430	-115,781	-119,233
Placement Costs	120,579	133,297	147,279	162,705
Other HNB Cost	10,679	11,279	11,279	11,279
Commissioning Cost - New Places	162	37	0	0
Invest to Save Project Costs - TSIL	986	986	986	986
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>132,406</b>	<b>145,599</b>	<b>159,544</b>	<b>174,970</b>
<b>Funding Gap Pre Savings / Cost Reduction</b>	<b>23,230</b>	<b>33,169</b>	<b>43,763</b>	<b>55,737</b>
TSIL Programme Defined Opportunities	-3,788	-10,976	-19,195	-27,666
Increase in Local Specialist Places	-2,480	-5,995	-9,868	-13,803
<b>Total Savings / Cost Reduction</b>	<b>-6,268</b>	<b>-16,972</b>	<b>-29,063</b>	<b>-41,469</b>
<b>Annual Revenue Funding Gap</b>	<b>16,963</b>	<b>16,197</b>	<b>14,700</b>	<b>14,268</b>
<b>Cummulative High Needs Deficit Brought Forward</b>	<b>48,501</b>			
<b>Cummulative High Needs Funding Gap</b>	<b>65,464</b>	<b>81,661</b>	<b>96,361</b>	<b>110,629</b>
Surplus (-ve) / Deficit Other DSG Blocks	-8,060	-8,057	-7,557	-4,957
<b>Dedicated Schools Grant Surplus (-ve) / Deficit</b>	<b>57,404</b>	<b>73,604</b>	<b>88,804</b>	<b>105,672</b>
<b>High Needs Spend as % of High Needs DSG</b>	<b>122%</b>	<b>130%</b>	<b>139%</b>	<b>148%</b>
<b>Surplus / Deficit as % of Total DSG</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>14%</b>

As can be seen in the above table placement expenditure is 110% of High Needs DSG in 2024-25 rising to 136% in 2027/28 if no actions are taken to achieve value for money and effective management of placements.

48. Local authorities are required to carry forward DSG as an unusable reserve through the continued use of a Statutory Accounts override and may only now contribute to DSG with the approval of the Secretary of State. The accounts override legislation is confirmed to March 2026 when it is expected to end. Unless further legislation changes this, from this point local authorities will be required to make financial provision for the deficit.
49. It is nationally recognised that additional funding alone will not address the financial difficulties many of which are created by a system where school and parental expectations have a greater influence than a local authority assessment of needs, appropriate provision and affordability. It is clear that policy changes are needed. Whilst the DfE's Change programme may deliver some of that change in the long term there are no short- or medium-term solutions to address the financial challenges. At the continued levels of expected growth, the position is completely unsustainable and puts the Council's finances in a very difficult position. As such it is essential that the planned measures to contain ongoing growth, are successful, but additional measures put in place to reduce both demand and costs.
50. Despite the challenging financial position, the local authority budget makes provision for growth funding to support SEN services post TSIL through an additional annual investment of £1.2m.
51. The TSIL programme is now well into its 'implementation phase', with the majority of the designed changes having been implemented across the target areas – ranging from specific teams within the County Council to the entirety of the SEND system in Leicestershire. This will deliver significant improvements and cost reductions. The programme predominantly aims to deliver solutions to this for new entrants into the SEND system, and not to inappropriately change provision for a child.
52. The TSIL programme has considered workload and performance within the Special Educational Needs Assessment (SENA) Service. The Service is responsible for delivering the local authority's statutory duty under the SEND Code of Practice to carry out statutory assessment and review of children and young people who have an EHCP from age 0 – 25, write Education Health and Care (EHCP's) plans and identify and secure the provision to meet the needs and are key contributors to meeting the 20-week statutory timeline for assessments but are dependent upon other advice givers to do so.
53. The review identified that the current model was failing to achieve statutory duties:
  - 1% of new EHCP's were delivered on time
  - 10% of EHCP amendments were completed in the required 12 week
  - 33% of annual reviews were completed
  - 12% of phase transfers were completed on time
54. A review of the SENA Service considered 'ways of working' as well as well as capacity. A new operating model has created three specialist teams focusing on assessments, reviews and placements. This will improve productivity by creating

expert teams in each of these areas and is estimated to improve productivity by c30%. The review also considered capacity from a performance perspective but also the current position of agency staff. The growth request will increase staffing through expanding case manager numbers and management capacity. Workflow tracking will allow the effective management of staffing levels to respond to peaks and troughs in service demand as well as changing trends with a clear link between staffing needs and service volume.

55. The growth funding, alongside changes in the Education Psychology (EP) Service, will support a new service structure and approach to managing workload. It will:
- Improve the timeliness of assessments, reviews, and placements – 11% of assessments are now being completed within the 20-week timeframe, compared to 2% in 2022 and 0% for the first half of 2023. The programme will be continuously seeking to drive this number up.
  - Improve communication with parents and schools with clear steps in all processes, in turn reducing complaints and tribunals in the longer term.
  - Ensure that every child achieves the right support at the right time, and placements will meet need.
56. Under the Schools and Early Years Finance (England) regulations the costs of the SEN assessment service falls to the local authority budget. However, the financial benefit is through reduced placement costs which, under the same regulations, fall to be met from High Needs DSG. Whilst local authorities cannot directly contribute to DSG without the permission of the Secretary State this position clearly sets out the contradictory nature of the SEN funding system.
57. The achievement of some TSIL benefits is also dependent upon the delivery of the above but also sufficient capacity to engage proactively with parents and schools, managing performance through case tracking and understanding specialist provision particularly the capacity they have and the children they can best support. To respond to this position and mitigate its impact on both the delivery of statutory duties and programme savings a growth bid of £1.2m has been considered necessary within the MTFS without which it is estimated that c£9m of TSIL benefits could be at risk.
58. **Appendix E** set out the number of specialist places commissioned for 2024-25 and their average unit cost. It should, be noted that these are the minimum number of places being commissioned and additional places may be commissioned throughout the year as need arises. The average unit cost will also vary as needs and costs change throughout the year.

### **Central Services Block:**

59. The central services block funds a number of school-related expenditure items such as existing school-based premature retirement costs, copyright licences under a national DfE contract for all schools and other historic costs. The 2024-25 settlement is £3.9m.
60. The provisional settlement continues an annual reduction of 20% for the Historic Costs element of the settlement but a guarantee remains in place to ensure that funding does not decrease below the financial commitment to meet former teacher

employment costs. The Leicestershire allocation is £118k below the cost and a claim for additional funding will be submitted in February.

### **Early Years Block:**

61. The DfE have announced additional early years DSG to extend early years entitlements. In addition to the offer of the Free Entitlement to Early Education (FEEE) of 15 hours for 38 weeks per year for three and four-year-olds, the existing two-year-old entitlement to 15 hours of free childcare for eligible children of disadvantaged parents expands to include to 15 hours of free childcare for eligible children of working parents starting from April 2024 for two-year-olds and September 2024 for children aged between nine months and two years-old.
62. Whilst the Early Years DSG settlement has yet to be published it is estimated to be £63.2m and based on funding rates of £4.77 per hour for the three – four-year-olds and £7.07 for two-year-olds. Local authorities are required to pass through 95% of the settlement to providers, the remaining 5% meeting the cost of the Early Learning and Childcare service and continuing to recoup the early years deficit recorded in 2022-23.
63. The local authority hourly rate announced by DfE provides funding to support providers with the core costs of providing entitlement hours. Local authorities are required to pass a minimum of 95% of funding to providers, local authorities are able to retain 5% of total funding which fund local authorities to administer the entitlements locally. The DfE view Local authorities being best placed to determine how to use their total funding allocation to meet the needs of their communities are required to set local provider hourly rates. For 2024-25 95% is delegated to providers for three and four year olds and 97% for the twos and under to ensure the highest funding rate is available to providers.
64. The 95% pass through rates includes:
- the universal hourly base rate, which is paid to all providers.
  - supplements for deprivation.
  - special educational needs inclusion fund (SENIF), which should be targeted at children with lower level or emerging special educational needs (SEN).
  - contingency funding, which is extra money set aside for changes in the number of children taking up the entitlements throughout the year.
65. Following consultation with providers the 2024-25 rates are set out below. The base rate has increased by £0.58 per hour for 3- and 4-year-olds and by £1.68 per hour for 2-year-olds. Leicestershire’s specialist and maintained nurseries are funded as special schools.

	<b>2023-24 £ per Hour</b>	<b>2024-25 £ per Hour</b>
<b><u>3- &amp; 4-Year-Olds:</u></b>		
Base Rate	4.44	5.02
Deprivation top-up	0.04 – 0.08	0.04 – 0.08

<b><u>2-Year-Olds:</u></b>		
Base Rate	5.33	7.01
<b><u>Under 2's:</u></b>		
Base Rate	N/A	9.49
Deprivation top-up	N/A	0.04 – 0.08

### **Funding School Growth**

66. Within the Schools Block, but separate to funding for individual schools, local authorities receive funding for the initial revenue costs of commissioning additional primary and secondary school places. For 2024-25 the grant is confirmed as £2.8m. The growth fund can only be used to:

- support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need.
- support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation.
- meet the revenue cost of new schools.
- meet revenue costs, for schools, of removing or repurposing surplus places.

From 2024 to 2025 local authorities are required to provide growth funding where a school or academy has agreed with the local authority to provide an extra class to meet basic need in the area (either as a bulge class or as an ongoing commitment).

The growth fund must not be used to support:

- schools in financial difficulty; any such support for maintained schools should be provided from a de-delegated contingency.
- general growth due to popularity; this is managed through lagged funding. This includes cases where academies have admitted above pupil admission numbers (PAN) by their own choice.

67. Schools Forum agreed a revised Growth Policy at its meeting of 21 November 2023 as a result in The DfE's introduction of new minimum requirements for local authorities. It should be noted that the growth fund relates exclusively to mainstream schools and cannot be used to support new SEND provision without a transfer from the schools to high needs block, the cost of commissioning new SEND provision falls to be met from the high needs block as there is no DfE revenue funding for establishing additional specialist provision and therefore contributes to the overall deficit.

### **Dedicated Schools Grant Reserve:**

68. Local authorities continue to be required to carry any DSG deficit forward for recovery against future years grant and may also only contribute local resources to the Schools Budget with the permission of the Secretary of State.

69. Leicestershire is one of 55 authorities within the DfE's Delivering Better Value in SEND (DBV) Programme. The programme provides support through both a SEND and a financial advisor and has resulted in a grant of £1m to support SEND transformation but this support has been slow to mobilise. The DfE have required




a submission of a DSG management plan which has recently been submitted and constitutes the financial action and the TSIL programme as set out in this report. A response from the DfE has not yet been received.

70. It is forecast that the DSG reserve will remain in deficit for the period of the MTF5 as a result of the continued and increasing overspend on high needs, this will partially be offset by the accumulation of funding allocated to the authority to meet the revenue costs of new and expanding schools. Overall, the high needs deficit for 2024-25 is projected to be £64.5m rising to £110.6m in 2027/28. Overall, the DSG deficit is forecast at £57.4m (8% of Total DSG) rising to £105.7m (14% of DSG) in 2027/28.

71. Whilst the TSIL programme will deliver further cost reductions in future years outside the current MTF5 period the financial position is clearly unsustainable and remains the most significant financial risk for the Council.

**Notional SEN Budget:**

72. The Notional SEN budget is an identified amount of funding within a schools overall delegated budget that is to contribute to the special educational provision of children with SEN or disabilities and is to guide schools in the allocation of resources to meet additional needs of pupils. In terms of high needs, the national funding system sets out that element 2 funding is met from the notional SEN budget:

£10,000		Paid by Local Authority for each occupied place - may be more than one funding authority	Total cost of provision specified in Education, Health and Care Plan Needs less £6,000  <b>High Cost, Low Incidence</b>	E l e m e n t  3	Element 3 funding - sometimes referred to as 'Top-up' is paid where the additional provision within the Education, Health and Care Plan exceeds £6,000 by the local authority with financial responsibility for the pupil and is in addition to the school delegated budget
		£6,000	First £6,000 of cost of provision specified in Education, Health and Care Plan  <b>Low Cost, High Incidence</b>	E l e m e n t  2	Element 2 Funding is met within the school delegated budget from the Notional SEN Budget. This is subsidiary calculation within the delegated budget consisting of 4% AWPU, 50% Low Prior Attainment and 67% IDACI. It is a financial measure of the expected level of SEND within the school population.
		£4,000	Universal provision for all Pupils  <b>Universal</b>	E l e m e n t  1	Element 1 Funding is the delegated pupil led funding for all schools and not affected by the individual level of need of pupils

\* Delegated budget refers to the S251 Statement for maintained schools, GAG for academies and Core Funding for FE Providers

73. The calculation of the Notional SEN Budget is locally defined. A review of the Notional SEN was received by Schools Forum at the meeting on 21 November 223 and its calculation is unchanged for 2024-25. The calculation captures the formula factors that correlate to the expected incidence of SEN rather than indicators that

are the result of an identified SEN needs through, for example, the number of EHCP's within the school. The proportions and funding factors upon which the notional SEN budget is calculated are detailed out in the following table, the calculation is individual to each school and therefore the proportion of the overall school budget will vary:

<b>Funding Factor</b>	<b>2024-25 % to Notional SEN</b>
Age Weighted Pupil Unit	4%
Prior Attainment	50%
IDACI	67%
<b>Total Notional SEN Budget Contained within the Funding Formula</b>	<b>£37.687m</b>

As the Notional SEN Budget is intrinsically linked to the funding formula it is subject to similar increased to that for overall pupil funding. The 2024-25 notional SEN budget is an increase of £1.38m (5%) from 2023-24

74. In accordance with the High Needs Operational Guidance the local authority will continue to assess schools where the notional SEN budget is insufficient to meet commitments to element 2 funding. This compares the aggregated commitment to Element 2 costs and notional SEN budget. Where the notional budget is shown to be insufficient to meet commitments an additional payment will be made to schools. Schools should, within their management processes, consider how their SEN notional budget is fully deployed to support pupils within the mainstream school environment.

#### **Excluded Pupils:**

75. The arrangements for reclaiming funding are set out in the School and Early Years Finance Regulations are mandatory for any pupil permanently excluded. They are required to reflect the funding attributable to a pupil of same age and circumstances and is therefore based on the average per pupil funding value for primary, Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4. These values are detailed in the following table and will be applied as the deduction to school budgets from April 2023.

<b>School Phase</b>	<b>Annual Rate £</b>	<b>Daily Rate £</b>
Primary	4,160.70	21.90
Key Stage 3	5,866.10	30.87
Key Stage 4	6,612.50	34.80

Deductions will also be made in respect of the pupil premium if applicable to an individual pupil.

76. It should be noted that budget deductions for permanently excluded pupils are required from the excluding schools under the finance regulations irrespective of whether the excluded pupil was recorded on the October census driving the school budget.
77. These rates will also be applied to the funding adjustments made in relation to dual registered pupils at Oakfield, the charges levied for the education of children with medical needs and will be recommended to the Secondary Education Inclusion Partnerships.

### **Pupil Premium:**

78. Pupil Premium rates have been increased for 2024-25 and are set out below:

	<b>2023-24 £ per Pupil</b>	<b>2024-25 £ per Pupil</b>
Primary Free School Meals 6	1,455	1,480
Secondary Free School Meals 6	1,035	1,050
Looked After and Previously Looked After Children	2,530	2,570
Service Premium	335	340

79. The allocations are passported intact by the local authority to maintained schools for eligible pupils on the school roll but are retained by the local authority for looked after children which is allocated by the Head of the Virtual School, academies receive funding directly from the ESFA.

### **The Local Authority Budget:**

80. Demand for Children and Family Services continues to increase with growth of £41.3m projected over the period of the MTFs, as the requirement to meet CFS needs before intervention, arising from demographic growth and an increased need for social care. The continuing impacts of the pandemic and cost of living crisis provide additional challenges which are likely to be far-reaching as the effects have a cumulative impact on families, increasing the likelihood of family breakdown and the need for care services.
81. This revised MTFs for 2024-28 projects a gap of £6m in the first year that will need to be balanced by the use of earmarked reserves. There is then a gap of £33m in year two rising to £83m in Year 4. Delivery of the MTFs requires savings of £164m to be made from 2024-25 to 2027/28, unless service demand reduces, or additional income is secured. This MTFs sets out in detail £81m of savings and proposed reviews that will identify further savings to reduce the £83m funding gap on the main revenue budget and the £111m estimated funding gap on High Needs in 2027/28. High Needs expenditure within the Government grant going forwards has (in recent years) exceeded grant to the extent that a cumulative deficit of £65m is forecast by the end of the current financial year. Strong financial control plans and discipline will be essential in the delivery of the MTFs.



82. In order to set out the full context of the financial challenges facing the department the provisions for growth and savings set out in the Children and Family Services budget for 2024/2 – 2027/28 are summarised below. The significant challenge within this section of the budget continues to be the growth in the number and cost of social care placements and the staff required to support both services for both looked after children and vulnerable children and their families. The growth and savings attributed to the department are shown below:

References		<b>GROWTH</b>	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
			£000	£000	£000	£000
		<b>CHILDREN &amp; FAMILY SERVICES</b>				
**	G1	Demographic growth & increasing cost of Social Care Placement mix	13,700	21,400	30,100	39,800
**	G2	Front-line social care staff - increased caseloads	0	250	250	350
	G3	Post Transforming SEND & Inclusion In Leicestershire(TSIL) sustainability	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
	G4	Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) - increased demand/cost	2,250	2,250	2,250	2,250
	G5	Demand management	-1,050	-1,150	-1,310	-2,290
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16,100</b>	<b>23,950</b>	<b>32,490</b>	<b>41,310</b>
		<b>SAVINGS</b>				
		<b>CHILDREN &amp; FAMILY SERVICES</b>				
**	CF1	Eff Innovation Partnership - Creation of Assessment & Resource team and Hub and investment in residential accommodation	-1,000	-1,250	-1,500	-1,500
*	CF2	Eff Departmental establishment modelling / Re-design	0	-440	-940	-940
**	CF3	Eff Defining CFS For the Future Programme - Phase 2 (including Dept. Eff. Savings)	-200	-1,100	-1,700	-2,300
**	CF4	SR Education Quality & Therapeutic Services Review	-355	-355	-355	-355
	CF5	Eff Reduced Care Costs through growth of internal family based placements	-750	-1,250	-2,100	-3,100
	CF6	Eff Defining CFS For the Future Programme 3: Smarter commissioning and procurement - Social Care Placements and externally commissioned services	0	-1,900	-3,200	-4,950
	CF7	Eff SEND Service - Demand reduction and reduced tribunals	0	-100	-250	-400
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-2,305</b>	<b>-6,395</b>	<b>-10,045</b>	<b>-13,545</b>

References

**SAVINGS**

2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27
£000	£000	£000	£000

**CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES**

**	CF1	Eff	Pathways workstream - Focus on prevention, drift and duration of interventions across all pathways	-215	-280	-395	-450
**	CF2	Eff	Settings workstream - Reduced care placement costs through growth of in-house capacity & supported lodgings and a review of placements	-900	-2,670	-4,490	-6,470
**	CF3	Eff	Disabled Children's Service Enablement Workstream	-100	-150	-200	-250
			<i>Total Defining CFS For the Future Programme</i>	<i>-1,215</i>	<i>-3,100</i>	<i>-5,085</i>	<i>-7,170</i>
**	CF4	Eff	Innovation Partnership - Creation of Assessment & Resource team and Hub and investment in residential accommodation	-250	-500	-1,000	-1,250
**	CF5	Eff	Departmental efficiency savings	0	-200	-500	-800
	CF6	Eff	Departmental establishment modelling / Re-design	0	0	-440	-940
	CF7	Eff	Defining CFS For the Future Programme - Phase 2	0	-1,000	-1,500	-2,000
	CF8	Eff	Alternative approach for delivering anti-bullying	-50	-50	-50	-50
	CF9	SR	Review Virtual School provision	0	-355	-355	-355
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-1,515</b>	<b>-5,205</b>	<b>-8,930</b>	<b>-12,565</b>

**Reference Key**

\* items unchanged from previous Medium Term Financial Strategy

\*\* items included in the previous Medium Term Financial Strategy which have been amended

Eff - Efficiency saving

SR - Service reduction

Inc - Income

**Capital Programme:**

1. The proposed Children and Family Services capital programme totals £89.8m, for which the majority (£65.1m) there is external funding or capital receipts expected, and £24.5m prior years' external funding held in reserves, resulting in £266k call on LCC capital funding over the four-year life of the proposed MTFS as per the summary table below.
2. The programme continues to focus upon the delivery of additional primary and secondary school places and additional places to be delivered to support the Transforming SEND and Inclusion in Leicestershire (TSIL) programme. £63.6m is proposed to be invested in the provision of additional placements; £13.9m for SEN and £12.3m for investment in other capital requirements including completing the

investment in residential homes, strategic capital maintenance and improved schools' access and security.

<b>CFS Capital Programme '£000</b>	<b>2024-25</b>	<b>2025/26</b>	<b>2026/27</b>	<b>2027/28</b>	<b>Total</b>
Additional School Places	24,401	33,487	4,967	700	<b>63,555</b>
SEND Programme	12,650	1,250	0	0	<b>13,900</b>
Other Capital	3,946	2,800	2,800	2,800	<b>12,346</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,997</b>	<b>37,537</b>	<b>7,767</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>89,801</b>

### **Provision of Additional School Places:**

85. The investment in additional school places totals £63.6m over four years including £24.4m next year. The programme is funded through the Basic Need grant from the DfE and S106 developer contributions.

### **SEND Programme:**

86. The four-year investment in the SEND programme is £13.9m and contains funding for developments to support the TSIL programme.

87. The majority of the capital programme is likely to be funded by external grant and developer S106 contributions as follows:

<b>Capital Resources '£000</b>	<b>2024-25</b>	<b>2025/26</b>	<b>2026/27</b>	<b>2027/28</b>	<b>Total</b>
Grants	5,636	19,577	3,500	3,500	32,213
External Contributions / S106	9,120	14,288	4,297	1,693	29,398
Earmarked capital receipts	1,750	1,672	0	0	3,422
Discretionary Capital Funding	266	0	0	0	266
Prior Years' grant funding held in reserve	24,225	2,000	-30	-1,693	24,502
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>40,997</b>	<b>37,537</b>	<b>7,767</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>89,801</b>

88. Basic Need Grant is received from the DfE based upon the need to create additional mainstream school places. Grants of 3.1m and £17.1m have been confirmed for the years 2024-25 and 2025/26 respectively but estimates of £1m have been included for the final two years of the programme. The grant reflects the overall place need across the County and for both maintained schools and academies. The grant meets the infrastructure costs of creating new places in

primary and secondary schools. Eligible revenue costs fall to be met from the local authority's growth fund, funded from DSG for primary and secondary schools.

89. Strategic Maintenance Grant is received from the DfE for the maintenance of maintained schools only. This grant is based on a formula that considers pupil numbers and the overall condition of the school estate. The grant reduces as schools convert to academies. Local authority allocations are yet to be confirmed. An assumption of £2m per annum has been included in the MTFS.

90. S106 Contributions it is estimated that a total of £29.4m of S106 contributions fund the proposed programme, £9.1m in 2024-25. Estimates for the latter two years of the MTFS are less certain and are dependent upon the speed of housing developments.

### **Appendices:**

The following are appendices to this report:

- Appendix C 2024-25 Children and Family Services Proposed Budget
- Appendix D 2024-25 Leicestershire Schools Funding Formula
- Appendix E 2024-25 High Needs Commissioned Places

### **Officer to Contact:**

Jenny Lawrence

Finance Business Partner – Schools and High Needs

Email: [Jenny.Lawrence@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Jenny.Lawrence@leics.gov.uk)

Tel: 0116 305 6401

**APPENDIX A****Consultation on the De-delegation\* of funding to deliver Local Authority School Improvement Functions**

*\*De-delegation effectively means the retention of part of a school budget by the LA before the total is calculated*

**Introduction:**

1. On 11 January 2022 the DfE published the outcome of their consultation on reforming how local authorities' school improvement functions are funded. Since 2017, the Local Authority School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering grant has been allocated to local authorities to support them in fulfilling their statutory school improvement functions under Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and their additional school improvement expectations as set out in the Schools Causing Concern (SCC) guidance (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate.
2. As a result of the consultation the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant was reduce by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and will be removed entirely from 2023/24. Instead, the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 will allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives.
3. In recent years Leicestershire has received the following amounts:
  - 2019/20 £330,371
  - 2020/21 £339,189
  - 2021/22 £314,887
  - 2022/23 £139,000
  - 2023/24 and onwards £0
4. It was agreed by Schools Forum on March 23, 2022, that £9 per pupils be de-delegated from maintained school budgets in 2022/23 to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions.
5. It was agreed by Schools Forum on February 14, 2023, that £18 per pupils be de-delegated from maintained school budgets in 2023/24 to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions.
6. To maintain the status quo, it was proposed the offer be extended into following years when there would need to be an ongoing de-delegation of £18 per pupil to cover the same level of per pupil funding.
7. De-delegation can only be approved on an annual basis.

**Statutory School Improvement Functions for the Local Authority:**

8. Local Authorities have statutory school improvement functions under [Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#) and additional school improvement expectations as set out in the [Schools Causing Concern \(SCC\) guidance](#) (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate.

**The Use of this funding in Leicestershire:**

9. This funding is used to fulfil Leicestershire Local Authority statutory responsibilities around maintained schools including:
- An Education Effectiveness Partner linked to each school developing a relationship between the school and LA offering advocacy and oversight: a watchful eye and critical friend giving support and somewhere to go in challenging times; ad hoc responses and signposting; knowledge of the position of schools and when/if intervention is needed.
  - The Education Effectiveness Partner closely monitor standards in maintained schools and report on standards in maintained schools to the senior leaders of the school, the governing board of the school, the local authority and where appropriate, the diocese through notes of visit.
  - The Education Effectiveness Partner identify and evaluate risk of ‘causing concern’ or ‘eligible for intervention’, as defined in Schools Causing Concern, Education and Inspections Act 2006 and Education and Adoption Act 2016.
  - Commissioned health checks and audits as appropriate; support in preparation for, and response to, inspection.
  - Development support around safeguarding, financial planning and governance, and support with working with a range of linked LA and wider services.
  - Partnership development to support collaborative groups to become self-supporting, sustainable, and robust “strong families of schools”.
  - Funding to support core improvement activities and formal intervention overlaps with wider improvement provision.
10. Maintaining this service and engagement with schools strengthens the ability of the Education Effectiveness Team to add value to all schools and academies through its universal offer, funded via County Council funding, (Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership strategic improvement activities, communications, advocacy for schools and signposting) and insight into the education sector in Leicestershire.
11. The additional improvement function for LA maintained schools currently includes the following:
- a) Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP), providing a single point of contact, help & advice, support & signposting (local authority, localised and Hubs), advocacy and confidential conversations.

- b) Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools including support and development of a Collaborative Committee for maintained schools and academy members.
  - c) A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback including:
    - i. Health-check (evaluation quality of teaching and learning)
    - ii. Safeguarding audit
    - iii. Pupil Premium review
    - iv. SEND review
    - v. External Review of Governance
    - vi. Website audit
  - d) Next Steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support.
  - e) Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service.
  - f) Support and development of safeguarding arrangements post inspection, audit or new headteacher one-to-one visit.
  - g) Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.
  - h) The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes.
  - i) The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance.
  - j) Centralised fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas, recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice, Inspection Skills training as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g., development of curriculum leadership.
  - k) Commissioned School Improvement Partner (SIP) support, mentoring and/or targeted peer support with a school improvement consultant.
  - l) Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools.
  - m) A range of regular communications including meetings, seminars, and webinars.
  - n) Full day local authority induction for new headteachers plus an onsite safeguarding visit for all new to headship headteachers from LCC Safeguarding and Compliance.
  - o) Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for leadership and staff development – where appropriate (release for 2024-25).
12. It is proposed that the additional improvement function continues to be delivered through the de-delegation.
13. The Education Effectiveness Team engages with and supports all schools and education settings in Leicestershire through strategic planning and partnership (including the Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership (which acts as a hub for this activity); managing communications such as the headteacher briefing, social media and meetings with headteachers; and fulfilling statutory duties around

safeguarding, moderation, and SACRE. The team identifies opportunities to make appropriate connections for the benefit of children in Leicestershire. This activity is funded separately, and alongside the de-delegated funded activities for maintained schools. This proposal sets out the proposed use of the de-delegated funding from maintained schools.

**School Improvement Budget 2024/25:**

14. The regulations allow for LAs to deduct the funding from maintained schools budget shares as an Education Function for services relating to maintained schools only in much the same way as for de-delegated services if approved by the Schools Forum. If the maintained schools' School Forum representatives agree that this funding can be deducted from school budget shares, £18 per pupil will be de-delegated in 2024/25.
15. It should be noted that if the Schools Forum maintained schools' representatives do not approve to de-delegate funds for this function that the Secretary of State retains the power to approve the de-delegation contrary to the decision of the Schools Forum if it is deemed necessary to ensure that the local authority is adequately funded to exercise its core school improvement functions and a decision is requested by the Local Authority.



**Consultation Questions:****Consultation on De-delegation of Funding for School Improvement in Maintained Schools.**

Q1. Which area is your school located?

Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley & Bosworth, Melton, North-West Leicestershire, Oadby & Wigston

Q2. Please provide the following details:

School name: DfE number:

Q3. In what role are you responding to this survey?

Headteacher, Chair of Governors, Other (please specify) Please specify 'Other':

Q4. The DfE no longer allocates funding for school improvement and monitoring to local authorities in the form of a grant. It is expected this should instead be funded through the de-delegation of funds from the maintained school budget share with the approval of their Schools Forum maintained schools' representatives.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "I understand the impact of this proposal on the Local Authority Core and Additional Improvement Function offers for maintained schools."

Strongly agree, Tend to agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Tend to disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know

Comment

Q5. Do you agree that the comprehensive Additional Improvement Function offer (described in the introduction) represents value for money?

Strongly agree, Tend to agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Tend to disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know

Comment

Q6. How likely, if at all, is your school to access the following areas of the Local Authority's Additional Improvement Function offer?

The LCC Additional Improvement Function Offer for maintained schools includes:

	Very likely, Fairly likely, Not very likely, Not at all, likely, Don't know
Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP)	
Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools	
Participation through a Collaborative Committee for maintained and academy members schools	

<p>The rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback (including a health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit)</p>	
<p>Next steps support with recommendations from the check and audits, from support commissioned in partnership between school leaders and their EEP and brokered by the LA</p>	
<p>Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service</p>	
<p>Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.</p>	
<p>Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance</p>	
<p>Fully funded centralised CPD opportunities (recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice, Inspection Skills training as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g., Curriculum training)</p>	
<p>Commissioned School Improvement Partner (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support</p>	
<p>Funding support with evidenced-based research projects in schools</p>	
<p>A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin</p>	
<p>Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring, plus an onsite safeguarding visit for all new to headship headteachers from LCC Safeguarding and Compliance</p>	
<p>Regular meetings, seminars and webinars provided by the LA and associated partners</p>	
<p>Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for managers and staff development – where appropriate (for 2024-25)</p>	

Q7. What, if anything, else should we consider as part of our Additional Improvement Function offer?

Q8. Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local Authority's Additional Improvement Function and Core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2024/25?

Yes, No, Don't know

Why do you say this?

Q9. Do you understand that the final decision around the de-delegation of funding to support these functions is retained by the Secretary of State for Education?

Yes, No, Don't know

Why do you say this?

Q10. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX B

## De-Delegation Consultation Results

Q1- Which area is your school located?	Blaby-3, Charnwood-8, Harborough-7, Hinckley & Bosworth-13, Melton-5, North West Leicestershire-22, Oadby & Wigston-3					
	Headteacher	Other	No response			
Q3- In what role are you responding to this survey?	56	5				
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Q4- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?  <b>'I understand the impact of this proposal on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools'</b>	29	25	3	1	2	1
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Q5- Do you agree that this represents a comprehensive core offer which represents value for money?	10	27	14	5	4	1
	Very likely	Fairly likely	Not very likely	Not at all likely	Don't know	
Q6- How likely, if at all, is your school to access the following areas of the Local Authority's core offer?						
Partnership working with a dedicated Education	47	12		1	1	

Effectiveness Partner (EEP)						
Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools	44	9	4	2	1	
Participation through a Collaborative Committee for maintained and academy members schools	33	17	6	2	3	
A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback (including a health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit)	43	16	1	0	1	
Next steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support	35	16	6	0	3	
Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service	29	25	4	0	3	
Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.	38	11	7	3	1	

Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance	24	21	11	1	4	
Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas (recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice, Inspection Skills training as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum training)	37	14	5	2	3	
Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support	26	14	15	3	3	
Funding support with evidenced-based research projects in schools	25	20	8	1	6	
A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin	38	22	1			
Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring	19	5	15	21	1	
Regular meetings, seminars and webinars	29	26	5	0	1	
Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for managers and staff development – where appropriate (new for 2024-25)	27	21	9	2	2	
	Yes	No	Don't know			
Q8- Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local	50	7	3	1 blank		

Authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2023/24?						
	Yes	No	Don't know			
Q9- Do you understand that the final decision around the de-delegation of funding to support these functions is retained by the Secretary of State for Education?	57		3			



### Comments

#### **Q3. Other:**

Executive Headteacher (2)

Chair of Governors (3)

#### **Q4. Why do you say this?**

- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) held a meeting with our collaborative group and explained the structure, functions, and limitations of LA support if school funds are not de-delegated.
- Information from the LA is very clear and transparent
- I understand the de delegation process and happy for the funds to be taken at source in order for us to receive the core and additional functions.
- Having had this explained at a \_ Collaborative Meeting, I completely understand the statement outlined above.
- Meeting held with LA to discuss this explained well at briefing
- A comprehensive information session with the EEP with our collaborative group. A presentation was also shared via email.
- I am getting my head around funding/budgets and the role of the LA as a new headteacher and have had a meeting around delegated funding.
- I understand that without the DfE grant, de-delegation is needed to maintain LA services for schools.
- Explanation by education effectiveness department
- I agree that I understand the statement, however, I do not agree to the DfE's funding structure changing.
- Explained clearly by XXXX (Education Effectiveness)
- Not sure about the true cost and the impact of the support and how this will be measured and reported.
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) clearly explained this to my group of schools
- I understand that in order to fund school improvement services, the money will be taken from schools' budgets and paid to the local authority.
- Guidance from the Ed Effectiveness team on the matter.
- Fully explained by LA
- There seems no option, but the government should be paying this as an additional grant as budgets are already stretched
- This aspect has been fully explained to all Headteachers within our XXX Collaborative Group Meeting.

- Well-informed after thorough Ed Effectiveness presentation at collaborative committee / to XXXX group about de-delegation and implications for funding and support
- I understand the impact
- We had a meeting where it was explained to us very fully and our questions were answered.
- We have not been made aware of the impact of this proposal.
- I know what I have been told, but not seen this in practice, so far
- It has been outlined in communications from Education Effectiveness and school EEP.
- As this is no longer funded centrally, we understand (but don't necessarily agree that) unless this comes out of our school budget then we will no longer benefit from the support/services from School Improvement Services.
- I understand that without the funding important services will cease for our schools.
- Information provided as document and by being discussed in collaborative group
- We've had the opportunity to discuss this through our collaboration.
- As a maintained school I have appreciated the support.
- I have attended headteacher briefings where this has been explained to us.
- Our budget is already overstretched without losing more funds.

**Q5. Why do you say this?**

- I have not yet accessed all aspects of the AIF and therefore am unable to say if they are value for money. Those I have accessed and have been commissioned by the LA have been value for money.
- This school and many schools have benefited
- Very happy with the additional function offer and make good use of it.
- The school received a lot of support when I came to the school in order to raise standards quickly in anticipation of OFSTED
- Support for collaborative group very helpful.
- It does but does need high quality people to deliver that support.
- As a new headteacher at a school which is about to be inspected I feel I have had support from the LA in terms of EEP involvement, a health check, and various audits.
- I think that for some schools they would not need or have access to all the services offered during the year. Therefore, to be considered value for money the de-delegation should be more closely linked to what the school is actually receiving.
- We need some support including CPD
- Funding is bespoke to each school/partnership's needs.

- I do not feel that audits, which appears to be the primary offer, is a comprehensive offer. As a new headteacher in a maintained school, I feel we get next to no support.
- As a maintained school we would not be able to get the services for such value for money
- A lot of school improvement now comes from Academies /Trusts or from local specialised Hubs. As more schools convert to academies, I believe the LA school improvement offer will unfortunately become redundant.
- On the face of it, last year we had a School review, a Safeguarding audit and an EEP visit. We also had a website review. At £18 a pupil this means we paid around £7k. We felt the need to buy in additional advisor visits to work with leaders and also looked elsewhere. This means we paid £1500 out of school funds and the LA possibly paid £1k for advice to the school. So on that basis I tend to disagree.
- It is value for money should you need the support but if you are ok then you get less support
- At the briefing, costs were outlined to school leaders to help them to understand whether it was value for money or not.
- Support appropriately provided to schools that require it.
- I think the offer in principle represents value for money for maintained schools as a group. My hesitation is what this can look like on an individual school's basis.
- After the services were fully explained it was easy to understand. I think all governors would benefit from knowing just what is on offer perhaps as a GSD course.
- It looks good on paper but the detail of the amount of support is not quite clear.
- We do not know the impact and if this will represent value for money. We do not know which services will be offered to schools.
- If you are good or outstanding, you get less support. So, you are paying into a pot, for someone else?
- Over the past year our school has received many of the described audits and activities. This was due to the unique set of circumstances that we were in with an acting head in place and a subsequent RI grading in our most recent ofsted inspection. At times it felt too much but also some of the areas identified for development were not able to be funded, despite using LA approved staff to facilitate CPD and support for staff. This was quite frustrating.
- As a Collaborative group of schools, we met with the EEP team, we agreed to continue with the LA support for an academic year whilst monitoring the effectiveness of the support. We are still within this process and have been evaluating alongside our Governing Bodies. We have approached the LA to help fund school improvement across the Collaborative this year and will be discussing the impact vs cost at a later date.
- This is tricky! As a school we have benefitted - without a doubt - and from experience with other LA's/CC's I know that parts of the offer in Leicestershire are second to none! For example, the work of GSD and commissioned support through

the EEP team. However, as CoG I had to really push for a health-check in summer 2023. We were (are again now) an outstanding school and self-evaluated at the time to be 'Good'. We appointed a new HT in the middle of the pandemic who responded well to a health-check in 2021. However, we were desperate, as a Board, to secure reliable, external validation of this work in 2023 but were told that we were not eligible for further commissioned support at that time. Following a 'push' XXXX WAS booked for June 2023. As a Board we ensured her findings were acted upon and Ofsted then validated this work and awarded an Outstanding grade. My worry is that other schools may not/are not in the position to fully appreciate how crucial this work is to rapid school improvement. Furthermore, what we have also secured as a collaborative of schools, is our own investment in regular audit/QA as we feel that we need to supplement the current offer from the LA.

- We can do this as we are financially ok - many schools are not.
- As a special school we seem outside-some of the support offered on occasion. However, on request our EEP has been very responsive.
- Overall good for LA maintained schools. For my individual school, it is an expensive service in terms of amount of consultancy support.
- I agree the support offered is valuable, but I still believe that as a maintained school it should come from the DFE. However, I still stress that the support is very valuable.
- It's value for money will depend on how much of the additional improvement support we access.
- Again, we are struggling to maintain our own services with our current budget never mind losing another £18 per pupil.

**Q7- What, if anything, else should we consider as part of our Additional Improvement Function?**

- Would like post Ofsted support guaranteed and actually provided
- I think the quality of the standing list needs to be reviewed and quality assured as well as the opportunities to work with other providers i.e., EEF etc. There should be opportunities for this as I don't think the standing list is always the highest calibre or the newest thinking
- High quality experts in their field sent out to advise.
- Some answers to Q6 are 'don't know' as they are not relevant at the minute - e.g. Ofsted and new HT) or I don't have enough information e.g. the last question We do need to see change with finance systems which are out of date in the light of payroll changes and SIMS which is also out of date and won't communicate effectively (without duplication of work) with Dataplan and online banking- I don't need anyone to carry out a finance audit if you are just going to tell us there are lots of things we have to change and systems at County hall don't support us and LCC won't help us to correct - we have no money
- Funding group CPD

- As a small school I feel that what I will gain for the money paid is more than reasonable. However, I do feel for very large schools who have to pay a significant amount when based on £18 per pupil. I appreciate that their budget is greater but I wonder if the amount paid by very large schools should be capped.
- Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring, plus an onsite safeguarding visit for all new to headship headteachers from LCC Safeguarding and Compliance: I did not find this useful as a whole as it was a lot of information 'dumping'. Support is just not there. I would like ongoing support.
- Draw up an action plan with schools ahead of commissioning support for the next academic year (Cost out the support the school is entitled to.) Follow-up to the School Reviews by a qualified EEP rather than having annual school reviews. If these cost £500 a time, surely there are quicker and more cost effective ways to check on the recommendations of the initial school review? REVIEW by and INSPECTOR- FOLLOW-UP by an EEP. THEN IF NEEDED ANOTHER REVIEW!
- Fairness for all schools - funded support for all
- It feels like a challenging time, where many schools are part of academies and providing effective support is hampered by changing landscapes. At the moment, we are on a journey where we feel confident with our CPD and school development, whilst it would be nice to have wider external support, we have not felt that the authority has really be able to provide this and have in fact, found more useful advice and challenge within our own headteacher networks. To be able to provide any CPD offers that really meet the needs to a diverse range of schools is also challenging, as we are all on different journeys, so the equity of this offer doesn't always seem quite right. Whilst we have valued the support
- to develop our collaborative partnerships more, I'm not sure being allocated any funding for projects would be any more beneficial that us as a group of headteachers working to share CPD and put together plans to work collegiately to save on costs and where we have aligned school development priorities. As we continue to work more closely as a collaborative group, we feel this will almost run itself (for the time being). Things like audits are valuable, but we could still pay as you go for this, and it would be more cost effective to do so. Finally, with budgets so incredibly stretched, we cannot see how we can continue to afford anything beyond just paying staff at the moment - so we really need to manage every penny.
- Only the course as suggested. There is so much for governors new to education need to understand so anything that helps is appreciated.
- Knowing how much we have contributed and how much we are getting out of it in terms of services and value for money. It would be helpful to request money in such a way that it is beneficial for our school. If school has a successful OFSTED, is the earmarked money for OFSTED inspection support available to be used in an alternative way. More transparency about the service and packages available rather than only finding out from other schools and then having to request it.
- How this is allocated, we have not received everything that is listed. Some things that we have requested have not been allocated (eg SEND review & Safeguarding review).
- The ability for a more bespoke approach and some flexibility in funding - see previous comments.

- Potentially more thought as to the frequency of audit activities and the impact these have on smaller schools - having had an Ofsted, H&S audit, safeguarding audit and health check all within a very short space of time has had a big impact on workload of a very small team. A better degree of communication between the parties who arrange these would ensure that they are spread out to allow time to focus on next steps and to allow enough time to research and embed new strategies fully.
- Compensating schools in some way for peer-to-peer support in Collaborative Groups school improvement (as a well-established Collaborative Group we are being asked by a number of groups to give up our time to support them through establishing their groups)
- This is so important and 'word on the street' is that many schools are considering academisation as they feel that the offer from the LA is 'patchy-at-best'. In my work as an education adviser, this pains me!!!
- More support with GDPR matters Some elements of support are not relevant to special schools and we appear to need to pay towards website checks, HR checks, SCR check through LA commissioned services. There is no discount or subsidy for maintained schools
- Applying pressure to the finance department in LA, because all of this is fairly immaterial if schools have significant deficits. I know of no school without financial problems. Information is supplied late and inaccurate and makes decisions very difficult
- I feel very supported by the LA with the current offer. Currently we feel supported to remain maintained; I don't feel there would be any additional benefit to us as a school to join a MAT.

#### **Q8- Why do you say this?**

- In order to access the programmes of support, these will need to be funded.
- The school has received a high level of support in the past which contributed to the good ofsted
- For our school it provides value for money.
- I would not want to lose the services provided by the LA as a maintained school.
- I feel that there should be a fixed price for the core offer, which is lower, so represents better value for money for those schools not accessing the Additional Improvement function. The Additional Improvement offer should be an additional cost for schools that access this service.
- Because I do not see the value for money. I already pay into a collaborative, so this is on top, of that and only pays for school improvement work, not any wider systems.
- Good value for money
- As previously mentioned, LCC's school improvement offer will likely become untenable due to academisation.
- Depends on the changes as outlined in previous answer.

- The Governors have decided that it is important for me, as a Headteacher of a maintained school to have support
- The cost should more than cover the expense of buying services in separately.
- Yes, but only because we are not additionally funded by the government
- As a 'Collaborative Group' we have all agreed to support this de-delegation of funds.
- I think that funding needs to match school resources especially if schools are in deficit. £4,500 is a lot of money if a school budget is not balanced.
- Although I have selected yes, I feel the £18 is too high. I want to support the LA. Being a maintained school is important to the leadership team and governors at my school. However, we are in a deficit budget this year and likely to be again next year and the payment to the LA is a substantial amount.
- I appreciate the services offered especially the governor help. Headteachers also need somewhere to go for advice as it is a lonely job at times.
- Yes, as long as: all of the services listed are provided, there are staff available to support schools, the service is not reduced once this has been agreed.
- I feel it should be funded by central government. I feel services are targeted towards RI schools, but all schools will benefit regardless of their current OFSTED grading.
- £7470 would be the total for our school. We will have to monitor the support we receive to check that this is value for money. We do want the LA to continue to be available to schools and we realise this can only happen with de-delegation.
- As stated, I will not get much as an outstanding school, so why pay anything? Could be one question.
- If schools need extra support the LA should help them, not penalise others.
- Depending upon the outcome of the effectiveness of support gained from 2023-24 and with increasingly tight budgets to consider this becomes even more paramount.
- I feel that I don't have a choice!! We also top-up with additional funds - as outlined before
- Overall good value for majority of maintained schools
- I don't actually see that we have any choice. We need the LA support as a maintained school and without this per pupil funding, we wouldn't receive the support needed.
- £18 seems a reasonable sum per child, however if it is will be dependent on how successful the proposed functions are and how equitably they are shared amongst schools.
- Collaborative group decided we all would.

#### **Q9- Why do you say this?**

- Explained clearly at the meeting.

- Yes - there is no choice - if we say no DFE will just do this
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) told us at a collaborative meeting
- I had all my questions answered and I was able to explain at the governor meeting what was happening and the reason why. This was important as we had scrutinised the budget and the clarification of the 100% increase was the reason why was explained.
- Because I was told this information at a meeting. So assume this is a fact?!!

**Q10- Do you have any other comments or suggestions?**

- None, thank you!
- Grouping some of the training so it can be delivered to a few of us in one go e.g., Pupil Premium
- Thank you for all the work you do.
- Referring back to the question on funding around Governor Development; we already subscribe to GDS to provide similar support at the moment and would need to understand how these two services would function. Referring back to the question on finance audit support, this is currently provided without cost for maintained schools. If a new HT was in place, then we would probably access the induction service.
- To see the work of the Ed Effectiveness Team and GSD become increasingly aligned is super. As a school we are doing well - this is ultimately because we have great people in leadership roles.
- I have been really impressed with Safeguarding support from XXXX and our EEP XXXX. Both really professional and added value in terms of supporting our ethos of continuous
- improvement through their collaborative, informative and responsive approaches.
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) is being proactive at promoting the benefits of collaborative working and being approachable. This is welcome and appreciated.
- No, thank you



**CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

**REVENUE BUDGET 2024/25**

Budget 23/24	S/D/B *	Employees	Running Expenses	Internal Income	Gross Budget	External Income	Net Total 24/25	Schools	Early Years	High Needs	Dedicated Schools Grant	LA Block	
£		£	£	£	£	£	£						
1,464,222	C&FS Directorate	B	1,346,284	117,939	0	1,464,223	0	1,464,223	18,121	43,628	150,803	212,553	1,251,670
<b>1,464,222</b>	<b>C&amp;FS Directorate</b>		<b>1,346,284</b>	<b>117,939</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,464,223</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,464,223</b>	<b>18,121</b>	<b>43,628</b>	<b>150,803</b>	<b>212,553</b>	<b>1,251,670</b>
2,527,289	C&FS Safeguarding	S	2,715,658	195,844	-384,213	2,527,289	0	2,527,289	0	0	0	0	2,527,289
115,191	LSCB	S	312,689	309,293	-67,451	554,531	-439,340	115,191	0	0	0	0	115,191
<b>2,642,480</b>	<b>Safeguarding, Improvement &amp; QA</b>		<b>3,028,347</b>	<b>505,137</b>	<b>-451,664</b>	<b>3,081,820</b>	<b>-439,340</b>	<b>2,642,480</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,642,480</b>
1,646,527	Asylum Seekers	S	1,491,916	12,472,445	0	13,964,361	-10,067,834	3,896,527	0	0	0	0	3,896,527
3,794,214	C&FS Fostering & Adoption	S	3,410,355	383,859	0	3,794,214	0	3,794,214	0	0	0	0	3,794,214
44,605,703	C&FS Operational Placements	S	0	55,774,684	0	55,774,684	-424,389	55,350,295	0	0	0	0	55,350,295
3,911,261	Children in Care Service	S	3,369,561	770,209	0	4,139,770	-228,509	3,911,261	0	0	0	0	3,911,261
1,720,760	C&FS Adoption	S	1,615,822	126,438	0	1,742,260	-21,500	1,720,760	0	0	0	0	1,720,760
<b>55,678,465</b>	<b>Children in Care</b>		<b>9,887,654</b>	<b>69,527,635</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79,415,289</b>	<b>-10,742,232</b>	<b>68,673,057</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68,673,057</b>
5,867,298	CPS North	S	4,149,351	1,717,947	0	5,867,298	0	5,867,298	0	0	0	0	5,867,298
4,431,429	CPS South	S	4,156,129	275,300	0	4,431,429	0	4,431,429	0	0	0	0	4,431,429
1,391,526	Childrens Management	S	471,675	957,496	-37,645	1,391,526	0	1,391,526	0	0	0	0	1,391,526
3,220,963	C&FS First Response	S	3,210,098	45,865	0	3,255,963	-35,000	3,220,963	0	0	0	0	3,220,963
1,001,839	Child Sexual Exploitation Team	B	825,456	176,383	0	1,001,839	0	1,001,839	0	0	0	0	1,001,839
3,995,663	C&FS Disabled Children	S	986,314	3,009,349	0	3,995,663	0	3,995,663	0	0	0	0	3,995,663
<b>19,908,718</b>	<b>Field Social Work</b>		<b>13,799,023</b>	<b>6,182,340</b>	<b>-37,645</b>	<b>19,943,718</b>	<b>-35,000</b>	<b>19,908,718</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,908,718</b>
551,292	Practice Excellence	B	552,191	45,101	0	597,292	-46,000	551,292	0	0	0	0	551,292
<b>551,292</b>	<b>Practice Excellence</b>		<b>552,191</b>	<b>45,101</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>597,292</b>	<b>-46,000</b>	<b>551,292</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>551,292</b>
290,455	C&FS Community Safety	B	324,639	2,361,686	-1,158,386	1,527,939	-1,240,441	287,498	0	0	0	0	287,498
<b>290,455</b>	<b>Community Safety</b>		<b>324,639</b>	<b>2,361,686</b>	<b>-1,158,386</b>	<b>1,527,939</b>	<b>-1,240,441</b>	<b>287,498</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>287,498</b>
3,914,668	C&FS CFWS East	B	3,593,105	360,271	-109,096	3,844,280	0	3,844,280	0	0	0	0	3,844,280
4,712,703	C&FS CFWS West	B	4,388,825	750,517	-122,463	5,016,879	-309,646	4,707,233	0	0	0	0	4,707,233
3,329,179	C&FS CFWS Youth	B	4,284,263	927,873	-685,349	4,526,787	-1,191,552	3,335,235	0	0	0	0	3,335,235
409,208	C&FS CFWS Central	B	75,000	359,174	0	434,174	-19,766	414,408	0	0	0	0	414,408
-2,342,441	C&FS Troubled Families Pooled Budget	B	25,000	318,126	-932,316	-589,190	-1,688,649	-2,277,839	0	0	0	0	-2,277,839
<b>10,023,317</b>	<b>C&amp;FS Children &amp; Families Wellbeing</b>		<b>12,366,193</b>	<b>2,715,961</b>	<b>-1,849,224</b>	<b>13,232,930</b>	<b>-3,209,613</b>	<b>10,023,317</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,023,317</b>
1,095,127	C&FS Education Sufficiency		1,492,705	28,665	0	1,521,370	-244,075	1,277,295	427,240	0	0	427,240	850,055
<b>1,095,127</b>	<b>Education Sufficiency</b>		<b>1,492,705</b>	<b>28,665</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,521,370</b>	<b>-244,075</b>	<b>1,277,295</b>	<b>427,240</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>427,240</b>	<b>850,055</b>
40,610,279	C&FS 0-5 Learning	S	2,600,731	39,851,102	-35,500	42,416,333	-67,662	42,348,671	0	40,391,097	1,600,815	41,991,912	356,759
546,908	C&FS 5-19 Learning	B	851,815	495,802	-381,966	965,651	-218,930	746,721	363,214	0	0	363,214	383,507
4,052,438	Inclusion	S	1,645,758	3,860,856	-160,959	5,345,655	-491,953	4,853,702	0	0	3,717,334	3,717,334	1,136,368
1,658,395	Oakfield	S	0	1,794,023	0	1,794,023	0	1,794,023	0	0	1,424,995	1,424,995	369,028
0	Music Services	B	1,748,274	361,699	0	2,109,973	-2,109,973	0	0	0	0	0	0
597,627	Education of Children in Care	S	928,854	1,603,811	-546,020	1,986,645	-1,621,229	365,416	0	0	0	0	365,416
<b>47,465,646</b>	<b>Education Quality &amp; inclusion</b>		<b>7,775,432</b>	<b>47,967,293</b>	<b>-1,124,445</b>	<b>54,618,280</b>	<b>-4,509,747</b>	<b>50,108,533</b>	<b>363,214</b>	<b>40,391,097</b>	<b>6,743,144</b>	<b>47,497,454</b>	<b>2,611,079</b>
107,856,867	C&FS SEN	S	1,859,621	116,691,100	-634,741	117,915,980	0	117,915,980	0	0	116,386,046	116,386,046	1,529,934
2,423,669	C&FS Specialist Services to Vulnerable Gro	B	2,633,383	239,539	-268,810	2,604,112	-180,444	2,423,668	0	0	2,423,668	2,423,668	0
1,202,510	C&FS Psychology Service	B	1,606,415	1,267,250	-124,000	2,749,665	-265,000	2,484,665	0	0	0	0	2,484,665
1,246,055	HNB Development Programme	D	247,889	998,083	0	1,245,972	0	1,245,972	0	0	1,245,972	1,245,972	0
-13,332,664	DSG Reserve income	N/A	0	0	-24,367,202	-24,367,202	0	-24,367,202	0	0	-24,367,202	-24,367,202	0
<b>99,396,437</b>	<b>SEND &amp; Children with Disabilities</b>		<b>6,347,308</b>	<b>119,195,972</b>	<b>-25,394,753</b>	<b>100,148,527</b>	<b>-445,444</b>	<b>99,703,083</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95,688,484</b>	<b>95,688,484</b>	<b>4,014,599</b>
6,560,279	C&FS Business Support	B	6,575,568	393,318	-324,807	6,644,079	0	6,644,079	8,570	372,546	206,110	587,225	6,056,854
2,285,220	Central Charges	B	0	2,285,220	0	2,285,220	0	2,285,220	1,434,683	210,848	639,689	2,285,220	0
-482,528	C&FS Finance	B	0	604,781	-2,618,699	-2,013,918	0	-2,013,918	604,781	0	0	604,781	-2,618,699
1,349,900	C&FS Human Resources	S	1,399,900	0	0	1,399,900	-50,000	1,349,900	674,900	0	0	674,900	675,000
827,264	C&FS Commissioning & Planning		887,266	1,554,100	-64,524	2,376,842	-1,549,600	827,242	0	0	0	0	827,242
552,840	C&FS Sub Transformation	S	106,845	1,245,995	0	1,352,840	0	1,352,840	0	0	0	0	1,352,840
<b>11,092,975</b>	<b>Business Support &amp; Commissioning</b>		<b>8,969,579</b>	<b>6,083,414</b>	<b>-3,008,030</b>	<b>12,044,963</b>	<b>-1,599,600</b>	<b>10,445,363</b>	<b>2,722,934</b>	<b>583,394</b>	<b>845,799</b>	<b>4,152,126</b>	<b>6,293,236</b>
-148,028,076	C&FS Dedicated Schools Grant	S	0	12,837,810	-400,555	12,437,255	-162,200,267	-149,763,012	-3,835,279	-41,018,118	-104,909,615	-149,763,012	0
495,365,205	Delegated School Budgets	S	0	507,654,507	0	507,654,507	-12,055,427	495,599,080	494,117,695	0	1,481,385	495,599,080	0
-493,633,856	Delegated Dedicated Schools Grant	S	0	0	0	0	-493,813,926	-493,813,926	-493,813,926	0	0	-493,813,926	0
0	Dedicated Schools Grant Recoupment	S	0	-400,858,477	0	-400,858,477	400,858,477	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>-146,296,727</b>	<b>C&amp;FS Other</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>119,633,840</b>	<b>-400,555</b>	<b>119,233,285</b>	<b>-267,211,143</b>	<b>-147,977,858</b>	<b>-3,531,510</b>	<b>-41,018,118</b>	<b>-103,428,230</b>	<b>-147,977,858</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>103,312,407</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>65,889,354</b>	<b>374,364,983</b>	<b>-33,424,703</b>	<b>406,829,634</b>	<b>-289,722,635</b>	<b>117,107,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117,107,000</b>

\* S/D/B : indicates that the service is Statutory, Discretionary or a combination of both

This page is intentionally left blank



Secondary low prior attainment (year 11)	64.53%	20.77%
--	--------	--------

**Other Factors**

Factor	Lump Sum per Primary School (£)	Lump Sum per Secondary School (£)	Lump Sum per Middle School (£)	Lump Sum per All-through School (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
6) Lump Sum	£134,400.00	£134,400.00			£36,848,000	7.09%	
7) Sparsity factor	£57,100.00	£83,000.00			£1,544,175	0.30%	

Rows 45 to 48 are populated with the NFF methodology, please leave this as is if you wish to follow the NFF. As per the Operational Guidance, the distance thresholds can be increased or the year group size thresholds decreased and the distance threshold taper is optional. An alternative method of allocation to the NFF's average year group size taper can be chosen: the continuous taper (Tapered) or fixed sum (Fixed). Examples of each are provided in the Operational Guidance.

Primary distance threshold (miles)	2.00	Primary pupil number average year group threshold	21.40	Apply primary distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity primary lump sum?	NFF
Secondary distance threshold (miles)	3.00	Secondary pupil number average year group threshold	120.00	Apply secondary distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity secondary lump sum?	NFF
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)	2.00	Middle school pupil number average year group threshold	69.20	Apply middle school distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity middle school lump sum?	NFF
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)	2.00	All-through pupil number average year group threshold	62.50	Apply all-through distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or fixed sparsity all-through lump sum?	NFF

8) Fringe Payments			Fringe multiplier	1.0000	£0	0.00%	
9) Split Sites	Basic eligibility funding	£53,700.00	Distance funding rate	£26,900.00	£195,192	0.04%	
10) Rates					£3,596,869	0.69%	
11) PFI funding					£0	0.00%	

12 ) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of ESFA)

Circumstance	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY23-24	£0	0.00%	0.00% 0.00%
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools	£0	0.00%	
RENT	£84,592	0.02%	
Exceptional Circumstance4	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance5	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance6	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance7	£0	0.00%	

<b>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding minimum per pupil funding level and MFG Funding Total)</b>	£514,683,927	99.02%	
--	--------------	--------	--

13) Additional funding to meet minimum per pupil funding level	£5,078,315	0.98%	
<b>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total)</b>	£519,762,242	100.00%	

14) Minimum Funding Guarantee	0.50%	£476,758	
Where a value less than 0% or greater than 0.5% has been entered please provide the disapplication reference number authorising the value			
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)		Yes	
Capping Factor (%)	1.60%	Scaling Factor (%)	50.00%

Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied				-£1,225,918		
				Total (£)	Proportion of Total funding(%)	Notional SEN (%)
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling) (Please note that the total deduction for capping and scaling is greater than the total MFG)				-£749,160	-0.14%	
<b>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula</b>				<b>£519,013,082</b>		<b>£37,687,229</b>
Notional SEN	Top-up - proportion of NOR	2.86%	SEN support plus EHCP minus Top-up - proportion of NOR	12.48%	Notional SEN funding per eligible pupil	£1,817

TRUE

TRUE

TRUE

High Needs threshold (only fill in if, exceptionally, a high needs threshold different from £6,000 has been approved)				£0.00		
Additional funding from the high needs budget				£0.00		
Growth fund (if applicable)				£2,342,032.05		
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)				£0.00		
Other Adjustment to 23-24 Budget Shares				£0		
<b>Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding)</b>				<b>£521,355,114</b>		
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement				78.00%		
% Pupil Led Funding				90.89%		
Primary: Secondary Ratio				1 :	1.27	

TRUE

FALSE

24-25 NFF NNDR allocation, excluding prior year adjustments				£3,596,869		
<b>Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding) after deduction of 24-25 NFF NNDR allocation</b>				<b>£517,758,245</b>		

This page is intentionally left blank

### **Appendix E - High Needs Commissioned Places**

Special School	Category	Total High Needs Places 24/25	Average top up per place
Forest Way	Academy	263	7,180
Dorothy Goodman	Academy	364	8,500
Ashmount	Maintained School	195	9,482
Birch Wood	Maintained School	185	11,736
Maplewell Hall	Maintained School	246	5,513
Birkett House	Academy	240	9,029
Foxfields	Academy	79	18,342
Fusion	Academy	89	18,342
Forest Way (C&I Unit)	Academy	12	16,800
Dorothy Goodman (C&I Unit)	Academy	25	21,580
Birch Wood (C&I Unit)	Maintained School	41	21,580
Maplewell Hall (C&I Unit)	Maintained School	61	21,580

Special Unit	Category	Total High Needs Places 24/25	Average top up per place
Hugglescote Community Primary School	Maintained School	4	3,103
Newbold Verdon Primary School	Maintained School	23	7,671
Iveshead	Academy	11	19,983
Iveshead (SEMH Unit)	Academy	8	16,800
St Denys Church Of England Infant School	Maintained School	12	5,526
Westfield Infant School	Maintained School	23	4,931
Westfield Junior School	Maintained School	18	3,965
Thorpe Acre Junior School (C&I Unit)	Maintained School	10	16,800
Brookside Primary School	Academy	20	5,574
Sherard Primary School And Community Centre	Academy	30	4,994

**Appendix E - High Needs Commissioned Places**

Asfordby Captains Close Primary School	Academy	10	16,800
Winstanley SHINE Secondary	Academy	15	16,800
Kingsway Primary	Academy	9	16,800
Woodcote Primary School	Academy	8	16,800
Christ Church & St Peters Primary School	Academy	9	16,800
Wigston Academy Trust	Academy	7	19,983
Glenfield Primary School	Academy	15	4,298
Beacon Academy	Academy	37	5,122
Rawlins Academy (MLD)	Academy	71	4,687
The Beauchamp College	Academy	6	3,171 plus HI teachers supplied by STS
The Cedars Academy	Academy	3	3,408
The Cedars (SEMH Unit)	Academy	10	16,800
Wreake Valley (C&I Unit)	Academy	21	16,800
Thomas Estley (C&I Unit)	Academy	7	16,800
Hinckley Parks Primary (SEMH Unit)	Academy	7	16,800
Rawlins Academy (C&I Unit)	Academy	9	21,580
Wigston All Saints (C&I Unit)	Academy	15	17,563
Oasis The Retreat Specialist Pre-School	Pre-School	7	11,623
Wigston Menphys Early Years	Pre-School	21	7,870
Sketchley Menphys Early Years	Pre-School	23	7,870



**Appendix E - High Needs Commissioned Places**

Beacon Early Years	Pre-School	5	10,105
--------------------	------------	---	--------

Further Education Provider / Alternative Provision	Category	Total High Needs Places 24-25	Average top up per place
SMB Group College	Further Education	40	3,471
Loughborough College	Further Education	77	4,413
Oakfield School	Maintained Alternative Provision - Pru	30	10,634

## **Appendix E - High Needs Commissioned Places**

Post 16 in mainstream	Category	Total High Needs Places 24-25	Average top up per place
Ashby School	Academy	3	5,724
The Beauchamp College	Academy	2	5,780
Bosworth Academy	Academy	3	4,931
Brookvale Groby Learning Campus	Academy	4	5,145
The Castle Rock School	Academy	1	3,649
De Lisle College	Academy	5	4,132
The Hinckley School	Academy	2	4,098
Lutterworth College	Academy	2	5,780
The Robert Smyth Academy	Academy	2	5,540
Melton Vale Sixth Form College	Academy	6	4,911
Wigston College	Academy	2	4,247
Countesthorpe Academy	Academy	1	4,023
The Cedars Academy	Academy	1	6,341

Special Independent Schools - Primary Need	Category	Total High Needs Places 24-25	Average cost of day placement
C&I	Independent	202	£71,702
SEMH	Independent	177	£57,881
Dyslexia	Independent	9	£23,347
VI	Independent	2	£58,173
HI	Independent	7	£32,304
Independent Specialist Provision (16+)		242	£24,964

**Appendix E - High Needs Commissioned Places**

Special School top up rates incorporating outreach, fixed allowances, split site and satellites	Band 5	Band 6	Band 7	Band 7A	Band 8	Band 9	Band 10
Forest Way	£2,981	£4,856	£6,731	£8,605	£12,358	£16,108	£19,859
Dorothy Goodman	£3,097	£4,972	£6,847	£8,721	£12,474	£16,224	£19,975
Ashmount	£3,118	£4,993	£6,868	£8,742	£12,495	£16,245	£19,996
Birch Wood	£3,543	£5,418	£7,293	£9,167	£12,920	£16,670	£20,421
Maplewell	£3,126	£5,001	£6,876	£8,750	£12,503	£16,253	£20,004
Birkett House	£3,440	£5,315	£7,190	£9,064	£12,817	£16,567	£20,318

**New Provisions Under Development**

Provision Type	Total High Needs Places Created	Estimated Opening Date	Average top up per place
Robert Smyth C&I Unit	15	Jan-24	16,800

This page is intentionally left blank