



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**Schools' Forum  
Monday 9 December 2019  
4.00 pm – 6.00 pm  
G91 Hove Town Hall**

**Minutes**

**Members present**

School Members

Peter Freeman (Chair)	Primary Governor, Coombe Road Primary School
Tad Matus (TM)	Primary Governor, St Joseph's Catholic Primary School
Oli Sharpe (OS)	Primary Governor, Middle Street Primary School
Damien Jordan (DJ)	Primary Headteacher, Fairlight Primary School
Chris Taylor (CT)	Primary Headteacher, Patcham Infant School
Rachel Kershaw (RK)	Primary Headteacher, St Margaret's CoE Primary School
Mel Fane (MF)	Secondary Governor, Cardinal Newman Catholic School
Ashley Harrold (AH) (Vice Chair)	Secondary Headteacher, Blatchington Mill School
James Kilmartin (JK)	Secondary Headteacher, Cardinal Newman Catholic School
Julie Plumstead (JP)	Nursery Headteacher, Turnerland Nursery

Academies Members

Aaron Barnard (AB)	Aldridge Education Trust
--------------------	--------------------------

**Members apologies**

School Members

Rachel Burstow (RB)	Special Schools Headteacher, Hill Park Special School
Louise Cook (LB)	PRU Headteacher, Central Hub

Non-school Members

Martyn Howe (MH)	16-19 Provision, MET
Paul Shellard (PS)	Teachers' Union, NEU

**Members not present**

School Members

Julie Champion (JC)	Special Schools Governor
---------------------	--------------------------

Non-school Members

Mandy Watson (MW)	Diocese of Chichester (Anglican)
Sarah Clayton (SC)	Diocese of Arundel and Brighton (Catholic)

**LA Attendees**

Jo Lyons (JL)	Assistant Director Families and Schools
Louise Hoten (LH)	Head of Finance, Children's Services
Andy Moore (AM)	Schools Accountant Children's Services
Georgina Clarke-Green (GCG)	Assistant Director Health SEN and Disabilities

Sharon McKenzie (SM)	Acting Traded Services Strategic Manager
Susie Haworth (SH)	Schools Meals Manager
Cllr John Allcock (JA)	Chair of Children, Young People and Skills Committee
Cllr Sarah Nield (SN)	Opposition Spokesperson, Children, Young People and Skills Committee

**Other attendees**

Viv Warren (VW)	Early Years, Tarnerland Nursery
Sarah Booker-Lewis	Local Democracy Reporter
Ruth Ali (RA)	Clerk to the Forum

Item		Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He advised the Forum of the resignation of Roopal Patel (PVI Representative, St Joseph’s Nursery). The new clerk to the forum was introduced. The two councillors were welcomed, as was new attendee Aaron Barnard, Finance Director of the Aldridge Education Trust, attending from now forward in place of Mark Poston.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (7 October 2019) and matters arising</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Accuracy:</b> MF pointed out that she is inaccurately listed as being a Primary School governor representative, whereas she is a Secondary School governor representative (Cardinal Newman Catholic School). Subject to this amendment, the minutes were <b><i>agreed as a true record.</i></b> The chair thanked AH for chairing that meeting in his absence.	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Matters arising</b> 2.3: JL updated the Forum about training and induction for new Forum members. Induction meetings are offered to new members and new Head teacher induction includes finance and the Forum. There is also the opportunity of the pre-meet to answer any questions arising from the pre-circulated papers.	
<b>2.3</b>	The chair advised that an induction pack for new members will also be prepared, consisting of DfE Guidance documents, Forum Terms of Reference, membership list and direction to the Schools’ Forum page on the council’s website.	
<b>2.4</b>	Though not directly arising from the minutes of the last meeting, JL/GCG were asked to update the Forum on the consultation for the High Needs Block (HNB). £2.5m additional HNB funding is expected in April. The LA has looked at the pressures on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) considering both their statutory duty and the information coming in from Headteachers. JL/GCG have now written to all Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Forum Representatives, asking to contribute suggestions and giving opportunity to raise awareness of further pressures additional to those already known. Deadline for comment is 20 December. Feedback will be collated.	
	<b>GCG will present paper to January Forum on proposed budget allocation</b>	

	<b>following outcome of consultation.</b> In addition, feedback will be sought through other means, such as Headteacher Cluster Chairs' meetings, SENCO meetings and all other partnership meetings.	<b>GCG</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of the last Schools Block Working Group (SBWG) meeting (25 November 2019)</b>	
	The minutes of the SBWG, which had been circulated, will be referred to throughout as relevant.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Term Time Only (TTO) verbal update</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	Cllr JA introduced himself and explained his background. As new chair of the Children, Young People and Skills Committee, he emphasised his desire for dialogue with all stakeholders.	
<b>4.2</b>	The council had previously made a proposal to the forum regarding the funding of the TTO back pay which includes 50% being paid from the council's general fund budget and 50% from the Schools' Block but with the option to pay this back over 10 years. He is aware of teachers' and governors' concerns around this proposal and the wish for the council to offer an alternative and more generous approach.	
<b>4.3</b>	Cllr JA has agreed to pause any decision regarding who and how this pay back is funded until later in 2020, being aware of cuts schools have experienced and the impact on education and support schools have been able to provide, in particular the impact that it has had on the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children and families. Pausing the decision will give JA time to set up opportunities for dialogue following which officers can look into all possible alternative options regarding how this might be funded. It will then also be clearer what further additional funding might be available to schools from any new government.	
<b>4.4</b>	Cllr JA has already met with one of the schools' partnerships where this issue was discussed and was able to listen to the points of view put forward by Headteachers. Over the next six months he would like to attend meetings of other partnerships and listen more to all in relation to this matter.	
<b>4.5</b>	Cllr JA referred to the agenda item where it will be discussed whether this year the forum will also support the allocation of a schools contingency budget to sit centrally to support schools when they find themselves in exceptional challenging circumstances. He highlighted the concerns raised by some that this contingency budget may be swallowed up by paying off the deficit if and when a school transfers to Academy status, confirmed that the LA has responsibility for that and that the schools contingency criteria would warrant consideration for it to be used in this way. Cllr JA reassured the Forum that the 2020-21 budget will not be used for that purpose, as many schools would then not be able to access this much needed resource.	
<b>4.6</b>	However, if 19-20 ends with an underspend of the contingency budget, Cllr JA requested that consideration should be given to using some of this to support Moulsecomb Primary School in addressing their financial deficit, regardless of whether they become an academy or not, alongside the needs of other schools that may also meet the criteria.	
<b>4.7</b>	Cllr JA added that the council's budgets are under tremendous pressure, they have	

<p>4.8</p> <p>4.9</p> <p>4.10</p>	<p>had to make year on year savings which have impacted on children and families and the city as a whole. Continual demands on the general fund in this way have a knock on effect on services, many of which support schools and children when further cuts and savings would then need to be made.</p> <p>The chair thanked Cllr JA and invited the Forum to comment on the TTO matter (contingency being an agenda item, no comments were invited here).</p> <p>AB asked for clarification that academies are excluded from the Council decisions on funding this. This is correct, as for them, staffing matters are the responsibility of the Trust. This has been discussed with academy partners. For Voluntary Aided (VA) schools, the LA has been in contact with both Dioceses.</p> <p>In response to the question whether there is a timeframe by which a decision will have to be made, the Forum was advised that this will be in the new financial year, and not at the beginning, as sufficient time must be given for dialogue. <b>The LA will update Headteachers and Chairs of Governors in writing of this discussion and advise them of relevant dates.</b></p> <p>Clarification was sought about the assumption on TTO back payments in the Schools Block figures for 2020/21 to be considered later on the agenda. It was confirmed that there is no impact on the budget figures as any charge will be made on actual.</p>	<p>JA</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>DSG 2020/21</b></p>	
<p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.10</p>	<p>LH summarised the content of the briefing paper and recommendations, this being an update on the paper presented to the Forum in October where further information was requested before making a decision on Contingency, Insurance and Asset Management. This information was provided in papers 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. AM has worked closely with the insurance team, -a summary of which is included.</p> <p><b>Contingency</b></p> <p>Discussions took place as to what sort of things were charged to contingency, and it was further that a detailed retrospective breakdown of the use of contingency, including the names of schools, should be shared at the Forum, and not just at the SBWG. This was agreed, but only after consultation with the Headteachers concerned.</p> <p><b>Approved:</b>  <b>Primary School Members approved de-delegation of £157,000 to Contingency.</b>  <b>Secondary School Members approved de-delegation of £143,000 to Contingency.</b>  <b>This totals £300,000.</b></p> <p>This was on the understanding that contingency for 2020/21 would not be used to finance the deficit left to the LA if Moulsecoomb converts to academy status.</p> <p><b>Insurance</b></p> <p><u>Questions raised were:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the VA (Catholic) schools insured for? - Buildings are covered by Catholic Mutual, but LA insurance covers contents and employees.</li> <li>• Is there any difference about liability? – AM was not aware. Governors have a liability in VA schools - being the employers - that does not exist in community schools. It would be useful to look at the policy schedules</li> </ul>	

<p>5.11</p> <p>5.12</p>	<p>outside of this meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal to decrease the rebate would leave Catholic schools with a funding problem. – The Catholic Dioceses nationally have agreed to go down the route of compulsory insurance with Catholic Mutual, but it would be helpful to pick up this discussion outside of this meeting.</li> <li>• Is £100,000 excess correct? – The council self-insures up to £100,000, reducing the overall insurance cost. This option would not be available to individual schools in separate contracts, as it would mean taking out a policy with a £100,000 excess.</li> <li>• <b>Is the implication that the council would pay for the first £100,000 cost in the case of, for example, a fire? – Yes.</b></li> <li>• <b>Does this also apply to CoE schools? – Yes, it also covers buildings not owned by the LA. - AM to double check above with insurance team.</b></li> <li>• How much more money would the Catholic Secondary School have to pay? – The proposal is to reimburse only the difference of the calculated figure and the de-delegated figure, this being over £9,000. A precise figure can be given at the January Forum meeting.</li> <li>• Where is it agreed that the Catholic insurance rebate is paid through contingency? – There is no other area it can come from, as it is not possible to differentiate in de-delegation between community schools and VA schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approved:</b>  <b>Primary School members approved de-delegation of £283,000 for insurance.</b>  <b>Secondary School members approved de-delegation of £169,000 for insurance.</b></p> <p><b>Asset Management</b>  No further discussion.  <b>Approved:</b>  <b>All members approved de-delegation of £149,000 to Asset Management.</b></p>	<p>AM</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Schools Block 2020/21</b></p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>AM took the Forum through the previously circulated briefing paper, which outlined the national position and consideration and proposals for local arrangements for 20-21 as discussed at the SBWG meeting in November. He highlighted in particular the change in the way deprivation is funded, i.e. that it used to be based on Free School Meals (FSM) only. For 2019/20 75% on FSM, 12.5% on FSM6 and 12.5% on IDACI, for 2020/21 50% FSM and 25% for both FSM6 and IDACI and in 2021/22 these will be split at 1/3 each.</p> <p>Some Forum members expressed concern that the eligibility for FSM6 appears to be decreasing, and that IDACI covers more pupils and is therefore less focussed on deprivation.</p> <p>Primary schools were concerned that they would be “hit twice” with a variation of the formula – once because of reductions in numbers and the second time because of a reduction in the deprivation factor. They felt that secondary schools are in a better position as they have “advance warning”, whereas primary schools are the</p>	

6.4	<p>first entry point. AM explained that minimum per pupil funding will make up for any IDACI changes if these changes bring a school below the minimum per pupil figure of £3,750 (primary) or £5,000 (secondary).</p> <p><b>Noted:</b>  <i>All forum members noted the proposals to the approach of the formula for 20-21 and that all funding models are illustrative as all data will be updated for the October 2019 census.</i></p>	
7.	<b>School Meals update</b>	
7.1	<p>SH summarised her previously circulated briefing paper, which gave an update on school meals and the management of the Universal Infant School Meals (UIFSM) grant and supplementary FSM grant. She also sought agreement from the Forum to retain central management of these grants.</p> <p>7.2 At the last consultation in 2017, all primary schools indicated a preference to remain with central management, as it ensures that all children have equal access to school meals and all schools benefit from economies of scale. All schools receive 20p per meal back at the end of the year. The LA has been notified that the supplementary grant is available for two years, as transition protection during the rollout of Universal Credit.</p> <p>7.3 The LA has received £217,000, £50,000 of which was transferred to secondary schools and the remainder retained centrally. Any funding remaining from these grants is returned to schools.</p> <p>7.5 In response to a question it was confirmed that funding at £2.30 per meal has stayed the same since 2014, and £440 per pupil for FSM.</p> <p>7.6 <b>Agreed:</b>  <i>As there were no further comments or questions, all members agreed that central management of the grants should be retained.</i></p>	
8.	<b>Criteria for Notice of Concern</b>	
8.1	<p>AM explained that the Criteria for Notice of Concern have not been updated since 2009. His previously circulated document 8.1 proposes to add the following two additional criteria to the existing ones:</p> <p><i>d. Setting a balanced budget and overspending above £25k (Nursery, Primary &amp; Special) or £50k (Secondary)</i>  <i>e. An Audit Option of Minimal Assurance in the overall effectiveness of controls</i></p> <p>These have been discussed at the SBWG meeting in November, and the SBWG supports the proposal.</p> <p>8.2 A member asked how closely aligned an audit is with financial advice given from the Schools Finance team. LA members confirmed that they ensure that their guidance is watertight and appropriate advice is given to schools. Audit and advice should therefore always be completely aligned. Schools are advised to inform Schools Finance of any examples where this has not been the case.</p> <p>8.3 <b>Noted:</b>  <i>All members noted the updated Criteria for Notice of Concern.</i>  <b>AM will update the Scheme for Financing Schools accordingly and publish on BEEM.</b></p>	AM

9.	<b>Services to Schools 2020/21</b>	
9.1 9.2 9.3 9.4 9.5 9.6 9.7	<p>In addition to the information prior to the meeting (paper 9), SM gave a verbal update:</p> <p>All charging models are based on cost recovery only with no profit. In 2018/19 there were either no uplifts or a capped uplift of 1%, with services absorbing any further cost increases rather than passing onto schools. In 2019/20, many services have still been able to deliver with no uplift to their charges.</p> <p>In 2020/21 some services are able to continue absorbing any extra costs and not pass on any increases to schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caretaking &amp; Site Management</li> <li>• Equalities &amp; Anti-Bullying</li> <li>• Health &amp; Safety</li> <li>• Local Authority Strategic Property Function ( CERA)</li> <li>• Outdoor Education</li> <li>• PSHE</li> <li>• School data</li> <li>• Safeguarding Training</li> </ul> <p>The following will see between 1% and 3% uplift due to staff costs and other inflationary costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy Support Service (part of BHISS) – teachers’ pay</li> <li>• EMAS – teachers’ pay</li> <li>• Finance</li> <li>• HR</li> <li>• Some ICT services</li> <li>• Legal</li> <li>• Payroll</li> </ul> <p>Energy and Water Management – reduction due to removal of third party Automated Meter Reading charges, plus a reduction in management charges and Service Support Charges.</p> <p>Other services are still calculating their charges and there will be a full update in January so that schools can make informed decisions before they receive their budgets at the end of the month. Discussions with schools throughout the buyback period up to the 1 April will then be held.</p> <p>The Academies Representative asked whether a Service Level Agreement (SLA) could be drawn up for the Connected Hub, as the Aldridge Education Trust has bought into this, and the auditors would like to see a SLA in place, as it concerns provision outside of the Trust. It was requested that this should be done for all schools, with a view to answering to Ofsted requirements around “alternative provision”. <b>JL agreed to ensure this is actioned by Richard Barker (RB) (Head of School Organisation).</b></p>	JL, RB
10.	<b>AOB</b>	
	No other business was discussed. The meeting closed at 5.30pm.	

--	--	--

**Next Meetings (all 4.00pm to 6.00pm and starting with a pre-meet at 3.30pm):**

Wednesday 15 January 2020, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall

Monday 16 March 2020, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall

Monday 15 June 2020, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall

Monday 12 October 2020, Room G91, Hove Town Hall

Monday 7 December 2020, Room G91, Hove Town Hall



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**Schools Forum  
Monday 9 December 2019  
4.00 pm – 6.00 pm  
G91 Hove Town Hall**

**AGENDA**

**Chair: Peter Freeman**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Lead(s)</b>
1.	4.00	5 mins	<b>Welcome and apologies</b> Items for any other business to be stated	Peter Freeman
2.	4.05	10 mins	<b>Minutes of last meeting (7 October 2019) and matters arising</b> (minutes attached)	Peter Freeman
3.	4.15	5 mins	<b>Minutes of the last Schools Block Working Group (SBWG) meeting (25 November 2019)</b>	Ashley Harrold
4.	4.20	15 mins	<b>Term Time Only (TTO) verbal update</b>	Jo Lyons & Cllr John Allcock
5.	4.35	10 mins	<b>DSG 2020/21</b>	Louise Hoten
6.	4.45	20 mins	<b>Schools Block 2020/21</b>	Andy Moore
7.	5.05	20 mins	<b>School Meals update</b> Updates on UIFSM, the Free School Meals supplementary grant and the current contract	Susie Haworth
8.	5.25	10 mins	<b>Criteria for Notice of Concern</b>	Andy Moore
9.	5.35	10 mins	<b>Services to Schools 2020/21</b>	Sharon Mackenzie
10.	5.45	5 mins	<b>AOB</b>	Peter Freeman
			<b>Next Meeting: Wednesday 15 January 2020 4.00 – 6.00 pm Brighton Town Hall</b>	



**Schools Forum**  
**Monday the 7<sup>th</sup> of October 2019**  
**4.00 pm – 6.00 pm**  
**Meeting Room G91 Hove Town Hall**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**Present:**

School Members

Ashley Harrold (AH) (Vice Chair) Headteacher, Blatchington Mill School

Early Years and Primary Schools

Damien Jordan (DJ) Headteacher, Fairlight Primary School  
Oli Sharpe (OS) Parent Rep, Middle Street Primary  
Chris Taylor (CT) Headteacher, Patcham Infant School  
Mel Fane (MF) Our lady of Lourdes Primary School  
Tad Matus (TM) Governor, St Joseph's Primary School  
Viv Warren (VW) Early Years Representative  
Julie Plumstead (JP) Nursery Headteacher Representative  
Rachel Kershaw (RK) Headteacher, Primary

Secondary Schools

James Kilmartin (JK) Headteacher, Cardinal Newman Catholic School

Special Schools

Rachel Burstow (RBu) Headteacher, Hill Park Special School

Academies

Mark Poston (MP) Headteacher, PACA

Non-School Members

Roopal Patel (RP) PVI Early Years Representative  
Sarah Clayton (SC) Headteacher, St Mary's Catholic Primary, Representative of the Roman Catholic Diocese  
Paul Shellard (PS) Teacher Unions Representative

Local Authority

Georgina Clarke Green (GC) Assistant Director, Health SEN & Disabilities  
Jo Lyons (JL) Assistant Director, Education & Skills  
Louise Hoten (LH) Head of Finance, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance  
Steve Williams (SW) Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance  
Nigel Manvell (NM) Deputy Chief Finance Officer  
Alix Macfarlane (AMa) Alix Macfarlane, Communications  
Andrea Weller (AW) Clerk to Forum

**Apologies:**

Peter Freeman (PF) (Chair) Governor, Coombe Rd Primary School  
Richard Barker (RB) Head of School Organisation, Education & Skills  
Andy Moore (AM) Principal Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance

Mandy Watson (MW)  
 Louise Cook (LC)  
 Derek Swindells (DS)  
 Julie Champion  
 Carolyn Bristow (CB)  
 Mo Bham (MB)  
 Kenneth Simpson (KS)

Chichester Anglican Diocese  
 Executive Headteacher - The Central Hub  
 Governor, Dorothy Stringer School  
 Governor, Special Schools  
 Head of SEN Statutory Services  
 Principal Educational Psychologist  
 HR Business Partner

No.	Item	Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies.</b>	
1.1	AH explained to new attendees what the meeting is about and went round the table so that everyone could introduce themselves as new members.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (24 June 2019) and matters arising</b>	
2.1	VW was an attendee at the last meeting so therefore needs to be added to the previous minutes.	<b>AW</b>
2.2	The minutes from the last meeting apart from the above were agreed for accuracy.	
2.3	2.2 JL will need to check regarding introductory session was actioned to see if any dates are carry forward.	<b>JL</b>
2.4	2.4 SLA correspondence is going out later this time.	
2.5	2.5 Energy and Water are now sending direct communications to schools and DJ has received it.	
2.6	4.9 SW said it is hard to get accurate national data about school balances due to the large number of academies. SW advised the Education Policy Institute published a paper in January 2019 that stated across all maintained schools the average revenue balance as a percentage of income was 6.3 per cent, equivalent to a balance of just under £104,000. 5.1 LH said AM has it in hand to amend the Scheme for Financing Schools in relation to the treatment of redundancies.	
2.7	9.8 will be raised later in the meeting.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of the last SBWG meeting (23 September 2019)</b>	
3.1	The minutes were tabled and AH gave a summary.	
3.2	Updated paper for schools with balances, identified 12 schools and themes around those schools.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2019/20</b>	
4.1	<u>Update following July 2019 revision</u>  Been an increase in the early years block, funding for 3 and 4-year olds has	

	increased due to numbers going up. The high needs block decreased as a result of more children being educated outside of city. This is based on the annual adjustment made by the Department for Education for import and export. They have paid £6000 initially for element 2 of high needs funding and they have now taken that money out of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to reflect the increased number of pupils with high needs being educated outside of the city.													
<b>5.</b>	<b>Schools Block 2020/21</b>													
5.1	SW gave outline of paper as initial proposal and interim paper. The Government has not yet published full detail and will need to be revisited at December's Forum. However for 2020/21, there will be an additional £2.6 billion nationally included in Schools Block funding. Minimum per pupil allocations excluding premises will be £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools in 2020/21. <u>The initial proposals for 2020/21 presented are in line with previous discussions with Schools Forum:</u>													
5.2	<u>Lump Sum</u>  The LA considered three options for setting the level of the lump sum in the 2020/21 formula. These were described at the meeting and were set out in the paper.													
5.2.1	After due consideration the LA believes the impact of reducing the lump sum will have a disproportionately detrimental impact on one-form entry primary schools. The economies of scale that exist within these schools are minimal and for this reason the LA is proposing to retain a lump sum of £130,000 in 2020-21.													
5.2.2	This proposal was supported by the Forum.													
5.3	<u>Deprivation</u>													
5.3.1	SW reminded Forum members of the earlier discussions at both Schools Block Working Group and Schools Forum, and the proposal to adopt a gradual approach to the use of the 3 indicators on the basis set out in the table below.  <table border="1" data-bbox="354 1491 1248 1695"> <thead> <tr> <th>Deprivation Indicator</th> <th>2019/20</th> <th>2020/21</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Free school meals eligibility</td> <td>75.0%</td> <td>50.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ever-6 free school meals eligibility</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IDACI</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Deprivation Indicator	2019/20	2020/21	Free school meals eligibility	75.0%	50.0%	Ever-6 free school meals eligibility	12.5%	25.0%	IDACI	12.5%	25.0%	
Deprivation Indicator	2019/20	2020/21												
Free school meals eligibility	75.0%	50.0%												
Ever-6 free school meals eligibility	12.5%	25.0%												
IDACI	12.5%	25.0%												
5.3.2	The LA proposed to implement this arrangement for 2020/21. This will bring Brighton and Hove closer to the approach used by most other LAs and that used in the national funding formula.													
5.3.3	DJ felt that idaci affects different parts of the city and it would be good to look at the model of this and how it affects poorer families. Government are aware of this and they are going to do an impact assessment. None of the individual deprivation measurements are particular precise. OS suggested having a rolling average. SW advised the Department of Education has provided the data set, there is no local flexibility. The LA proposal was supported by the Forum.													

6	Term-Time Only Back Pay Liability	
6.1	<p>NM went through paper and is largely the same as before. KS is around if needed. Went through revised calculations and gave reasons. The ongoing cost is going to be added to the pay bill. Unions have given a good case for the back pay claims. LA felt a need to come to some settlement. The risk of taking to court will mean high costs and potential delays in resolution. LA Have worked with unions and negotiated what is best for the council. The overall back pay liability is estimated at £3.8 million. The LA has identified funding to support 50% of the back pay costs from corporate budgets and this proposal sent to Policy, Resources and Growth Committee. This would mean an equal share of the back pay liability of c. £189,000 per annum to go to schools and general fund if spread over 10 yrs. Group need to discuss more as to how it is done and members are aware of pressures. JL gave them commitment at Policy, Resources and Growth committee (PR and G). Primary had meeting with previous members. Members are clear they want to listen to views. JL said other models of support would be considered and invited suggestions from schools. These, for example, may give a higher weighting of corporate funding to small schools or those with high numbers of SEND pupils.</p>	
6.2	<p>AH said that it has gone down a different route at P, R and G committee. Look here at this group and then go back to PR and G committee.</p>	
6.3	<p>NM only aware of one other authority where they have given the whole amount but they may be financially better off. KS would need to clarify. Other local authorities are looking at it including our neighbours. Unions and headteachers feel that it lies with the local authority and have taken advice from HR advice purchased through the buyback. Huge inclusion issue when it comes to who employs the support staff who work at schools who have special needs children. Schools have had no involvement in the negotiation. Members do understand but they have to balance funds for other areas and is set in the context of an £8m to £10m general fund budget gap. Trying to get a negotiation. Distribution would need to be discussed further. Liability would sit with the end employer. RBU concerned what the figures are and the impact. Special schools have higher costs. Events in November for staff to sign up so the figures will be announced there, is a settlement so not an exact calculation. Legal will work with finance as quickly as they can, legal liability sits with the school and the local authority have taken advice with legal. NM not sure we can do legally regarding top slicing and government capitalisation. SW has written to the Department of Education to clarify and get advice.</p>	
6.4	<p>JK feels that it is an unwelcome additional charge, could there be a payback period longer than 10 years? NM can feed that back, look at other resources and finance could look at individual schools who have a high deficit.. Leavers only have 6 months to come forward, finance will have a definite figure soon. It was advised that NAHT are in talks with Unison and GMB. Staff might not claim as they are worried about schools deficits. NM will make sure employers are kept informed every step of the way. Will be noted in the minutes and if anyone has any further questions to e-mail to JL and she will feedback to members alongside other budget debates. Will not be decided until December or January. Schools invited to propose options of how corporate funding could be assigned and Finance can model those and consider them at the Schools Block Working Group where there could be a detailed discussion. JL will double check if diocese happy or not. JK said would like</p>	

6.5	to be treated the same as other schools, extended for 3 schools until October 9, JL will check back re Diocese and whether individual schools need to respond.  JL to check if there was a letter from Jooles Miller before 7 October.	JL
<b>7.</b>	<b>School Meals update</b>	
7.1	<u>Updates on UIFSM, the Free School Meals supplementary grant and the current contract</u>  Deferred to next meeting.	
<b>8</b>	<b>DSG 2020/21</b>	
8.1	LH advised the local authority receive £177m for DSG, spending review not included	
8.2	GCG and SW had meeting this week regarding high needs block. Will need security that new funding is permanent.	
8.3	LH outlined areas where Forum approval is required for de-delegation and central retention of Central Services Schools Block Funding. DJ said schools ideally need more clarity on funding settlement for 2020/21 before they can agree.	
8.4	It was agreed Forum would consider each area to see which proposals could be agreed and defer any others to the December meeting.	
8.5	Contingency – JL can provide that in RB’s absence. Finance can provide a breakdown summarising use of contingency Decision for de-delegation of contingency was deferred to December Forum. EMAS – de-delegation agreed.	
8.6	FSM eligibility admin – LH looking at which students are eligible for FSM, they go through eligibility checks including national insurance. This has to go through GDPR checks. £25k across the board – all agreed.	
8.7	Insurance – JK will like more clarification – deferred to December	
8.8	Union duties - jury service suspension. For school staff – all agreed.	
8.9	Growth fund this recognises where schools have pre-agreed organisational changes and where there is a time lag between new year groups / additional forms of entry being introduced and these pupils appearing on the census to be counted for funding purposes. – all agreed.	
8.10	Central services block – Funding for central functions Section 6 — Legionella works - agreed.	
8.11	Miscellaneous headteacher’s support – introduction and support for new headteachers and conferences – agreed.	
8.12	School Admissions – OS gave feedback – agreed.	

8.13	Termination of employment costs – historical costs and have been funding though the scheme- reduced figure, LH gave description to JK – all agreed.	
8.14	Schools Forum – agreed.	
8.15	Copyright licence – figure set by Department of Education included but group don't have to agree.	
8.16	Old education services grant areas – statutory duties, Access to Education and asset management – detailed report provided last year, DJ and Emma Lake contributed	
8.17	Statutory duties and access management agreed. Asset management to be deferred. Further information required particularly relating to VA schools	
<b>9.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
9.1	Nothing discussed.	

**Next Meeting: Monday 9 Dec, 4 – 6pm, room G91 Hove Town Hall. Room available from 3:30 for pre meet**

**All meetings start at 4pm:**

**2020 dates tbc:**

**Wed 15 Jan, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall (Monday 13 Jan clashes with CYPS Committee)**

**Mon 16 March, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall**

**Mon 15 June, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall**

**Mon 12 October, HTH tbc (room can only be booked 1 year in advance)**

**Mon 7 December, HTH tbc (room can only be booked 1 year in advance)**

**Schools Block Working Group**  
**Notes of the meeting held on Monday 25 November 14:00 to 16:00**  
**Room 112, Hove Town Hall**

**Present:**

Chair: Ashley Harrold (AH) Blatchington Mill School  
Jimmy Hollingworth (JH) Longhill High School  
Emma Lake (EL) Hangleton and Benfield Federation  
Kate Williams (KW) Longhill High School  
Sarah Wilks (SAW) Hangleton Primary School

Local Authority

Andy Moore (AM) Principal Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance  
Steve Williams (SW) Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance

Apologies

Richard Barker (RB) Head of School Organisation  
Louise Hoten (LH) – Head of Finance (Children and Adults)  
Damien Jordan (DJ) Fairlight Primary School  
Julie Aldous (JA) Middle Street Primary School  
Ken Simpson (KS) HR Business Partner/Schools HR Relationship Manager

No.	Item	Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	<b>AH</b>
	The Chair welcomed the group, apologies listed above.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of previous Meeting 23 September 2019</b>	<b>AH</b>
	All agreed, DJ had requested amendments of the minutes, but they had already been agreed and things have moved on so minutes are staying at they are. However they can be picked up at Schools Forum.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Information/feedback from headteachers</b>	<b>All</b>
	Nothing was discussed.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Term Time Only (TTO) Support Staff</b>	<b>AM</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update</li> <li>• Staff have had letters, events planned for November &amp; December</li> <li>• Payments to be made in December</li> <li>• Costs to be kept centrally and to be spread over the following 10 years</li> </ul> <p>AM reported to the group in KS's absence. AM advised various bulletins gone out around individual staff. KS is in the process of going through settlement, people are coming to sessions, some choosing to sign agreement. Will be received in December's payroll on Monday 23 December. KS has had discussions with AM to make sure it hasn't hit school account. AM will get a list and check that are not any elements where there will be one cost code and will be early January. There will be given a high level figure for the initial payment.</p> <p>SAW and KW asked what happens if there is a challenge, AM said</p>	

	<p>individuals would have to liaise with KS.</p> <p>KS is having conversations where schools have done restructures which have impacted on certain people. KS is picking up individually at each of the twelve sessions. Some are at King's Alfred and Brighton Centre which are running up to 5 December. The national insurance will be different for everyone due to everyone's individual earning levels. Finance have assumed on cost at a particular percentage. Also how universal credits will impact on payments</p> <p>Cllr John Allcock is coming to the Schools Forum on 9 December. AM said we don't have information on what the council's settlement is for 2020/21 and we will have a better position when we know that. There is a separate slot on the Schools Forum agenda for John Allcock and JL. JH said they can feedback regarding anybody who is ground staff. AM will feedback to KS as it has been unclear and it has been hard trying to get staff to be able to attend the sessions. AM said KS has had individual conversations about their settlements.</p>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Items raised at Schools Forum</b>	<b>AM</b>
	<p>Contingency is current £157K primary and £143K secondary. Total £300K. The allocation of funds is shown in the relevant table. One off costs could be related to a teacher's historical pension. One was going over 8 years, the school wouldn't have planned for it, for example, unforeseen costs and it would be unfair for school to pick up things such as water leaks. Individual schools including payroll to come to AM. AM will send to JL to get ideas as she is the budget holder. Rates different from one year to the next. Rates are charged to the school and then the local authority make up the shortfall. AM went into the table more. The group asked how the contingency could be more transparent, AM gave some examples of the use of contingency and went into more detail. The group requested a breakdown of which schools use contingency in a given year, for transparency and to consider if there were endemic funding issues for some schools in the city.</p> <p><b>Action: AH and EL to get a breakdown of contingency before School Forum and individual schools so that each phase could vote if it needs to regarding £300K.</b></p> <p>AH will be requesting three years from 16/17 to make sure we are setting the form correct.</p> <p>Insurance: There is a de-delegation amount within the formula. In 2019/20 £283K primary which came up from the faith schools especially catholic, and £169K for secondary. The way in which it is delegated is done by the total number of pupils and the amount of cash that is needed and different for the two phases. AM has done analysis and it shows how it has been split between phases including faith and catholic and shows how insurance is worked out, employees, premises split in two for mainstream and Voluntary Aided, we own the land but they insure the buildings. Some of the Catholics schools are concerned as they are being paid through the Catholic mutual. AM found secondary schools have been undercharged by £13K and will be sorted out for 2020/21. When Catholic schools went with their Catholic mutual and therefore seven primaries and one secondary were reimbursed-</p> <p>Asset management – DfE split, responsibilities are held for all schools, two bullets points and is a general lease. City Academy Whitehawk and other academies. Responsibility for maintained schools is listed. GC provided</p>	<p><b>AM</b></p>

	<p>some wording which has gone into the main report. AM went through e-mail from GC. £15m has to be delegated to various schools. Money has gone to schools that were going to be allocated to the new secondary school that didn't go through, GC working with the 3 PFI schools that are having an increase in size. The information from GC will go into the report. GC has given more information as to what her team does with that particular funding.</p> <p><b>Item on Staffing Implications</b>  Teachers' pension grant – Based on November payroll and is where schools calculate within the cash they have got and what they have paid in. AM is running a report as to what the pension funds were and what should have been paid in. AM will work with the individual schools to sort out. The window of opportunity will start early December. AM said it has gone out in a government bulletin. If more than half a percentage of their budget then the local authority will pay that and explained how it is calculated and will not take it back if in a positive situation. Majority of schools have got what they have budgeted for or above. KH has sent out e-mail including a spate line based on pupil figures and what is left available for schools to charge. They won't say what the 2020/21 figure is up until January and AM has upped the figure. AM not sure if there is any additional grant for September 2020 and finance will advise schools.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Local Formula Information</b>	<b>SW/AM</b>
	<p>Local Formula Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formula modelling for 2020/21</li> <li>• Options following the October Schools Forum</li> </ul> <p>AM said last there was quite a discussion from 100% free school meals (FSM) to 75%. 12.5% for IDACI and FSM ever 6 and then 50% FSM and then one third, one third, one third. Provisional increase of £5.2m for schools block 20/21 compared to 19/20, similar increase for 21/22 and 22/23.</p> <p>Increase by £5.2m and based on 2019 October's census and pupil numbers. 5% split where primary budget is coming into secondary and there are discussions around primary PANs and how that will be allocated equally for pupil deprivation and low attainment so we are more aligned to other local authorities and is edging towards the national funding formula. £130K lump sum will stay the same. Total number of pupils gone down in secondary due to various reasons, AM has analysed change from October 18 to October 19 and how the schools have budgeted. AM has asked the team to contact individual schools concerned.</p> <p>Minimum per Pupil Funding for 2020/21 at £3,750 for primary (increasing to £4,000 for 2021/22) and £5,000 secondary cash allocation after premises. Figures depend on various factors and table on page 4 which is being introduced. Some schools will gain a lot to get their per pupil figure up Increase will be capped and there is a table which shows how this is going to be split. It is a compulsory factor.</p> <p>The MFG can be between 0.5% and 1.84%, and we propose 0.5% at the Schools Forum. This was discussed and agreed by colleagues</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Update on "Financial Notice of Concern"</b>	<b>AM</b>
	<p>Update on "Financial Notice of Concern"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See document for updates to then go to the December Schools Forum meeting</li> </ul> <p>In September 2009 there are two additional items for PR&amp;G. There is a overspending of licence deficit and not meeting the deadline Audit option of failing to identify SAW said should it be a % of budget rather than an amount. When finance have discussion with their licence deficits. Schools wouldn't</p>	

	want them to overspend too much but can put something in following this. EL enquired what happens when schools underspend. Discussed at Schools Forum and the prices of when a school carries forward 5% primary and 8% secondary and Finance will look at schools budget plan. Some schools feel it is up to the local authority. Schools should be spending it for the pupils. EL said they never do the outturns until September. It should be done at September as payroll are doing their monthly payroll. EL and SAW asked about training and AM said they would have conversations around that with the school, no notices sent out recently but there is appropriate time to look at them.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Update on National Information</b>	<b>AM</b>
	All covered previously.	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Date(s) of next meeting(s)</b>	<b>AH</b>
	Group agreed to have meeting on 13 January from 2pm to 4pm.	

**Brighton & Hove City Council****Meeting: Schools Forum****Date: 9 December 2019****Report of: Head of Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance****Subject: DSG 2020/21****Wards Affected: All****1 Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To update the Schools Forum on the DSG for 2020/21.
- 1.2 To seek approval to de-delegate budgets for Contingency, Insurance and Asset Management.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the estimated DSG of £185.551m for 2020/21
- 2.2 To agree the de-delegation of Contingency and Insurance within Exception 1 for the Primary phase totalling £0.440m as per paragraph 4.
- 2.3 To agree the de-delegation of Contingency and Insurance within Exception 1 for the Secondary phase totalling £0.312m as per paragraph 4.
- 2.4 To agree to the de-delegation of Asset Management within the Central Services Schools Block (CSSB) of £0.149m as per paragraph 5.5.

**3 Background**

- 3.1 Following the recent national spending review announcements and the commitment to increase funding for schools the government has now published more detail regarding the funding arrangements for the 2020-21 financial year. This information shows a 3.9% increase in the unit rates of funding for the Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. This equates to a provisional increase in the Schools Block of c. £5.2m when compared to 2019-20. It is important to note that this is an estimate of the likely increase. In addition the provisional increase for the High Needs Block of c. £2.5m (9.94%). The actual allocation will be based on the October 2019 census data and will not be confirmed until mid/late December 2019.
- 3.2 The DfE introduced national funding formulae for each of the schools, high needs and central school services in 2018-19. These formulae will be used to calculate the blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that are allocated to local authorities and will sit alongside the early year's national funding formula which was introduced in 2017-18.
- 3.3 While it remains the Government's intention that a school's budget should be set on the basis of a single national formula, local authorities will continue to determine

final funding allocations for schools 2020-21. The national funding formula (NFF) will set notional allocations for each school, which will be aggregated and used to calculate the total schools block received by each local authority.

- 3.4 Final local authority level allocations for 2020-2021 for the schools, central school services and high needs blocks have not yet been published. The final Schools Block element of funding is due to be published in December and will reflect pupil numbers and other data recorded in the October 2019 census.
- 3.5 Nationally, the schools and high needs budgets will rise by £2.6 billion in 2020/21 (this includes c. £0.780bn high needs block funding), and, separate to this, the government will provide almost £1.5 billion of funding to compensate schools for the increased cost of employer pensions contributions.
- 3.6 The Schools NFF for 2020-21 will continue to have the same factors as at present, and the government's aim is to implement a formula to address historic underfunding and move to a system where funding is based on need. The key aspects of the background NFF for 2020-21 are:
  - the minimum per pupil funding levels will be set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools
  - the funding floor will be set at 1.84% per pupil
  - an increase of 4% to the NFF's core factors
  - there will be no gains cap in the NFF, unlike the previous two years, so that all schools attract their full core allocations under the formula
- 3.7 As stated, in 2020-21 local authorities will continue to have discretion over their schools funding formulae and, in consultation with schools, will ultimately determine allocations in their area. However, as a first step towards hardening the formula, from 2020-21 the government will make the use of the national minimum per pupil funding levels, at the values in the school NFF, compulsory for local authorities to use in their own funding formulae.
- 3.8 In addition, two important restrictions will continue in 2020/21:
  - Local authorities will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee in local formulae, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. This is a change and will allow LAs to mirror the real terms protection in the NFF, which is the Government's expectation
  - Local authorities can only transfer up to 0.5% of their Schools Block to other blocks of the DSG, with Schools Forum approval. To transfer more than this, or any amount without Schools Forum approval, they will have to make a request to the Department for Education.

#### 4 Exception 1 – Where maintained schools agree that a service should be provided centrally – part of the Schools Block

- 4.1 For 2020/21 the draft figures per phase are shown in the table below. It will be necessary for Forum members to agree to de-delegation on a phase by phase basis (this section only applies to mainstream Primary and Secondary schools and does not apply to Academies and Free Schools);

Service	para	Decision	Primary £k	Secondary £k	Total £k
Mainstream Schools Contingency	4.2	To be agreed	157	143	300
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS)		Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	349	0	349
Free School Meals (FSM) eligibility administration		Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	16	9	25
Insurance	4.3	To be agreed	283	169	452
Staff Costs (Union Duties / Jury service / Suspension)		Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	44	40	84
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>849</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>1,210</b>

- 4.2 The first area to be considered is the **Contingency** fund that enables the Council to support schools whenever unforeseen issues arise. In 2018/19, £299,539 was spent (Primary £104,956 and Secondary £194,583). There are a large number of potential cases where schools may receive an allocation from contingency. These include:

- Exceptional unforeseen costs which it would be unreasonable to expect governing bodies to meet;
- Schools in financial difficulties ;
- Additional costs relating to new, reorganised or closing schools;
- Correction of formula errors / errors in data.

The approach to agreeing to keep a central schools contingency is a positive example of collaborative working amongst the family of schools with heads collectively recognising the fact that different schools find them in exceptional circumstances.

Appendix One outlines how contingency has been utilised in previous years.

In total, it is proposed that £0.300m will once again be held as a contingency in 2020/21, to ensure those schools that need support can receive it.

- 4.3 The second area to be considered is funding for **Insurance**. At present insurance cover for buildings, contents, liability and other miscellaneous insurances are arranged centrally by the Insurance Team. As well as ensuring that cover is adequate and appropriate for the school's needs the Insurance Team provides day to day advice to schools and plays a large part in the administration and negotiation of claims.

The most obvious benefit of maintaining the current arrangement is one of cost effectiveness and value for money. By tendering all of the schools together, with the remainder of the council's insurance requirements, lower premiums and less onerous terms can be achieved. Schools are traditionally viewed by insurers as

high risk but by offering the remainder of the council's property and liability risks at the same time this has the effect of tempering this risk as the insurance market will consider the risk presented to them as a whole.

Schools may face significant increases in premiums for property and liability insurance to reduce the current £100,000 excess on both property and liability claims to avoid having to find a large amount from their budget if a serious claim arises.

The schools also benefit from assistance and advice from the insurance team, who can liaise with insurers and the council's insurance broker, where necessary, and ensure that any advice provided to schools reaches all appropriate staff and is consistent.

The risks in changing the current arrangements include higher premiums and more restrictive terms. Inappropriate covers may be arranged or gaps in cover may exist. Schools would probably need to secure the services of a broker to identify and arrange policies to meet their needs and claims would need to be negotiated direct with insurance companies or loss adjustors.

For Catholic schools, insurance for the building only, is not included as this is paid directly to each school following the diocese request to opt out of this element at a national level.

Appendix Two outlines the split of insurance between mainstream and VA schools.

## 5 Central School Services Block (CSSB)

- 5.1 For Exception 2 and Exception 3 items, the DfE will allow expenditure on these lines up to the total budgeted for in 2013/14, but no new commitments or additional expenditure will be permitted unless DfE approval is granted.
- 5.2 This block will contain the items previously considered under Exception 2, Exception 3, Copyright Licenses and Other Duties. The DfE will be using a national formula to calculate the CSSB, based on 90% pupil numbers and 10% deprivation, and then increased by the Greater Labour Market (GLM) Area Cost Adjustment (ACA), which is 1.00611 for Brighton & Hove.
- 5.3 The amount of funding previously in Exception 3 (Admissions, Termination of employment costs and Schools Forum) will be protected at £648k. However, some of the other allocations will reduce by 2.5% per year for 2020/21 until the national formula for the CSSB is in place.
- 5.4 Further details on the specifics of the operation of the CSSB for 2020/21 will be published in December 2019 with the final DSG information.

Service	Decision	Central Services Schools Block £k	High Needs Block £k	Early Years Block £k	Total 2020/21 £k
Ex 2 – Combined Services – Legionella works	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	26	6	1	33

Ex 2 – Miscellaneous Expenditure – Headteacher Support	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	17	2	1	20
Ex 3 – School Admissions	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	315	5	1	321
Ex 3 – Termination of employment costs	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	223	22	7	252
Ex 3 – Schools Forum	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	32	6	2	40
Ex 4 – Copyright licenses as notified by DfE	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	150	0	0	150
Other Duties – Statutory and regulatory duties	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	219	0	0	219
Other Duties – Access for Education	Agreed at SF 7 October 2019	112	0	0	112
Other Duties – Asset Management	To be agreed	149	0	0	149
<b>Total Central School Services Block</b>		<b>1,243</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,296</b>

### 5.5 Asset Management

- Management of the LA's capital programme including preparation and review of an asset management plan, and negotiation and management of private finance transactions
- General landlord duties for all buildings owned by the local authority, including those leased to academies

The DfE has stated that there is an expectation that Schools Forum will recognise the ongoing costs of local authority central functions and this is why these items have been included within the CSSB.

The funding is to provide the asset management functions associated with running a school estate. It covers matters relating to the responsibility for capital strategy for all maintained schools including academies e.g. basic need funding, ensuring that all schools have appropriate facilities, are safe, weather resistant, have appropriate heating, lighting and ventilation, adequate water supplies and drainage, adequate playing fields and managing the risk from asbestos and general health and safety duties for employees and others who may be affected. In addition to this it covers the general landlord duty for all buildings let to academies and for all community school buildings.

The premises team do not keep timesheets of all their activities, however it is clear that they provide a service to all maintained schools in the city regardless of whether they are community schools, VA schools, Academies or free schools.

There has been a considerable amount of work recently (and still ongoing) on the matter of the allocation of Basic Need funding for all secondary schools in the city. This includes all secondary schools in the city not just the community schools.

The service provided in terms of ad hoc advice and guidance to all schools on matters of safety, appropriate facilities etc. is again provided to all schools regardless of their status. As an example of this, the team provided a considerable amount of input for on VA school recently when their heating system failed and needed immediate attention. This included officer time visiting the school, advice on the cause of the problems, advice on the selection of consultants and

specification for upgrading was provided which allowed the school to change their LCVAP bid to ensure that the heating system was suitable to provide a reliable service in the forthcoming winter period.

They also provide advice and guidance to any school wishing to use their own funding to undertake works at a school such as minor adaptations to room layouts or modest extensions.

Finally they complete the net capacity returns for all schools in the city. This is a statutory return required by the DfE and takes a considerable time each year to complete and includes VA and community schools.

Appendix Three gives the wording in the DfE guidance about Asset Management

## **6. High Needs Block**

- 6.1 As part of the Dedicated Schools Grant settlement for 2020/21 the Government has announced an additional sum of £780m nationally for high needs. The funding floor in the high needs national funding formula for 2020/2021 provides for every local authority (LA) to receive an underlying increase of at least 8% per head of 2 to 18 population.
- 6.2 For Brighton and Hove, it is estimated that this will result in an increase in the High Needs Block (HNB) allocation of c. £2.5m. This means the level of the HNB (prior to deductions for the direct funding of high needs places in FE colleges by the Education Skills and Funding Agency) will increase from £25.418m to £27.946m. This represents a real terms increase of 9.94% compared to 2019/20. At this stage the allocation is provisional and will be updated by DfE in December 2019 when certain elements of the formula will be revised to reflect October 2019 census data.
- 6.3 The HNB includes funding for education provision of high needs pupils and students from birth to 25 and the LA's responsibility for the education provision of young people subject to a learning difficulty assessment now applies up to the age of 25.
- 6.4 The LA is responsible for the allocation of the HNB and the majority of the funding in this block is delegated to / used to support maintained schools or is paid directly to establishments for the provision of education for children with high needs.
- 6.5 There are a number of existing budget areas where additional resources are required to meet increasing demand. These include mainstream schools top-up and capacity and the challenges facing special schools – both, in terms of capacity and the growing complexity of needs of pupils.
- 6.6 The increase in funding also allows the LA to plan new initiatives or extend existing provision, and the LA is considering how best to assign this additional resource to ensure it has the greatest benefit to the most vulnerable children and young people in the city. This will potentially include areas such as hidden children, expansion of resource bases and exclusion prevention.
- 6.7 The LA is keen to seek views from schools to ensure priorities are identified in partnership.

## 7. Overall DSG 2020/21

7.1 This table provides a summary of the provisional 2020/21 DSG allocation and details how the LA is proposing to apply this between the funding blocks.

	<b>Schools Block</b>	<b>Central Services Schools Block</b>	<b>High Needs Block</b>	<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>Total 2020/21</b>
	<b>£k</b>	<b>£k</b>	<b>£k</b>	<b>£k</b>	<b>£k</b>
Exception One	1,210	0	0	0	1,210
Growth Fund	384	0	0	0	384
Central Services Schools Block	0	1,296	0	0	1,296
	<b>1,594</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,890</b>
Funding available in HNB & EYB	0	0	27,850	15,836	43,686
Post de-delegation funding to schools	138,975	0	0	0	138,975
<b>Total Blocks (to be applied)</b>	<b>140,569</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>27,850</b>	<b>15,836</b>	<b>185,551</b>
<b>DfE Blocks (estimated)</b>	<b>139,417</b>	<b>2,448</b>	<b>27,850</b>	<b>15,836</b>	<b>185,551</b>
Difference	1,152	(1,152)	0	0	0
A. Delegation of Equal Pay, BHISS and Broadband	1,152	(1,152)	0	0	0

The schools block will be updated to reflect the October 2019 census information later this year.

At this stage, DfE has not published initial estimates for the 2020/21 schools, high needs and early years blocks, so the information above uses the NFF information provided in October. Further information is expected at the end of the autumn term for 2020/21 final DSG.

The changes that have been made to the presentation of the blocks (shown above) when compared to the DfE allocations are:

A) Delegation of Equal Pay, BHISS and Broadband funding in 2019/20

7.2 The overall summary of the 2020/21 DSG including the estimated adjustment for Academy recoupment is shown in the table below:

	<b>Schools</b>	<b>Central Schools</b>	<b>High Needs</b>	<b>Early Years</b>	<b>Total DSG</b>
<b>Total DSG – as above (£m)</b>	<b>140.569</b>	<b>1.296</b>	<b>27.850</b>	<b>15.836</b>	<b>185.551</b>
<b>Proposed split of 2020/21 DSG (%)</b>	<b>75.76</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>15.01</b>	<b>8.53</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Adjustments:					
Academy Recoupment – BACA (£m)	(4.088)	0.000	0.000	0.000	(4.088)
Academy Recoupment – PACA (£m)	(3.666)	0.000	0.000	0.000	(3.666)
Academy Recoupment – City Academy Whitehawk (£m)	(1.899)	0.000	0.000	0.000	(1.899)
Free School Recoupment – Kings School (£m)	(2.748)	0.000	0.000	0.000	(2.748)
Free School Recoupment – Bilingual Free School (£m)	(1.854)	0.000	0.000	0.000	(1.854)
<b>Total estimated Academy Recoupment (£m)</b>	<b>(14.255)</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>(14.255)</b>
<b>Updated split of 2020/21 DSG – October 19 Forum (£m)</b>	<b>126.314</b>	<b>1.296</b>	<b>27.850</b>	<b>15.836</b>	<b>171.296</b>
<b>Updated split of 2020/21 DSG (%)</b>	<b>73.74</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>16.26</b>	<b>9.24</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Academies and free schools for 2020/21 – recoupment academies are BACA, PACA, Kings School, Bilingual Free School & City Academy Whitehawk (CAW).

## DSG 2020/21 – Appendix One – Schools Contingency 2017/18 & 2018/19

The criteria for allocation of schools contingency are;

- Exceptional unforeseen costs which it would be unreasonable to expect governing bodies to meet,
- Schools in financial difficulties,
- Additional costs relating to new, reorganised or closing schools,
- Correction of formula errors / errors in data.

In 2017/18 a total of £300,000 was provided for contingency. A total of £294,738.46 was spent with the remainder being part of the Schools Block carry forward into 2018/19. In total £194,622.46 was spent in primary schools and £100,116.00 spent in secondary schools representing a 66% and 34% split respectively. Of the total amount committed 29% related to one-off costs, 7% on costs such as rate rises and the remainder on schools with financial difficulties.

In 2018/19 a total of £300,000 was provided for contingency. A total of £299,538.91 was spent. In total £104,956.32 was spent in Primary schools and £194,582.59 spent in secondary schools, representing 35% and 65% split respectively. Of the total amount committed 38% related to one off costs, 55% on costs for rate rises and the remainder on schools with financial difficulties.

		<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Primary budget £157k per year</b>	<b>One off costs</b>	£97,891.46	£30,284.32	£128,175.78
	<b>Financial difficulty</b>	£92,300.00	£0.00	£92,300.00
	<b>Rates</b>	£4,431.00	£74,672.00	£79,103.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£194,622.46</b>	<b>£104,956.32</b>	<b>£299,578.78</b>
<b>Secondary budget £143k per year</b>	<b>One off costs</b>	£10,680.00	£103,469.59	£114,149.59
	<b>Financial difficulty</b>	£92,000.00	£0.00	£92,000.00
	<b>Rates</b>	-£2,564.00	£91,113.00	£88,549.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£100,116.00</b>	<b>£194,582.59</b>	<b>£294,698.59</b>
<b>OVERALL</b>		<b>£294,738.46</b>	<b>£299,538.91</b>	<b>£594,277.37</b>
<b>Number of schools</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17 individual</b>
<b>Schools can receive more than 1 allocation a year e.g. rates and another element, and this has occurred in both years</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5 individual</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22 individual</b>
	<b>Total schools Prim 50</b>	<b>12/50 = 24%</b>	<b>15/50 = 30%</b>	<b>17/50 = 34%</b>
	<b>Total schools Sec 7</b>	<b>3/7 = 43%</b>	<b>4/7 = 57%</b>	<b>5/7 = 71%</b>
	<b>Total number 57</b>	<b>15/57 = 26%</b>	<b>19/57 = 33%</b>	<b>22/57 = 38%</b>

## Appendix Two - Insurance

At the October schools forum questions were asked about the insurance for schools, as this is one area that schools chose to have de-delegated.

The questions were around the split between the mainstream schools and the Catholic & C of E schools, as both own their own buildings and thus we presumably insure for a reduced cost. Also the Catholic schools arrange their own buildings insurance through their own diocese, so how is this reflected in the costs of insurance

There are several things that have been found from the analysis;

- Secondary schools have been not been charged the correct amount for insurance, this has been undercharged by approximately £13k
- Catholic schools have had an element of insurance given back to them over the past few years since they opted to insure with Catholic Mutual; this insurance rebate has been at £19,970 (Primary £9,290 and Secondary £10,680). However as you can see from the table below this is too much of a reimbursement for the Catholic schools.
- We therefore propose only to reimburse the difference between the de-delegation figure and the actual insurance cost £4,522 (Primary £2,889 and Secondary £1,633) from 2020/21 onwards.

<b>Insurance</b>	<b>Mainstream Schools</b>	<b>C of E Schools</b>	<b>Catholic Schools</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Responsibilities held for all schools</b>	41	8	8	57
	72%	14%	14%	100%
<b>De-delegation – Primary £283,000</b>	221,645	36,435	24,921	283,000
	78.3%	12.9%	8.8%	100%
<b>Insurance calculation of £283,000</b>	226,722	34,246	22,032	283,000
	80.1%	12.1%	7.8%	100%
<b>Difference</b>	-5,076	2,189	2,889	
<b>De-delegation – Secondary £169,000</b>	137,172	0	31,828	169,000
	78.3%	0%	8.8%	100%
<b>Insurance calculation of £169,000</b>	138,805	0	30,195	169,000
	80.1%	0%	7.8%	100%
<b>Difference</b>	-1,633	0	1,633	

# **Appendix Three – DfE guidance on Asset Management**

## **Annex 2 – Central services that may be funded with agreement of schools forums**

The split of services between responsibilities local authorities hold for all schools, and those that relate to maintained schools only are shown below.

Responsibilities held by local authorities for all schools are funded from the central school services block, with the agreement of schools forums.

Responsibilities held by local authorities for maintained schools only are funded from maintained schools budgets only, with agreement of the maintained schools members of schools forums.

We have included references to the relevant schedules in the 2018 (No. 2) Regulations, these refer to last year's and we will be updating these when the new regulations are laid.

### **Responsibilities held for all schools**

- Management of the LA's capital programme including preparation and review of an asset management plan, and negotiation and management of private finance transactions (Sch 2, 14a)
- General landlord duties for all buildings owned by the local authority, including those leased to academies (Sch 2, 14b)

### **Responsibilities held for maintained schools only**

- General landlord duties for all maintained schools (Sch 2, 77a & b (section 542(2)) Education Act 1996; School Premises Regulations 2012) to ensure that school buildings have: o appropriate facilities for pupils and staff (including medical and accommodation)
  - o the ability to sustain appropriate loads
  - o reasonable weather resistance
  - o safe escape routes
  - o appropriate acoustic levels
  - o lighting, heating and ventilation which meets the required standards
  - o adequate water supplies and drainage
  - o playing fields of the appropriate standards
- General health and safety duty as an employer for employees and others who may be affected (Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974)
- Management of the risk from asbestos in community school buildings (Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012)

**Brighton & Hove City Council****Meeting: Schools Forum****Date: 9 December 2019****Report of: Head of Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance****Subject: Schools Block Funding Formula 2020-21 – Proposals****Wards Affected: All****1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To update the Schools Forum on the proposed changes to the local formula for the allocation of the Schools Block in 2020-21.
- 1.2 Following the recent national spending review announcements and the commitment to increase funding for schools the government has now published more detail regarding the funding arrangements for the 2020-21 financial year. This information shows a 3.9% increase in the unit rates of funding for the Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. This equates to a provisional increase in the Schools Block of c. £5.2m when compared to 2019-20. It is important to note that this is an estimate of the likely increase. The actual allocation will be based on the October 2019 census data and will not be confirmed until mid/late December 2019.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the proposals to the approach to the application of the formula for 2020-21. This was considered by the Schools Block Working Group at a meeting in November 2019. In summary, this will:
  - increase the unit values of core formula factors by 3.9%
  - include a mandatory factor to ensure that minimum funding per pupil levels (excluding premises factors) are set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools
  - increase the basic entitlement (age weighted pupil unit) factor by the balance of funding available after applying increases to other factors
  - retain a lump sum of £130,000 per school as previously agreed by Schools Forum
  - incrementally extend the use of the ever-6 free school meals and the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) factors as previously agreed by Schools Forum
  - apply a minimum funding guarantee of +0.50% per pupil

These proposals are detailed in section 4 of this report.

- 2.2 To note all funding models are illustrative. All data will be updated to reflect the October 2019 census and school budgets will be recalculated using this data and the updated Schools Block allocation due to be announced in December 2019.

### 3. Background and Information – national position

- 3.1 The DfE introduced national funding formulae for each of the schools, high needs and central school services in 2018-19. These formulae will be used to calculate the blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that are allocated to local authorities and will sit alongside the early years national funding formula which was introduced in 2017-2018.
- 3.2 While it remains the Government's intention that a school's budget should be set on the basis of a single national formula, local authorities will continue to determine final funding allocations for schools 2020-21. The national funding formula (NFF) will set notional allocations for each school, which will be aggregated and used to calculate the total schools block received by each local authority.
- 3.3 Final local authority level allocations for 2020-2021 for the schools, central school services and high needs blocks have not yet been published. The final Schools Block element of funding is due to be published in December and will reflect pupil numbers and other data recorded in the October 2019 census.
- 3.4 Nationally, the schools and high needs budgets will rise by £2.6 billion in 2020/21, and, separate to this, the government will provide almost £1.5 billion of funding to compensate schools for the increased cost of employer pensions contributions.
- 3.5 The Schools NFF for 2020-21 will continue to have the same factors as at present, and the government's aim is to implement a formula to address historic underfunding and move to a system where funding is based on need. The key aspects of the background NFF for 2020-21 are:
- the minimum per pupil funding levels will be set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools
  - the funding floor will be set at 1.84% per pupil
  - an increase of 4% to the NFF's core factors
  - there will be no gains cap in the NFF, unlike the previous two years, so that all schools attract their full core allocations under the formula
- 3.6 As stated, in 2020-21 local authorities will continue to have discretion over their schools funding formulae and, in consultation with schools, will ultimately determine allocations in their area. However, as a first step towards hardening the formula, from 2020-21 the government will make the use of the national minimum per pupil funding levels, at the values in the school NFF, compulsory for local authorities to use in their own funding formulae.
- 3.7 In addition, two important restrictions will continue in 2020/21:
- Local authorities will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee in local formulae, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. This is a change and will allow LAs to mirror the real terms protection in the NFF, which is the Government's expectation
  - Local authorities can only transfer up to 0.5% of their Schools Block to other blocks of the DSG, with Schools Forum approval. To transfer more than this, or any amount without Schools Forum approval, they will have to make a request to the Department for Education.

#### 4. Considerations and Proposals for 2020-21 Schools Block – local arrangements

4.1 The introduction of the NFF represents a significant change. To provide stability for LAs and schools through the transition, the DfE has decided that LAs will continue to set a local schools formula to determine individual school budgets for 2020-21.

4.2 In 2019-20 LAs across the country have continued moving local formulae towards the schools NFF. For 2019-20, this also applied to Brighton and Hove and, most notably, changes were made to the lump sum and deprivation.

4.3 For 2020-21 the LA is proposing to accommodate the increased national funding within the local formula on the following basis:

- increase the unit values of core formula factors by 3.9% with an additional increase being applied to the low attainment factor
- include a mandatory factor to ensure that minimum funding per pupil levels (excluding premises factors) are set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools
- increase the basic entitlement (age weighted pupil unit) factor by the balance of funding available after applying increases to other factors
- retain a lump sum of £130,000 per school as previously agreed by Forum
- incrementally extend the use of the ever-6 free school meals and the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) factors as previously agreed by Forum
- apply a minimum funding guarantee of +0.50% per pupil

4.4 As the lump sum allocation will remain unchanged (in line with previous agreement of Schools Forum) the increase not being assigned to this area will instead be allocated through the low attainment factor. The LA has chosen to channel this additional funding through low attainment as Brighton and Hove currently distributes a lower proportion of funding through this factor when viewed against other comparators, including the NFF. The table below summarises the position for the 2019-20 financial year:

Comparator	Proportion of overall funding allocated through low attainment 2019-20
Brighton and Hove	6.17%
All LAs average	6.66%
Statistical neighbours average	7.32%
Proposed NFF	7.40%

The impact of allocating additional funding through low attainment means that this will align Brighton and Hove more closely to other comparators.

4.5 The introduction of the new mandatory factor to ensure that minimum funding per pupil (MFPP) levels (excluding premises factors) are set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools has a significant impact on the distribution of funding to schools. Based on the existing formula model for 2020-21 the likely implications of this are shown in the table below:

School Type	Number of schools attracting funding through MFPP factor	Potential Funding to be allocated through MFPP factor
Primary	11	£0.649m
Secondary	1	£0.071m
Total	12	£0.720m

The introduction of this factor means that the schools who have historically received the lowest levels of funding on a per-pupil basis will receive an additional allocation within their budget share to boost their funding levels to the minimum thresholds. This will particularly apply to schools that receive relatively low amounts of funding through the deprivation and low attainment formula factors. These schools are likely to receive higher per pupil increases than most other schools in 2020-21.

- 4.6 Due to the implementation and the cost of the new MFPP formula factor described in paragraph 4.5 the increase to be assigned to the basic entitlement factor is likely to be less than 3.9%. In the current funding model, based on overall affordability, it is estimated that the unit rates of the basic entitlement factor will increase by approximately 3.2% compared to 2019-20.
- 4.7 In summary, based on the current modelling of school budgets for 2020-21 the estimated increases to budget allocations through formula factors are summarised in the table below:

Formula Factor	Estimated change in funding to schools in 2020-21
Basic Entitlement	£3.282m
Deprivation	£0.495m
English as an Additional Language	£0.048m
Low Attainment	£0.639m
Minimum Funding per pupil	£0.720m
Total Estimated Increase	£5.182m

- 4.8 LAs will continue to set a minimum funding guarantee in local formulae, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.50% and +1.84% per pupil. This is a change and will allow LAs to mirror the real terms protection in the NFF, which is the Government's expectation. For 2020-21, Brighton and Hove is proposing to apply the MFG at a rate of +0.50%. The rationale for adopting this approach is twofold:
- an MFG of +0.50% continues to offer a degree of protection to schools that are not otherwise gaining funding on a per pupil basis. However the LA also believes that schools, who are gaining through characteristics identified in the formula, should receive a fair proportion of their gains – a higher level of MFG will mean that the scaling back of formula gains would increase
  - an MFG protection of greater than +0.50% would effectively 'lock in' more historical funding

- 4.9 The application of the formula on the basis outlined in this report means that the primary / secondary funding ratio is now 1:1.29. This is a very small change from the 2019/20 ratio of 1:1.30, and has moved due to the additional funding allocated to primary schools to achieve the requirements of the minimum funding per pupil thresholds.
- 4.10 The impact of the application of the formula model as outlined in this report is shown in appendix 1.
- 4.11 All information shown in the funding models are based on data from the October 2018 census and will be updated when the October 2019 census information is available. This will may have a significant impact on individual school allocations particularly where there are changes in pupil numbers between the 2 years.
- 4.11 The LA believes that the proposals set out in this paper to determine the 2020-21 funding formula represent a gradual and measured step in the transition towards the NFF.
- 4.12 It should be noted that the following areas fall outside of the Schools Block budget allocation and will be separately allocated to schools in 2020-21:
- Pupil premium
  - Teachers' pay grant
  - Teachers' pension grant

Indicative Budget Model 2020-21

School	Formula Budget 2019/20	Option 1 - MFG set at + 0.50%					Option 2 - MFG set at + 1.00%					Option 3 - MFG set at + 1.50%				
		Potential Formula Budget 2020/21	Funding through MFPP Factor	MFG included in Budget	Budget Change vs 2019/20	%age Change	Potential Formula Budget 2020/21	Funding through MFPP Factor	MFG included in Budget	Budget Change vs 2019/20	%age Change	Potential Formula Budget 2020/21	Funding through MFPP Factor	MFG included in Budget	Budget Change vs 2019/20	%age Change
Carden Nursery and Primary School	£1,492,499	£1,526,566	£0	£0	£34,068	2.3%	£1,526,455	£0	£0	£33,957	2.3%	£1,526,344	£0	£0	£33,846	2.3%
Moulsecomb Primary School	£1,334,955	£1,340,860	£0	£46,278	£5,905	0.4%	£1,346,766	£0	£52,184	£11,811	0.9%	£1,352,671	£0	£58,089	£17,716	1.3%
Coombe Road Primary School	£892,695	£926,825	£0	£0	£34,130	3.8%	£926,714	£0	£0	£34,019	3.8%	£926,603	£0	£0	£33,908	3.8%
Downs Junior School	£1,838,287	£1,920,494	£0	£0	£82,207	4.5%	£1,920,226	£0	£0	£81,939	4.5%	£1,919,958	£0	£0	£81,671	4.4%
Downs Infant School	£1,294,743	£1,349,215	£6,077	£0	£54,472	4.2%	£1,349,215	£6,077	£0	£54,472	4.2%	£1,349,215	£6,077	£0	£54,472	4.2%
Hertford Infant and Nursery School	£623,612	£643,467	£0	£0	£19,855	3.2%	£643,402	£0	£0	£19,790	3.2%	£643,338	£0	£0	£19,726	3.2%
Middle Street Primary School	£884,890	£900,385	£0	£0	£15,496	1.8%	£900,335	£0	£0	£15,445	1.7%	£900,284	£0	£0	£15,395	1.7%
Patcham Junior School	£1,355,645	£1,395,655	£0	£0	£40,011	3.0%	£1,395,525	£0	£0	£39,880	2.9%	£1,395,395	£0	£0	£39,750	2.9%
Patcham Infant School	£948,419	£964,826	£0	£0	£16,407	1.7%	£964,772	£0	£0	£16,354	1.7%	£964,719	£0	£0	£16,300	1.7%
St Luke's Primary School	£2,213,654	£2,356,084	£53,078	£0	£142,430	6.4%	£2,356,084	£53,078	£0	£142,430	6.4%	£2,356,084	£53,078	£0	£142,430	6.4%
Stanford Junior School	£1,259,375	£1,297,506	£0	£0	£38,131	3.0%	£1,297,382	£0	£0	£38,007	3.0%	£1,297,257	£0	£0	£37,883	3.0%
Stanford Infant School	£978,753	£991,355	£8,947	£0	£12,602	1.3%	£991,355	£8,947	£0	£12,602	1.3%	£991,355	£8,947	£0	£12,602	1.3%
Westdene Primary School	£2,230,355	£2,399,951	£98,152	£0	£169,596	7.6%	£2,399,951	£98,152	£0	£169,596	7.6%	£2,399,951	£98,152	£0	£169,596	7.6%
Carlton Hill Primary School	£985,390	£1,000,893	£0	£0	£15,502	1.6%	£1,000,842	£0	£0	£15,452	1.6%	£1,000,792	£0	£0	£15,401	1.6%
Balfour Primary School	£2,679,307	£3,030,951	£268,028	£0	£351,644	13.1%	£3,030,951	£268,028	£0	£351,644	13.1%	£3,030,951	£268,028	£0	£351,644	13.1%
Hertford Junior School	£880,926	£912,449	£0	£0	£31,523	3.6%	£912,346	£0	£0	£31,420	3.6%	£912,244	£0	£0	£31,318	3.6%
Coldean Primary School	£1,523,401	£1,594,446	£0	£0	£71,045	4.7%	£1,594,215	£0	£0	£70,814	4.6%	£1,593,983	£0	£0	£70,582	4.6%
Goldstone Primary School	£2,468,711	£2,571,274	£0	£0	£102,563	4.2%	£2,570,940	£0	£0	£102,229	4.1%	£2,570,606	£0	£0	£101,895	4.1%
Hangleton Primary School	£2,219,243	£2,321,417	£0	£0	£102,173	4.6%	£2,321,084	£0	£0	£101,840	4.6%	£2,320,751	£0	£0	£101,507	4.6%
Hove Junior School	£3,104,442	£3,254,392	£39,591	£0	£149,951	4.8%	£3,254,392	£39,591	£0	£149,951	4.8%	£3,254,392	£39,591	£0	£149,951	4.8%
St Peter's Community Primary School	£885,970	£910,137	£0	£0	£24,167	2.7%	£910,058	£0	£0	£24,088	2.7%	£909,980	£0	£0	£24,009	2.7%
Benfield Primary School	£1,145,699	£1,162,274	£0	£0	£16,575	1.4%	£1,162,220	£0	£0	£16,521	1.4%	£1,162,166	£0	£0	£16,467	1.4%
Brackenbury Primary School	£807,216	£836,534	£0	£0	£29,317	3.6%	£836,438	£0	£0	£29,222	3.6%	£836,343	£0	£0	£29,126	3.6%
West Blatchington Primary and Nursery School	£1,097,683	£1,102,430	£0	£1,566	£4,747	0.4%	£1,107,176	£0	£6,313	£9,493	0.9%	£1,111,923	£0	£11,059	£14,240	1.3%
West Hove Infant School	£2,288,755	£2,395,441	£38,295	£0	£106,685	4.7%	£2,395,441	£38,295	£0	£106,685	4.7%	£2,395,441	£38,295	£0	£106,685	4.7%
Mile Oak Primary School	£2,090,357	£2,176,408	£0	£0	£86,051	4.1%	£2,176,128	£0	£0	£85,771	4.1%	£2,175,848	£0	£0	£85,491	4.1%
Peter Gladwin Primary School	£785,680	£813,486	£0	£0	£27,806	3.5%	£813,395	£0	£0	£27,715	3.5%	£813,305	£0	£0	£27,625	3.5%
Brunswick Primary School	£3,199,581	£3,321,873	£8,886	£0	£122,292	3.8%	£3,321,873	£8,886	£0	£122,292	3.8%	£3,321,873	£8,886	£0	£122,292	3.8%
Elm Grove Primary School	£1,582,972	£1,644,296	£0	£0	£61,324	3.9%	£1,644,096	£0	£0	£61,124	3.9%	£1,643,896	£0	£0	£60,925	3.8%
Queen's Park Primary School	£1,759,568	£1,824,136	£0	£0	£64,568	3.7%	£1,823,925	£0	£0	£64,357	3.7%	£1,823,715	£0	£0	£64,147	3.6%
Saltdean Primary School	£2,043,115	£2,183,915	£76,794	£0	£140,800	6.9%	£2,183,915	£76,794	£0	£140,800	6.9%	£2,183,915	£76,794	£0	£140,800	6.9%
Woodingdean Primary School	£1,559,344	£1,622,882	£0	£0	£63,538	4.1%	£1,622,675	£0	£0	£63,331	4.1%	£1,622,468	£0	£0	£63,124	4.0%
Bevendean Primary School	£1,502,800	£1,567,845	£0	£0	£65,045	4.3%	£1,567,633	£0	£0	£64,833	4.3%	£1,567,422	£0	£0	£64,622	4.3%
Rudyard Kipling Primary School & Nursery	£1,487,414	£1,546,475	£0	£0	£59,060	4.0%	£1,546,282	£0	£0	£58,868	4.0%	£1,546,090	£0	£0	£58,676	3.9%
Fairlight Primary School	£1,680,231	£1,726,373	£0	£0	£46,143	2.7%	£1,726,223	£0	£0	£45,992	2.7%	£1,726,073	£0	£0	£45,842	2.7%
St Margaret's CofE Primary School, Rottingdean	£735,984	£753,854	£0	£0	£17,869	2.4%	£753,796	£0	£0	£17,811	2.4%	£753,737	£0	£0	£17,753	2.4%
St Bartholomew's CofE Primary School	£758,722	£776,661	£0	£0	£17,939	2.4%	£776,603	£0	£0	£17,880	2.4%	£776,544	£0	£0	£17,822	2.3%
St Martin's CofE Primary School	£939,729	£975,554	£0	£0	£35,825	3.8%	£975,438	£0	£0	£35,709	3.8%	£975,321	£0	£0	£35,592	3.8%
St John the Baptist Catholic Primary School	£879,370	£933,891	£0	£0	£54,521	6.2%	£933,713	£0	£0	£54,343	6.2%	£933,536	£0	£0	£54,166	6.2%
St Mary Magdalen Catholic Primary School	£843,711	£873,625	£0	£0	£29,915	3.5%	£873,528	£0	£0	£29,817	3.5%	£873,430	£0	£0	£29,720	3.5%
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	£677,032	£687,732	£0	£0	£10,701	1.6%	£687,698	£0	£0	£10,666	1.6%	£687,663	£0	£0	£10,631	1.6%
St Paul's CofE Primary School and Nursery	£820,193	£852,631	£0	£0	£32,438	4.0%	£852,525	£0	£0	£32,333	3.9%	£852,420	£0	£0	£32,227	3.9%
Our Lady of Lourdes RC School	£778,688	£803,056	£0	£0	£24,368	3.1%	£802,976	£0	£0	£24,289	3.1%	£802,897	£0	£0	£24,209	3.1%
St Mark's CofE Primary School	£862,029	£879,122	£0	£0	£17,094	2.0%	£879,067	£0	£0	£17,038	2.0%	£879,011	£0	£0	£16,982	2.0%
St Bernadette's Catholic Primary School	£811,077	£834,976	£0	£0	£23,899	2.9%	£834,898	£0	£0	£23,821	2.9%	£834,820	£0	£0	£23,743	2.9%
Aldrington CofE Primary School	£1,454,877	£1,502,673	£0	£0	£47,796	3.3%	£1,502,673	£0	£0	£47,796	3.3%	£1,502,673	£0	£0	£47,796	3.3%
St Andrew's CofE (Aided) Primary School	£2,102,133	£2,185,314	£10,263	£0	£83,181	4.0%	£2,185,314	£10,263	£0	£83,181	4.0%	£2,185,314	£10,263	£0	£83,181	4.0%
St Nicolas' CofE Primary School	£1,468,502	£1,538,958	£0	£0	£70,456	4.8%	£1,538,729	£0	£0	£70,226	4.8%	£1,538,499	£0	£0	£69,997	4.8%
Cottesmore St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£1,545,048	£1,605,964	£0	£0	£60,915	3.9%	£1,605,765	£0	£0	£60,717	3.9%	£1,605,567	£0	£0	£60,518	3.9%
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£890,789	£919,884	£0	£0	£29,095	3.3%	£919,789	£0	£0	£29,000	3.3%	£919,694	£0	£0	£28,905	3.2%
Varndean School	£6,932,024	£7,153,442	£0	£0	£221,418	3.2%	£7,152,721	£0	£0	£220,697	3.2%	£7,152,000	£0	£0	£219,976	3.2%
Dorothy Stringer School	£8,407,673	£8,683,318	£0	£0	£275,645	3.3%	£8,682,420	£0	£0	£274,747	3.3%	£8,681,522	£0	£0	£273,849	3.3%
Longhill High School	£5,062,665	£5,217,006	£0	£0	£154,341	3.0%	£5,216,503	£0	£0	£153,838	3.0%	£5,216,000	£0	£0	£153,336	3.0%
Blatchington Mill School and Sixth Form College	£7,484,149	£7,726,980	£0	£0	£242,830	3.2%	£7,726,189	£0	£0	£242,039	3.2%	£7,725,398	£0	£0	£241,248	3.2%
Hove Park School and Sixth Form Centre	£7,444,893	£7,684,612	£0	£0	£239,719	3.2%	£7,683,831	£0	£0	£238,938	3.2%	£7,683,050	£0	£0	£238,157	3.2%
Patcham High School	£5,348,801	£5,527,856	£0	£0	£179,055	3.3%	£5,527,273	£0	£0	£178,471	3.3%	£5,526,690	£0	£0	£177,888	3.3%
Cardinal Newman Catholic School	£8,669,636	£9,069,168	£70,557	£0	£399,532	4.6%	£9,069,168	£70,557	£0	£399,532	4.6%	£9,069,168	£70,557	£0	£399,532	4.6%
Bilingual Primary School - Brighton & Hove	£1,731,760	£1,854,011	£40,711	£0	£122,251	7.1%	£1,854,011	£40,711	£0	£122,251	7.1%	£1,854,011	£40,711	£0	£122,251	7.1%
City Academy Whitehawk	£1,826,134	£1,898,762	£0	£0	£72,628	4.0%	£1,898,525	£0	£0	£72,391	4.0%	£1,898,289	£0	£0	£72,155	4.0%
Portslade Aldridge Community Academy	£3,536,777	£3,666,443	£0	£0	£129,666	3.7%	£3,666,021	£0	£0	£129,244	3.7%	£3,665,598	£0	£0	£128,821	3.6%
King's School	£2,662,782	£2,748,323	£0	£0	£85,541	3.2%	£2,748,044	£0	£0	£85,262	3.2%	£2,747,765	£0	£0	£84,984	3.2%
Brighton Aldridge Community Academy	£3,990,135	£4,087,668	£0	£0	£97,534	2.4%	£4,087,351	£0	£0	£97,216	2.4%	£4,087,033	£0	£0	£96,898	2.4%
<b>Primary</b>	<b>£74,251,465</b>	<b>£77,410,183</b>	<b>£648,823</b>	<b>£47,844</b>	<b>£3,158,718</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>£77,415,479</b>	<b>£648,823</b>	<b>£58,497</b>	<b>£3,164,014</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>£77,420,775</b>	<b>£648,823</b>	<b>£69,149</b>	<b>£3,169,309</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	<b>£59,539,534</b>	<b>£61,564,816</b>	<b>£70,557</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2,025,282</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>£61,559,521</b>	<b>£70,557</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2,019,986</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>£61,554,225</b>	<b>£70,557</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2,014,690</b>	<b>3.4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£133,791,000</b>	<b>£138,975,000</b>	<b>£719,381</b>	<b>£47,844</b>	<b>£5,184,000</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>£138,975,000</b>	<b>£719,381</b>	<b>£58,497</b>	<b>£5,184,000</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>£138,975,000</b>	<b>£719,381</b>	<b>£69,149</b>	<b>£5,184,000</b>	<b>3.9%</b>

Brighton & Hove City Council

**Meeting:** Schools Forum

**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> December 2019

**Report of:** Susie Haworth, School Meals

**Subject:** School Meals Contract – Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) grant and supplementary Free School Meal grant (FSM)

**Wards Affected:** All

### **1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To provide an update on school meals and the management of the UIFSM grant and supplementary FSM grant and to request permission to continue with the central financial management of these grants

### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 To agree that the UIFSM grant funding is retained centrally as part of the contract management service provided to schools participating in the school meals contract
- 2.2 To agree that the supplementary FSM grant funding is retained centrally as part of the contract management service provided to schools participating in the school meals contract

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The responsibility for the provision of school meals for all schools was transferred from the Local Authority to schools a number of years ago. Many secondary schools took advantage of the delegation of funds from 2006 onwards and procuring and managing services directly. Primary & Special schools opted to remain in a corporate arrangement.
- 3.2 Funding associated with school meals was delegated to schools and is now returned for central management via the traded service/services to schools charge for the school meals contract. This charge covers the provision of free school meals for eligible pupils, a contribution to the team costs for contract management and repair/replacement of equipment and maintenance of premises/high level cleaning to ensure compliance with the Food Safety & Hygiene regulations.
- 3.3 Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) funding introduced in 2014/15
- 3.4 Supplementary Free School Meals grant. Due to the roll-out of Universal Credit, and the introduction of an income-based threshold this change to the benefit system and free school meal eligibility, the number of pupils eligible for free school meals will increase. Part of this increase will be because of the transitional protections put in place, which mean that pupils who were eligible for free school meals on 1 April 2018, and those who become eligible during the Universal Credit rollout period, will retain eligibility until the end of this rollout

period. For those still in education at this point, protections will continue until the end of their current phase of education; this covers until at least summer 2023.

3.5 This means that schools should not remove free school meals eligibility for pupils over this period; unless the pupil's parent requests that they do so. The school funding system already reflects the number of meals that schools need to provide. The DfE recognised that for some schools this increase in free school meal numbers may be difficult to manage in the short term, because school funding operates on a lagged basis. That means that changes in the characteristics of pupils in a school take time to have an impact on the funding the school receives. This grant will provide schools with extra funding to help them meet the higher costs of providing extra meals before the lagged funding system catches up. The grant is confirmed for 18/19 and 19/20

3.6 Grant conditions for both UIFSM and FSM are managed and met

#### **4. Universal Infant Free School Meals**

4.1 The provision of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM), for all Key Stage 1 pupils became a requirement from 2014. Government funding at £2.30 per meal is provided to schools based on their average take up of meals as recorded in the October and January census

4.2 In 2014 Schools Forum agreed that the UIFSM grant funding would be retained by the LA to enable central management in line with other contract income/costs/charges.

4.3 Schools were consulted in 2017, as part of the contract procurement process, as to whether they wished to change the financial set up of the contract, that is did they want to individually manage meal income/cost of meal provision or to continue with a centrally managed option, all schools indicated a preference for central management

4.4 Other local authorities give this funding directly to schools as they have different agreements in place for individual payment for meals provided by each school.

4.5 Some schools in other LA's, particularly small schools, report that the funding is insufficient to cover the cost of provision

4.6 The central management of the contract ensure that all schools benefit from the economies of scale of the group contract. Schools currently receive a return of 20p per UIFSM served during the year, provided that the total UIFSM grant received meets or exceeds the costs of meals provided

4.7 The contractor is paid for the meals served and not the number of pupils eligible to receive a UIFSM

4.8 At the end of the 19/20 financial year there will be an estimated balance of £700,000 accrued since 2014. The conditions of the grant allow a balance to be carried forward

4.9 The balance has been retained centrally to ensure that any shortfall in funding or increase in costs can be smoothed minimising any potential impact on school budgets. For example possible increase food cost post Brexit, a fall in the number of KS1 pupils

4.10 A decrease in the take up of meals increases the proportion of the selling price that is required to cover central costs, for example online cash collection and dinner money management systems. Therefore the current charge to schools of £2.10 per UIFSM may change in the future

## **5. Free School Meals Supplementary Grant**

5.1 In July 2018 the government announced an additional payment for schools called the Supplementary grant (FSM) to cover the time lag between increased costs associated with increased FSM eligibility being funded correctly

5.2 The FSM supplementary grant will be provided for a period of 2 years 18/19 and 19/20, the funding for 18/19 was £217,360 with £49,720 transferred to secondary schools, the balance of £167,640 was retained centrally

5.3 This grant will be used to cover the costs associated with an increased number of FSM eligible pupils (due to transitional protection of eligibility)

5.4 As with the UIFSM grant any monies remaining unspent will be returned to schools

5.5 From 20/21 it is expected that future provision will through core funding for schools, at which point charges for free school meals will be made through the traded services recharge

## **6. Current contract considerations**

6.1 The number of pupils choosing to have a school meal has fallen over the last year; this will reduce the contribution available to cover contract costs and will subsequently reduce any potential return to schools. A significant fall in meal take up would likely result in increased services to schools charges

6.2 Post Brexit there may be an unplanned increase in costs, food & fuel which will need to be met

6.3 The government has given no indication that the funding for UIFSM meals will increase from the £2.30 (set in 2014) or how much longer this policy will continue

## Brighton & Hove City Council

**Meeting:** Schools Forum

**Date:** 9 December 2019

**Report of:** Head of Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance

**Subject:** Notice of Concern in relation to Finance

**Wards Affected:** All

### 1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 To update the Schools Forum on the criteria for a Notice of Concern in relation to Finance.

### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To note and the proposed changes to the criteria for a Notice of Concern in relation to Finance.

### 3. Information / Background

- 3.1 In 2009 we put forward a Notice of Concern in relation to Finance. The attached appendix gives the specifics of what the criteria will be and the implications for schools in relation to that.
- 3.2 The appendix details the criteria that would be applied and therefore if a school did meet the criteria then a Notice of Concern would be applied from 2020/21, with the requirements applied to the relevant school.
- 3.3 This has been taken and discussed at the last Schools Block Working Group in November, who supported the updates and way forward.

## **Criteria for issuing a Notice of Concern in relation to finance**

A paper was taken to the schools forum on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2009, regarding the criteria to be used to issue a Notice of Concern in relation to finance. The four original criteria are highlighted on page 2 of this document, (a, b, c and f), along with two additional criteria, (d and e).

Within the Scheme for Financing Schools section 2.16 covers "Notice of Concern". The wording for this is:

### **2.16 Notice of Concern**

*The authority may issue a Notice of Concern to the governing body of any school it maintains where, in the opinion of the Chief Finance Officer and the Chief Education Officer/Director of Children's Services, the school has failed to comply with any provisions of the scheme, or where actions need to be taken to safeguard the financial position of the local authority or the school.*

*Such a notice will set out the reasons and evidence for it being made and may place on the governing body restrictions, limitations or prohibitions in relation to the management of funds delegated to it. These may include:*

- *insisting that relevant staff undertake appropriate training to address any identified weaknesses in the financial management of the school;*
- *insisting that an appropriately trained/qualified person chairs the finance committee of the governing body;*
- *placing more stringent restrictions or conditions on the day to day financial management of a school than the scheme requires for all schools – such as the provision of monthly accounts to the local authority;*
- *insisting on regular financial monitoring meetings at the school attended by local authority officers;*
- *requiring a governing body to buy into a local authority's financial management systems; and*
- *Imposing restrictions or limitations on the manner in which a school manages extended school activity funded from within its delegated budget share – for example by requiring a school to submit income projections and/or financial monitoring reports on such activities.*
- *Seeking assurance about the implementation of audit actions.*

*The notice will clearly state what these requirements are and the way in which and the time by which such requirements must be complied with in order for the notice to be withdrawn. It will also state the actions that the authority may take where the governing body does not comply with the notice.*

## **Criteria for issuing a Notice of Concern in relation to finance**

In order to have some objective criteria the following would be used to calculate if a Notice of Concern (about finance) should be issued to a school. The schools forum was notified that the following criteria would be used;

- a) Overspending above an approved Licensed Deficit agreement. This will be for any overspend greater than £5k (Nursery, Primary & Special) or £10k (Secondary) or a maximum of 5% of the Licensed Deficit amount, whichever is the greater.**
- b) Not meeting the timescales set out in their Licensed Deficit agreement i.e. not returning to a balanced budget within the time period agreed (unless otherwise agreed by the LA).**
- c) Setting a balanced budget and then overspending that for 2 consecutive years. This will be for any overspend greater than £5k (Nursery, Primary & Special) or £10k (Secondary).**
- d) Setting a balanced budget and overspending above £25k (Nursery, Primary & Special) or £50k (Secondary).**
- e) An Audit Opinion of Minimal Assurance in the overall effectiveness of controls.**
- f) Failing to submit the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) Return on time, or where there are more than 2 unmet criteria.**

As these are quite discreet criteria any one of these could trigger a school receiving a Notice of Concern letter, detailing why they had received the letter, i.e. they had met one of the above criteria, and that the following conditions would apply;

### **Initial**

- Provision of monthly VAT claims within the required timescales – by the 15th of the month following the month of the claim – April's claim to be received by the 15<sup>th</sup> of May.
- Provision of monthly reconciliations of SIMS FMS to the council's ledger – by the end of the month following the month of the claim – April's reconciliation to be received by the end of May
- Provision of monthly budget monitoring forecasts – by the end of the month following the month of the claim – Augusts' forecast to be received by the end of September
- Attendance on finance training by the head and finance officer of the school, which is provided free by the schools finance team
- Provision of a multi year budget, using the team's spreadsheet, within the required timescales

A school would not get a repeat notice if the above are met.

Should a school trigger more than one criterion (over the 6 listed) then the following additional would apply;

## **Criteria for issuing a Notice of Concern in relation to finance**

### **Additional**

- All of the **initial** criteria above
- The management of the finance officer to be reviewed by the headteacher, schools finance and governors.
- The chair of finance should be suitably qualified or have attended recent finance training
- The chair of governors should be suitably qualified or have attended recent finance training

Should a school get a second Notice of Concern letter, following either failure to meet any of the above conditions, or by hitting a trigger in the following financial year, then the following would apply;

### **Second/Additional**

- All of the **initial** criteria above
- The management of the finance officer to be reviewed by the headteacher, schools finance and governors
- The chair of finance should be suitably qualified or have attended recent finance training
- The chair of governors should be suitably qualified or have attended recent finance training

A school would not get a repeat notice if the above are met.

Should a school get a third Notice of Concern letter following (or have both criteria in year 1) either, failure to meet any of the above conditions, or by hitting a trigger in the following financial year, then the following would apply;

### **Final**

- Withdrawal of a school's delegated financial powers – meaning that schools finance would take control of the budget and be a signatory on the bank account and approve all expenditure
- Appropriate measures discussed with the governors, about the headteacher and finance officer

The Authority can move immediately to the Final position if it considers that a serious breach of any of the criteria has happened, or by concerns raised by Ofsted or as a result of an audit of the school. Although rare, there may be exceptional circumstances where financial powers would immediately be removed, for example if there was a major fraud.

The school's delegated financial powers would be returned once the Local Authority was satisfied that the school had appropriate plans and measures in place to meet its liabilities.

## **Brighton & Hove City Council**

**Meeting: Schools' Forum**

**Date: Monday 9 December 2019**

**Report of: Schools' Traded Services Manager**

**Subject: Services to Schools 2020/21**

### **1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1. To advise the Schools' Forum about the council's traded services to schools provision for 2020/21, including an outline of the proposed charging approach and details of any new services and provision.
- 1.2. To outline key developments, activities and feedback from the past year in relation to traded services.

### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1. To note and comment on the proposed approach for the council's services to schools provision for 2020/21.

### **3. Background and information**

- 3.1. In recent years the council has sought to minimise the price uplift, provide more clarity in relation to the pricing mechanism used to calculate charges and provide more clarity on the benefits of each service.
- 3.2. The development of Orbis affects a number of council services that trade with schools. Greater integration between council teams has continued during 2019/20 and will continue in 2020/21. At this time, it is not envisaged that there will be a fundamental change to services traded with schools by functions included within the Orbis partnership.
- 3.3. In the last couple of years the intention has been for services to absorb higher service costs without passing these on as price rises to schools. However, it has previously been acknowledged that price rises have been required when external charges such as teacher pay, licence costs and fuel costs have risen.
- 3.4. Two new SLAs were introduced in 2019/20:
  - 3.4.1. The Safeguarding Training (Single Agency) Service achieved full buyback from schools, enabling headteachers and designated safeguarding leads to attend the relevant courses when required, for one single charge per year.

3.4.2. Brighton & Hove Inclusion Support Service (BHISS) started trading in September 2019 and achieved 98% buyback from primary and secondary schools. For 2020/21 the schools will be purchasing a full year and communications are currently being sent out to headteachers, SENCOs and business managers with details of individual charges, taking into account their requirements.

#### **4. Proposal for charges for Services to Schools 2020/21**

4.1. We are currently reviewing the staffing, service provision and contributory budgetary factors for each individual service to limit the inflationary costs that may need to be passed on to schools.

4.2. An up to date position will be reported verbally at the meeting and the full agreed charges will be outlined in an update at Schools' Forum on Wednesday 15 January 2020.

#### **5. New services and developments**

5.1. Following feedback from schools during 2019/20, the Education, Standards and Achievement Service is proposing to split its support into two Service Level Agreements in 2020/21, as it is recognised that schools want more flexibility into what they buy and do not buy. Schools will now be able to choose the level of support according to their exact requirements, based on a daily charge. Furthermore, the statutory offer from the LA has been clarified with consistency in offer between secondary and primary. Overall the LA has increased its statutory offer.

The SLA provision will be split into two areas:

5.1.1. The Headteacher Appraisal External Adviser Service will enable governing bodies to receive the appropriate external advice to fulfil their statutory duty in carrying out the headteacher's annual appraisal (one day of support)

5.1.2. The School Partnership Adviser (SPA) Service will provide schools with bespoke school improvement support from SPAs (schools can choose between one and three days per year)

5.2. Following feedback from headteachers at Schools' Forum, the SLAs for 2020/21 will outline in more detail the statutory and core elements for each service. These aspects of the services are provided at no cost to schools.

5.3. The BEEM portal for schools, which hosts the SLAs and enables business managers to purchase the services, is being further developed for 2020/21. The 'Services' area <http://www.beem.org.uk/Services> will act as a 'one stop shop' that lists all traded and non-traded local authority services that are available to schools.