

**Schools Forum**  
**Wednesday 17 June 2020**  
**4.00 pm – 5.30 pm**  
**(held remotely)**

**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
Linda Newman (LN)	Secondary Governor, Longhill High School
James Kilmartin (JK)	Secondary Headteacher, Cardinal Newman Catholic School
Rachel Burstow (RBu)	Special Schools Headteacher, Hill Park Special School
Louise Cook (LB)	PRU Headteacher, Central Hub
Julie Plumstead (JP)	Nursery Headteacher, Tarnerland Nursery

Academies Members

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

Non-school Members

Martyn Howe (MH)	16-19 Provision, MET (till 4.30pm)
Paul Shellard (PS)	Teachers' Union, NEU
Mandy Watson (MW)	Diocese of Chichester (Anglican)

**Members apologies**

School Members

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

Non-school Members

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
Georgina Clarke-Green (GCG)	Assistant Director Health SEN and Disabilities
Steve Williams (SW)	Schools' Accountant, Children's Services
Richard Barker (RBa)	Head of School Organisation

**LA Attendees apologies**

Andy Moore (AM)	Schools Principal Accountant Children's Services
-----------------	--

**Other attendees**

Viv Warren (VW)	Observer - Early Years, Tarnerland Nursery
Ruth Ali (RA)	Clerk to the Forum

Item		Actions
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and requested two items for discussion under Any Other Business, ie updates on TTO payments and on funding for extra costs to schools related to Covid, such as childcare and cleaning.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (15 January 2020) and matters arising</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Accuracy:</b> The minutes were <i>agreed as a true record</i> .	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Matters arising:</b> 2.4 Backpay for Term Time only support staff: JL reminded members that Cllr John Allcock (JA) and Nigel Manvell (NM) attended previous meetings to give updates on the council offer. At that time, Headteachers and forum were concerned, and JA agreed to engage in conversations with partnerships before making a final decision. This was not possible, due to Covid. JA will now have further discussions with Headteachers, and a decision will be made in the autumn. Members were advised that it is not expected that schools will be required to make any payments before the next financial year. Some school members queried that they had been advised to budget for payments for this year. <b>However schools will now be told that they have increased flexibility in this year's budget assuming charges are deferred to 2021/22.</b>	SW
<b>2.3</b>	2.3: Minutes of the Schools Block Working Group (SBWG) meeting on 13 January had been circulated.	
<b>2.4</b>	2.5: The Scheme for Financing Schools has been updated. <b>However, a further update is now required, which should be completed by the next meeting.</b>	SW
<b>2.5</b>	2.6: <b>The work on Service Level Agreements (SLAs) for the Connected Hub has not yet been completed.</b> It was clarified that this is especially relevant for academies members, as the Connected Hub is an external provision for Trusts, for which an SLA is required.	RBa
<b>2.6</b>	3.8: Schools have been briefed at phase meetings on FCL budget savings.	
<b>2.7</b>	3.10: The issue around TTO national insurance contributions has been rectified.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Minutes of the last SBWG meeting (9 March 2020)</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	The main items of discussion at that meeting are covered in this agenda, ie unspent contingency, long term sick and maternity scheme, and schools' budgets.	
<b>3.2</b>	The meeting scheduled for 8 June did not take place due to the workload of schools in connection with Covid.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Outturn report 2019/20</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>School and DSG outturn report 2019/20</u></li> </ul> SW presented his report, updating the forum on the outturn position for the DSG. Schools balances are now a surplus £4.347m and the central DSG balance is a surplus of £0.703m. The report provided a more detailed analysis, in particular the recovery of the position of secondary schools. The number of schools finishing the financial year with an overspend has reduced; indications are that nine schools require a licensed deficit, which is in line with last year.	
<b>4.2</b>	Some schools have potential surplus balances; the number of these has reduced from 12	

	<p>to seven schools. Conversations are being held with those schools, <b>the outcome of which will be reported back at the next meeting.</b></p> <p>Central DSG underspend mainly relates to Early Years Block, and this will be subject to claw back from DfE to reflect the January 2020 Early Years census.</p> <p><u>4.1 School balances 2019/20 summary</u></p>	SW
4.3	<p>Members noted that a high number of schools had a reduction in their carry forward. SW clarified that a high number of schools with a reduction in carry forward were primary, and that some secondary schools had an increase. Their starting points were very different in that primary schools previously had a net underspend of £3,684,000, whereas secondary schools were in a net overspend position. This has now changed. If the use of significant amounts of carry forward continues, it must be evaluated whether this position is sustainable over a longer period.</p>	
4.4	<p>It was questioned whether the table listing the accumulated deficits and surpluses shows that one form entry schools are in a significantly worse position than other schools. It was confirmed that the breakdown seems to suggest that one form entry and smaller two form entry schools are in a worse position. The LA has recognised this by retaining a larger lump sum allocation in the local formula, and for the new financial year additional consideration has been given to the disproportionate impact of SEND for one form entry schools. This has resulted in additional allocations to these schools from the high needs block.</p>	
4.5	<p>It was requested that this should be discussed again at a future meeting, as it also has implication for future Published Admission Number (PAN) levels, a change in which would create more one and two form entry schools. The consultation on PAN changes cannot start until October, giving time for forum to discuss proposals.</p>	
4.6	<p>DJ suggested that the predicted reduction in pupil numbers in two form entry schools explains why some of them carry forward more while they can, deferring any cuts. Any discussion in relation to potential future numbers should therefore not be limited to one form and future one form entry schools, but all points should be considered.</p>	
4.7	<p>OS suggested that access to schools is not just an economic choice, but should also take account of the local community's view of what smaller schools can offer.</p>	
4.8	<p>JL explained that the cross party school organisation working group (CPSOWG), when discussing PANs, will take this point into account and look at what is needed locally; however finances also need to be considered. This will be done as a city wide approach.</p> <p><b>A report of the CPSOWG will be provided to the next meeting.</b></p>	
4.9	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b><i>Forum Members noted the level of school balances of £4.347m, representing a 2.9% (£4.225m) increase since the end of 2018/19, and the carry forward of £0.703m on Central DSG, representing a decrease of 0.101m since the end of 2018/19.</i></b></p>	RBa
5.	<p><b>High Needs Block 2020/21</b></p>	
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Report including additional funding for 2020/21 (supporting documents 5.1 Consultation Summary and 5.2 Breakdown of allocation of HNB)</u></li> </ul> <p>GCG took members through her report, highlighting that the majority of the funds allocated to the HNB goes straight to providers – special and mainstream schools and other educational providers</p>	
5.2	<p>The latest allocation to Brighton and Hove saw a £2.6m increase compared to 2019/20 and is a recognition of the increasing costs of supporting children and young people with</p>	

<p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.7</p>	<p>SEND. This increase will enable the LA to manage pressures in this area, having consulted with schools on a number of proposals.</p> <p>DJ asked whether the LA is able to confirm what additional capacity has been created with funds that have gone into specialist provision, as some schools continue to carry pupils with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) naming a special school, with no place available to them. Further questions were raised by other members how many additional places have been created.</p> <p>GCG explained that around 12 places have been created across all four provisions, and outlined how funds were allocated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carden currently has 22 places, and there has been no increase as it had so far been underfunded and has now been re-aligned</li> <li>- Hove Park, the number of places and the unit cost has increased because of a model that had to be agreed prior to GCG starting in her role</li> <li>- Bevendean Hearing Support Facility required extra staffing for high needs children who needed extra care.</li> <li>- Funds have been allocated for the creation of another centre for 20 places.</li> </ul> <p>DJ reiterated that the key question for Headteachers was that schools hold a large number of children with named specialist places, and they were hoping that funding would enable further additional places to be created. GCG clarified that the question was due to a misunderstanding of a figure in her report, which outlined a subtotal, and not an increase. The unit costs assigned to the resource bases vary and are linked to the levels of need. She recognised that there is an increase in the number of pupils requiring support, with a gap especially in Autism Spectrum Condition (ASC) and other learning difficulties. Funding has been set aside and capacity will be added. However, there will be other pockets of provision needed, and she would not wish to continue with ad hoc placements. Different levels of funding have been allocated through historical decisions, meaning that the HNB needs to be reviewed, which would be a mutual decision.</p> <p>RBU noted that the breakdown does not mention the outreach service done by special schools and asked whether the LA wants to commission support to children in mainstream schools. This is included in the special schools related budget and will therefore continue. <b>A separate breakdown was requested. This will be brought to a future meeting.</b></p> <p>PF noted that £680,000 has been allocated to areas where DSG is used to part fund the cost of LA functions and asked what proportion is funded by the LA for these services and what from DSG. He was advised that the vast majority is funded by the corporate general fund. Members asked whether this is on the basis of historical levels of funding or whether a decision is taken every year. It was confirmed that it is historical, set around 10 years ago and would have been included in a paper to Forum at the time. Home to School Transport was part of the consultation in the High Needs paper this year. There was brief discussion as to whether there is now a need for review. JL explained that the issue is looked at regularly, as the SEN team is a statutory function of the LA and is funded through a combination from different sources. If a significant change was made this would put potential pressure on the council general fund.</p>	<p>GCG</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Services to schools / school contingency</b></p>	
<p>6.1</p>	<p>RBa presented his paper which sought the comments of the forum on proposals for the delegation of the balance of the contingency fund 2019/20 and the ongoing provision of the Long Term Sickness and Maternity schemes.</p>	

6.2	<p>There had been ongoing discussion around the unspent contingency; these had been paused through Covid. £119,000 was uncommitted at the end of the financial year; this was incorporated into the DSG underspend with the intention of it to be paid back to primary and secondary schools on a per pupil calculation. This continues to be the position that is supported by primary and secondary Headteachers. <b>This funding will now be allocated to schools.</b></p>	SW
6.3	<p>When schools were making decisions about which services to schools to subscribe to, concerns about increases in charges due to both schemes (LTS and Maternity) running a consistent deficit were being addressed. It is difficult to monitor and predict demands on both elements, and in an effort to make adjustments to compensate for that, the LA has spent more on it, then increasing charges to make it up again. It had been intended to discuss this further at the discussion meeting in March, which had to be cancelled due to Covid.</p>	
6.4	<p>By the deadline, only four primary schools had decided to withdraw from the scheme. The situation now needs to be monitored, and if a significant number of schools withdraw, a decision will potentially have to be made about the long term viability of the scheme, and how to wind it up if necessary, considering the deficit still held at the moment. The LA reserves the right to review this in future years, although immediate concerns have not materialised.</p>	
6.5	<p>An analysis of the previous three years' allocations shows that none of those schools have contributed to the shortfall in the scheme. It is therefore proposed that those schools do not need to make any contribution to the shortfall upon their departure.</p>	
6.6	<p>DJ asked whether the scheme is run by Orbis or by the LA and was advised that it continues to be a local B&amp;H scheme. There is a wider piece of work ongoing around Orbis and a revised offer with partners Surrey and East Sussex, but this will take some time to develop. Meanwhile local arrangements are in place in all three authorities.</p>	
6.9	<p>RK asked whether the proposal for using DSG underspend to cover part of the deficit is in line with guidance, which states that any underspend has to go back to schools. SW clarified that guidance states that underspend has "to support the schools budget" and explained that this refers to the DSG as a whole and not individual schools. The same would apply to an overspend.</p>	
6.10	<p>In response to the question what will happen if the deficit builds up again, members were advised that the LA had used £200,000 to try and offset the deficit, and that premiums have increased to cover losses. There now needs to be a wider conversation with schools to discuss the way forward and whether it is viable to continue.</p>	
6.11	<p>PF summarised that the Forum supported the first recommendation, that the £119,000 underspend in the 2019/20 contingency allocation should be delegated to schools in 2020/21 on the same basis as had been used for the de-delegation although there was continued dissatisfaction among some members who suggested that the contingency could be used as an opportunity to pay off some TTO back pay. However discussion on proposals to address the exiting of four schools from the LTS/Maternity schemes highlighted the continuing concern among Headteacher representatives about the proposed use of funds.</p>	
6.12	<p>There is recognition that it is within the power of the council to continue with the proposal, but there is also recognition at governor level that schools need to have an insurance scheme of this kind in place. Some other arrangements need to be found if the council scheme is discontinued. This will require further discussion on the future of the</p>	

<p><b>6.13</b></p> <p><b>6.14</b></p>	<p>scheme and alternatives that can be recommended to schools if the scheme is wound up. The LA recognises that schools need some provision to address the uncertain impact of sickness. Forum will continue to be updated on the work of Orbis with schools.</p> <p>SW explained that the reason the scheme was in deficit was due to reimbursements to schools being in excess of the premiums that were charged. It was highlighted that the proposal being made is in the schools' interest. The proposal resolves the issue and leaves the scheme in a more positive position, whilst helping Headteachers. <b>SW was asked to look into guidance and feed back details.</b> (<a href="#">This is provided as appendix to these minutes.</a>)</p>	<p>SW</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	
<p><b>7.1</b></p> <p><b>7.2</b></p> <p><b>7.3</b></p> <p><b>7.4</b></p> <p><b>7.5</b></p> <p><b>7.6</b></p> <p><b>7.7</b></p> <p><b>7.8</b></p> <p><b>7.9</b></p> <p><b>7.10</b></p> <p><b>7.11</b></p>	<p>Feedback was sought from members on extra costs incurred through Covid. Members were reminded of the initial guidance issued in April, which specified three areas for which claims can be made, up to a maximum. So far no change to this proposal has been announced and no information issued about how to claim, which is an area of concern for schools.</p> <p>Details on to what extent schools will be open in September are awaited, as providing home delivery of education is also resource intensive.</p> <p>Members shared the areas in which they have incurred costs, in the hope that they can be claimed back. LA provision for continued Free School Meal vouchers was appreciated.</p> <p>JK asked if there is greater clarity about redeeming costs of FSM vouchers for schools which have gone with a different provider, ie not Edenred. RBA explained that going with a different provider due to the problems experienced with Edenred should be covered by the "exceptional circumstances" criterion and would therefore be a justifiable expense.</p> <p>OS explained that from a parental point of view it would be helpful for the LA to advise parents of likely scenarios for September, ahead of confirmed government guidance.</p> <p>JL agreed that this is a good point and explained that the LA is working with Headteachers and Unions to evaluate and address the situation locally in advance. However, there is a risk of putting work into making decisions, only for them to have to be amended when government guidance is issued.</p> <p>OS explained that, as detailed guidance is unlikely to be issued before August, the two broad scenarios of either being back to normal or not back full time should be explored.</p> <p>JL reminded the forum that a number of letters to parents have been issued by the LA with a view to managing expectations, and Headteachers are doing an amazing job liaising with their communities.</p> <p>Schools have worked hard in connection with the wider opening and home learning. Good practice is now being shared.</p> <p>In connection with summer activities, as indicated by government, JL explained that the LA is thinking about possible provisions through the Early Years and Family Information Service Teams, recognising that Headteachers and schools need a break. Activities would be targeted towards disadvantaged children. However, it would be for the government to provide resources to help clubs to run in a safe way, and their issuing guidance at short notice is not helpful.</p> <p>JK advised the forum of his retirement from his post as Headteacher of Cardinal Newman Secondary School. A new Secondary Headteacher Member needs to be elected. JK had been a member for a significant number of years and was thanked for his contribution.</p>	

	The meeting closed at 5.25pm	
	<b>Next Meeting: Monday 12 October 2020 4.00 – 6.00 pm either Room G91 Hove Town Hall or remotely – to be confirmed</b>	

## **Appendix**

### **Information taken from 'Dedicated Schools Grant – Conditions of Grant 2019/20' Document**

#### **Purpose of Grant**

The grant is paid in support of the local authority's schools budget. It is the main source of income for the schools budget (the schools budget includes all expenditure on areas relating to the Dedicated Schools Grant).

Local authorities are responsible for ensuring that the DSG is deployed in support of the schools budget. This includes both DSG funding allocated to central expenditure within the schools budget and funding for the Individual Schools Budget (ISB). The ISB is the element of the DSG that is allocated to mainstream schools within the Schools Block.

#### **Year end procedures**

At the end of the financial year the central expenditure element of the schools budget may be under or overspent. If there is an underspend in respect of central expenditure at local authority level this should be separately identified within the associated notes to the accounts. The underspend must be carried forward to support the schools budget in future years, including any of the budget that is moved into earmarked reserves.

**Schools Forum  
Wednesday 17 June 2020  
4.00 pm – 5.30 pm**

**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 (15 January 2020) and matters arising</b> (minutes attached)	Peter Freeman
3	4.15	8 mins	<b>Minutes of the last SBWG meeting</b> (9 March 2020)	Ashley Harrold
4.	4.23	17 mins	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Outturn report 2019/20</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School and DSG outturn report 2019/20</li> <li>• 4.1 School balances 2019/20 summary</li> </ul>	Steve Williams
5.	4.40	20 mins	<b>High Needs Block 2020/21</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report including additional funding or 2020/21</li> <li>• 5.1 Consultation summary</li> <li>• 5.2 Breakdown of allocation of HNB</li> </ul>	Georgina Clarke-Green
6.	5.00	20 mins	<b>Services to schools / school contingency</b>	Richard Barker
7.	5.20	10 mins	<b>Any Other Business</b>	All
			<b>Next Meeting: Monday 12 October 2020 4.00 – 6.00 pm Room G91 Hove Town Hall</b>	



**Schools Forum**  
**Wednesday 15 January 2020**  
**4.00 pm – 6.00 pm**  
**Committee Room 3 Brighton Town Hall**

**Draft Minutes**

**Members present**

School Members

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
Rachel Burstow (RB)	Special Schools Headteacher, Hill Park Special School
Julie Plumstead (JP)	Nursery Headteacher, Turnerland Nursery

Academies Members

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

Non-school Members

Paul Shellard (PS)	Teachers' Union, NEU
Mandy Watson (MW)	Diocese of Chichester (Anglican)

**Members apologies**

School Members

Peter Freeman (Chair)	Primary Governor, Coombe Road Primary School
Louise Cook (LB)	PRU Headteacher, Central Hub

Non-school Members

Sarah Clayton (SC)	Diocese of Arundel and Brighton (Catholic)
--------------------	--

**Members not present**

Non-school Members

Martyn Howe (MH)	16-19 Provision, MET
------------------	----------------------

**LA Attendees**

Jo Lyons (JL)	Assistant Director Families and Schools
Louise Hoten (LH)	Head of Finance, Children's Services
Andy Moore (AM)	Schools Principal Accountant Children's Services
Georgina Clarke-Green (GCG)	Assistant Director Health SEN and Disabilities
Sharon McKenzie (SM)	Acting Traded Services Strategic Manager
Steve Williams (SW)	Schools' Accountant, Children's Services

Nigel Manvell (NM) Deputy Chief Finance Officer  
 Vicki Jenkins (VJ) Childcare Strategy Manager  
 Rhianedd Hughes (RH) Head of SEN Statutory Services

**Other attendees**

Viv Warren (VW) Early Years, Tarnerland Nursery  
 Ruth Ali (RA) Clerk to the Forum

Item		Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
	In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair Ashley Harrold chaired the meeting.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (9 December 2019) and matters arising</b>	
	<b>Matters arising:</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	2.4: GCG's paper is covered under agenda item 8.	
<b>2.2</b>	4.9: Whilst Headteachers and Chairs of Governors have been updated, <b>an agreed timeframe regarding TTO payments still needs to be communicated by Cllr John Allcock (JA).</b>	<b>JA</b>
<b>2.3</b>	5.3: Members asked whether further information on how contingency has been spent in previous years is now available. AM confirmed that this information had been shared with the Schools' Block Working Group (SBWG) at their meeting on 13 January. Spending included rates, insurance for Catholic schools and emergencies. This year's contingency fund is underspent at the moment, but the remaining funds have not been allocated yet. He will inform the SBWG if any urgent matters arise. <b>Minutes of the SBWG meeting and details on contingency spend will be circulated to the forum.</b>	<b>AM</b>
<b>2.4</b>	5.10: A meeting has been arranged between AM, the insurance team and representatives from the Catholic schools.	
<b>2.5</b>	8.3: <b>The Scheme for Financing Schools will be updated by the next meeting, to take account of potential updates issued in February by the DfE.</b>	<b>AM</b>
<b>2.6</b>	9.7: <b>Work on Service Level Agreements (SLAs) for the Connected Hub still needs to be actioned by Richard Barker (RB).</b>	<b>RB</b>
	<b>Accuracy:</b>	
<b>2.7</b>	The minutes were <b><i>agreed as a true record.</i></b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>General Fund Budget Report</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	NM presented his report on the General Fund, which provides useful context for the forum, as sometimes the two budgets will interact.	
<b>3.2</b>	Due to the government's announcement of a one year spending review, there is still a vacuum for long term planning. The government has set a date of 11 March for the budget, which may then give an indication for overall departmental spending.	
<b>3.3</b>	Some challenges on the council, such as adult social care, were outlined.	
<b>3.4</b>	The draft budget was taken to the Policy and Resources Committee in December. Since then there were some changes, due to positive news about pension fund and employer contributions.	
<b>3.5</b>	Adult social care was highlighted as a critical issue, with a £4m overspend	

3.6	currently, and there may not be enough funds next year. The council has recently approved a new corporate plan, containing a number of commitments, which have not all been fully costed and built into the general fund budget. This is primarily about housing and homelessness, which has been addressed, but also about climate change, costs of which are not known yet. In summary, the council still needs to continue with a savings programme of £10m. This will provide a significant challenge to the Families, Children and Learning element.	
3.7	Children going into care have been kept at reasonable levels, as support and interventions are going in at the right time, avoiding the high cost of placements. However, there is still significant pressure under the savings programme, and the resulting difficulty for schools was also recognised. Sometimes cuts are not directly to schools, but schools feel the impact. JL outlined various changes to the budget data provided with the report.	
3.8	<b>JL &amp; GCG agreed to brief schools at their phase meetings on FCL budget savings which may impact on schools</b>	JL & GCG
3.9	NM confirmed that all savings will be accompanied by and published with impact assessments.	
3.10	Forum members requested clarification on TTO national insurance contributions, as schools had been charged for this when they were previously advised that these would be dealt with in the same way as the rest of the TTO payback. <b>AM confirmed that this will be rectified in January, and SBMs will be notified by the end of the week.</b>	AM
3.11	Not all support staff members have attended the meetings arranged for them. More will take place in January, February and March, and it will be ensured that these costs are picked up centrally as well.	
4.	<b>DSG 2019/20</b>	
4.1	AM presented an update on the Dedicated Schools Grant for the current year and advised members that the DfE had updated the Early Years Block (EYB) and the High Needs Block (HNB), with an increase in the HNB and a decrease in the EYB. The reduction in EYB is due to an overclaim in the January 2019 census. Figures for the January 2020 census have been corrected.	
4.2	The forum noted the report, and there were no further questions.	
5.	<b>DSG 2020/21</b>	
5.1	LH presented an update on the paper submitted to the forum in October and December, the purpose of which was for members to agree the final figures, following small increases in cost.	
5.2	Forum members asked to be taken through the changes in staff cost outlined in the paper. LH explained that these areas had been reviewed to ensure they are accurate, as they had historically been overspent.	
5.3	The SBWG had also discussed an increase in cost in connection with school suspensions, i.e. to reimburse £200 per day, and the increase also contributes to ensuring that there are sufficient funds for this.	
5.3	<b>Agreed:</b> <b>Primary Phase members agreed the de-delegation of insurance within Exception 1 of £0.290m, an increase of £0.007m, and staff costs of £0.050m an increase of £0.006m from the items agreed at the December 2019 Schools' Forum.</b>	

5.4	<b><i>Secondary Phase members agreed the de-delegation of insurance within Exception 1 of £0.201m, an increase of £0.032m, and staff costs of £0.050m an increase of £0.010m from the item agreed at the December 2019 Schools' Forum.</i></b>	
6.	<b>Schools Block 2020/21</b>	
6.1	This item followed on from the DSG report in item 5 and provided an update on arrangements previously agreed. SW presented the paper.	
6.2	The final settlement for 2020/21 was received before Christmas, updated data from the census has also been received, and this updated report now reflects all changes. The funding plan must be submitted to the DfE by 21 January.	
6.3	There was a change in the relationship between deprivation and low attainment, as the number of children had increased for deprivation and reduced for low attainment. It was therefore considered appropriate to reallocate and align the figures. It was clarified that this does not change the overall allocations to individual schools, as this had previously been expressed as a concern. The LA is now applying the new criteria for minimum per pupil funding (MPPF), which is £3,750 for Primary Schools and £5,000 for Secondary Schools, the impact of which is shown in the report.	
6.4	Forum members were initially concerned about the changes between allocations for deprivation and low attainment and explained that the late distribution of the papers did not allow for enough time to study and understand these in detail. AM recognised the concern and explained that the late distribution of papers was due to a particularly challenging timeframe this time.	
6.5	<p>Members asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the amount per pupil for low attainment different between Primary and Secondary? - This is partly historical and based on unit values. Secondary normally attracts more funding than Primary. There is still an appropriate balance, for example Pupil Premium (PP) is lower for Secondary. The LA looks at the overall formula.</li> <li>• How is low attainment defined? – It is set by the government. For Primary, it is pupils not achieving in EYFS.</li> </ul>	
6.6	This was discussed at the Schools Block Working Group (SBWG), which recognised the need for a formula that is fair. The figures appear skewed, but do not show PP. There is continuing concern about the impact of pupil numbers reducing in Primary, which will feed through to Secondary.	
6.7	<p>Clarification was sought on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Split sites – This is a school that operates from different buildings split by geographical distance.</li> <li>• PFI funding – Private Finance Initiative. This is a historical commitment of some schools dating back to 2003, which was a scheme to upgrade school facilities. This now amounts to schools which chose not to take part in the scheme subsidising those that chose to. When the contract ends, this funding will go back into the main pot.</li> <li>• Rent – This applies to exceptional circumstances and relates to schools which, for example, may have taken over another building by renting this space.</li> <li>• Does this mean all schools are paying for it? - Schools are given the actual cost, which is similar to rates for all schools.</li> </ul>	

<p>6.8</p> <p>6.9</p> <p>6.10</p> <p>6.11</p>	<p>Further to lower attainment, AM explained that this is by national weighting. More is going to Primary in terms of overall allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What happens to children that enter the country after EYFS? – They do not count.</li> <li>• Does the mobility factor cover some of that? – Yes. We also have an EAL factor which recognises that.</li> </ul> <p>Some variations for school budgets were discussed at SBWG. These are driven by student numbers, especially now with the new MFPP. Forum members asked if there is anything that can be done to change this, as some schools see large drops. This is correct, but it is expected that schools would have identified the trend in advance in their long term budget and worked with it. Deprivation etc has an impact on the individual budgets, but most of the allocation is driven by pupil numbers, though some schools have had a reduction in numbers, but increase in funding.</p> <p>It was highlighted that swings of pupil numbers year on year cause the budget to swing, but actions to address lower budgets take three or four years to implement. Some schools are located in parts of the city where there is no scope for increase in pupil numbers as there is no scope for new housing developments. AM explained that he had examined the October census and communicated with schools where numbers had reduced, offering help. It was highlighted that previously schools were also paid for having a space for a child, but this is no longer the case. JL explained that the decision had just been taken to reduce the PAN in some Primary schools, meaning the first phase on a longer term strategy has been completed.</p> <p>Further questions and suggestions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the proposal of a minimum funding per class be fed back somewhere? - This was acknowledged as a fair point, but a lot of local flexibility has been lost and national guidelines have to be followed. The possibility of raising this point at a regional meeting with DfE representatives was explored.</li> <li>• Is the same approach in terms of examination taken for bigger schools with bigger budgets and decreasing numbers? - Draft budgets are requested to be submitted by the end of February, and the LA examines and compares their planning, asking questions about large carryforwards. Schools should also provide challenge to their colleagues.</li> <li>• Although the Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR) provides more information now, it does not reflect whether schools have already restructured and taken action. How is this explained? – This will become part of the budget planning spreadsheet, which Finance is currently adapting. It has so far been shared with one secondary school, two primaries and one nursery. Finance is looking to incorporate additional charts for schools and the LA to benchmark, in alignment with SFVS information, to incorporate future predictions. The SBWG will feed back on this.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>High Needs Block 2020/21</b></p>	
<p>7.1</p>	<p>SW introduced the report, highlighting that the DfE has responded to national discussion and announced additional funding for HNB, equating to an increase of £2.65m in 2020/21 for Brighton and Hove.</p>	

7.2	The second part of his report focused on how the LA will allocate the funding.	
7.3	The third part contained an update on the commissioning process and funding proposals for Special Schools.	
7.4	GCG thanked all those who have responded to the consultation. Responses were as anticipated. However, respondents showed less support for “Building the capacity to identify, monitor and meet the need of hidden children”, which is an area that is high on the agenda for parents and carers, who keep raising it as they had been dissatisfied with the progress made. There is concern that a high number of children are not getting the full education offer for various reasons. This has safeguarding implications, which have to be monitored closely, and it is therefore a priority for the LA.	
7.5	Another area with less support from respondents was “Assessing specialist needs for Home To School Transport”. It was clarified to the forum that this is around ensuring that the right transport is in place, meeting the individual needs of the children. As a result of recent issues in that area, the LA needs to put more capacity into that area, working with parents and schools.	
7.6	There is increased demand for Special School places, and the LA is looking at ways to mitigate this. This may include being more creative in going forward in mainstream schools, for example exploring the option of opportunities for satellite provision for children not meeting the threshold for special provision, located in schools that have reduced their published admissions number (PAN).	
7.8	It is a priority to conduct an in depth HNB spending review, looking at the SEND strategy in place and using this information to evaluate the need for provision going forward and its cost, and then working with schools, special schools and parents to discuss allocation of funds. It is envisaged that this would be done in the next 18 months to two years, resulting in increased transparency.	
7.9	Members noted the report, and there were no further questions.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Early Years Block (EYB) 2020/21</b>	
8.1	VJ presented the paper. The DfE has announced an increase of 8p per hour for early year’s free entitlements for 2020/21 for all local authorities. This brings Brighton & Hove’s rates to £4.53 for three and four year olds and £5.28 for two year olds, which will be passed on to providers while retaining no more than 5% of the EYB for central spend.	
8.2	A change to the formula is being considered for this year, which increases the base rate for all providers and also increases funding for disadvantaged children living in the 0 to 10% (in the region of £1.10 per hour) and 11 to 20% (in the region of £.70 per hour) IDACI most disadvantaged areas. This proposal needs to be put to early years providers prior to being finalised.	
8.3	It was not possible to complete consultation with early year’s providers in time for this January schools’ forum meeting. This is because the changes to the EYB formula are in part dependent on the results of changes to HNB spend, and the results of consultation with schools on this were not available until late December.	
8.4	Therefore the proposal for EYB formula will be brought to the March schools’ forum meeting. This means that the deadline of 31st March 2020 for letting early years providers know about their budgets for 2020/21 will be met. However the requirement to consult schools’ forums on changes to local early years funding	

<b>8.5</b>	formulas, including agreeing central spend by 28 February will be delayed by 2.5 weeks. The forum noted the report, and there were no further questions.	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Services to Schools update</b>	
<b>9.1</b>	SM presented an update to the paper brought before the forum in December. This contained a complete list of services, including information on new ones.	
<b>9.2</b>	In addition, the forum was advised that Governor Support will see an uplift of 3%, as there had not been an increase for four years, and a rise in venue costs has to be passed on.	
<b>9.3</b>	Members sought clarification on point 4.3, which stated that the uplift for Literacy Support (LSS) would be confirmed. This service, as well as the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) are made up of a large number of teachers, and teachers' pay rises and other increases in costs of teachers would be passed on to schools buying into the service. EMAS sees a 3% uplift, and LSS is expected to be the same, but has not been confirmed yet. It should not be significantly different.	
<b>9.4</b>	Services to Schools information will be passed on to schools at the same time as their budgets and High Needs information. A summary of services will be emailed to all Headteachers and School Business Managers (SBMs) with links to BEEM.	
<b>9.5</b>	The forum noted the report, and there were no further comments or questions.	
<b>10.</b>	<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):**

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



**Schools Block Working Group**  
**Notes of the meeting held on Monday 9 March 14:00 to 16:00**  
**Room G28, 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  
 Damien Jordan (DJ) Fairlight Primary School  
 Rachel Kershaw (RK) St Margaret's CE Primary School

Local Authority

Steve Williams (SW) Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance  
 Louise Hoten (LH) Head of Finance (Children and Adults)  
 Richard Barker (RB) Head of School Organisation  
 Sharon MacKenzie (SM) School and Governance Development Manager

Apologies

Julie Aldous (JA) Middle Street Primary School  
 Ken Simpson (KS) HR Business Partner/Schools HR Relationship Manager  
 Andy Moore (AM) Principal Accountant, Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance

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 Monday 13 January</b>	<b>AH</b>
	No update regarding HR representative for the group, RB will feedback when he has more information.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Information/feedback from headteachers</b>	<b>All</b>
	Discussed further in meeting.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Schools Contingency</b>	<b>RB</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contingency budget money left over to redistribute amongst school is in the region of £108,000. The contribution is 52% from primaries, 48% from secondaries and calculated on a per pupil basis from each school. There is a need to consider if the funds are needed to offset deficits in the LTS/Maternity schemes.</li> <li>• Feeling from headteachers that the unspent money should be redistributed back to the school by the same basis as the original de-delegation took place. A further discussion at the Schools Forum meeting is required.</li> </ul>	

<b>5.</b>	<b>Services to Schools 20/21</b>	<b>RB</b>
	<p>Services to Schools 2020/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on 2020/21</li> <li>• Items raised by schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long Term Sickness (LTS)</li> <li>• Maternity (MAP)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Schools pay in a proportion of the money to the scheme to cover long term sickness, premature baby and maternity leave. It is a long running scheme whose premiums are adjusted according to predicted expenditure in the coming year and costs for the preceding year.</li> <li>• The formula is available on BEEM.</li> <li>• Schools have been looking at alternative schemes and has led to consideration about how the current deficit could be cleared. It is recognised that this is a new issue for schools to consider and enough notice will be needed or schools if there is a need to seek additional payments.</li> <li>• The notice period for schools to leave specific services was also raised and discussed. There are no plans to adjust the 6 months lead in time because of the impact it has on the council's staffing.</li> <li>• AH suggested that proper advice will be needed to ensure fully informed decisions are made about the running of insurance schemes and to allow comparison with schemes run by private providers.</li> <li>• It was agreed that this should be suggested as a focus of discussion at a future Schools Forum meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Schools Budgets</b>	<b>All</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SW took the groups through the draft of the schools' carry forwards for 2019/20 and school draft budgets for 2020/21.</li> <li>• The list of schools with forecast deficits was shared and discussed and details will be provided to the June meeting of the Forum in line with usual procedures.</li> <li>• DJ enquired as to whether the council was likely to be in the position to issue licenced deficits. SW confirmed there should be capacity to license new deficits in 2020/21 as the overall school balance position has improved.</li> <li>• The group raised concerns about the financial viability of 2 form entry schools and suggested that the council seek to extend the work that has been done in examining financial pressures in 1 FE schools to also look at 2 FE schools.</li> </ul>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	Nothing was discussed.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Date(s) of next meeting(s)</b>	<b>AH</b>
	8 June 2020 – 2pm to 4pm.	

**Meeting:** Schools' Forum

**Date:** 17 June 2020

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

**Subject:** Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Outturn 2019/20

**Wards Affected:** All

## 1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 To update the Forum on the outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

## 2 Recommendation

- 2.1 To note the level of school balances of £4.347m as at 31/03/20, an increase of £0.122m from £4.225m at the end of 2018/19 (a 2.9% increase).
- 2.2 To note the carry forward of £0.703m on Central DSG, a decrease of £0.101m from £0.804m at the end of 2018/19.

## 3 Information/Background

- 3.1 Appendix 1 shows the school balances position at the end of the 2019/20 financial year.

The overall position shows a net carry forward balance of £4.347m, an increase of £0.122m or 2.9% increase when compared to 2018/19.

### (a) Summary of Balances

The £4.347m balance is made up across phases as follows:-

<b>Phase</b>	<b>2018/19 £'000</b>	<b>%age of budget 2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20 £'000</b>	<b>%age of budget 2019/20</b>
Nursery	64	8.25%	40	5.06%
Primary	3,812	5.15%	3,395	4.49%
Secondary	(11)	(0.02%)	784	1.51%
Special & AP	360	4.24%	128	1.19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>3.14%</b>	<b>4,347</b>	<b>3.12%</b>

See Appendix 1 (attached) for a detailed school by school breakdown of the balances and movement from 2018/19.

(b) Movement in Balances

There is an overall increase in carry forwards of £0.122m and the split across phases shows the following movements:-

Phase	£'000
Nursery	(24)
Primary	(417)
Secondary	795
Special & AP	(232)
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>

*This is after schools put £405k of their revenue budgets into capital projects (RCCO). Primary £146k, Secondary £236k and Special £23k (in 2018/19 this was £670k, Primary £365k, Secondary £303k and Special £2k).*

The overall position of surpluses and overspends is detailed below (this includes monies held within phases for partnership activities):

Phase	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Movement £'000
Nursery surpluses	64	40	(24)
Nursery overspends	0	0	0
Primary surpluses	4,187	3,684	(503)
Primary overspends	(375)	(289)	86
Secondary surpluses	288	796	508
Secondary overspends	(299)	(12)	287
Special & AP surpluses	396	128	(268)
Special & AP overspends	(36)	0	36
Overall surpluses	4,935	4,648	(287)
Overall overspends	(710)	(301)	409
<b>Total net position</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>4,347</b>	<b>122</b>

Net position – number of schools	2018/19	%age	2019/20	%age	Movement
Overspent	11	17%	10	16%	-1
Balance between £0 and £10,000	2	3%	8	13%	6
Balance between £10,000 and £50,000	17	26%	14	22%	-3
Balance between £50,000 and £100,000	12	19%	14	22%	2
Balance between £100,000 and £250,000	20	30%	13	21%	-7
Balance above £250,000	2	5%	4	6%	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>-1</b>

(c) Deficit Balances (overspends)

In total there are 10 schools (out of 63) with deficit balances, a reduction from 11 as at the end of 2018/19, and the split of these is as follows:-

Phase	Deficit Balances 18/19	Total Schools 18/19	18/19 % age	Deficit Balances 19/20	Total Schools 19/20	19/20 % age
Nursery	0	2	0%	0	2	0%
Primary	6	50	12%	8	50	16%
Secondary	4	7	57%	2	7	29%
Special & AP	1	5	20%	0	4	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>64*</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>63*</b>	<b>16%</b>

\*During 2019/2020 The Connected Hub and the PRU merged to become Central hub Brighton. School budget plans for 2020/21 will incorporate these overspends and the Finance team are/will be working closely with schools to identify those who are likely to require licensed deficits in the coming year.

(d) Schools with balances greater than thresholds identified in the DfE Balance Control Mechanism

The balance control mechanism was introduced by Government in 2007 and operates where surplus balances are:-

Nursery, Primary and Special Schools Greater than 8% of budget\*  
 Secondary Schools Greater than 5% of budget\*\*

\* For special schools who now receive a significant component of their funding as top-up income, we have included this as budget for the purpose of the percentage calculation

\*\*We include 6<sup>th</sup> form income as budget for the 2 schools with sixth forms

The following table shows the number of schools who have balances in excess of these thresholds:-

Phase	Number >5% or >8% in 2018/19	Total Schools	%age 18/19	Number >5% or >8% in 2019/20	%age 19/20
Nursery	1	2	50%	0	0%
Primary	10	50	20%	6	12%
Secondary	0	7	0%	1	14%
Special	1	4	20%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11%</b>

The balance above the threshold is £0 in Nursery, £402,465 in Primary, £118,211 in Secondary and £0 in Special – totalling £520,676 a decrease of 4% compared to 2018/19. (In 2018/19 the balances above the threshold were £15,697 in Nursery, £511,084 in Primary, £0 in Secondary and £14,563 in Special – totalling £541,344).

Previously at Schools Forum it was agreed that any surplus balance would be discussed as part of conversations between the school and the local authority focussing around good use of resources and the needs of the pupils at the school.

(e) Other funds schools have access to from 2019/20

In addition to the school carryforwards identified in paragraph (a) above, schools also have access to funds carried forward for Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) (DFC can be spent over 3 financial years).

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Capital carried forward into 2019/20 – balance unspent of total allocation of funds taken £'000</b>	<b>Capital carried forward into 2020/21 – balance unspent of total allocation of funds taken £'000</b>
Nursery	7 (50%)	7 (31%)
Primary	136 (31%)	178 (23%)
Secondary	147 (32%)	106 (12%)
Special	144 (72%)	157 (70%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>434 (40%)</b>	<b>448 (23%)</b>

As you can see from the above table the movement from one year to the next in relation to Capital does reduce the overall school balances by £14k. However, this is after schools put £405k of their revenue budgets into capital projects (RCCO).

**4 Central DSG Outturn 2019/20**

4.1 The final central DSG outturn for 2019/20 was an underspend of £0.703m, a decrease of £0.101m from £0.804m in 2018/19.

4.2 An analysis of the £0.703m is shown in the table below.

<b>Block</b>	<b>Service Area</b>	<b>£'000</b>
HNB	High Needs top up to mainstream schools	61
HNB	High Needs top up to special schools	69
HNB	BHISS / Literacy Support	111
HNB	High Needs payments to external providers	(281)
HNB	Other High Needs Block areas	(54)
	<b>Total High Needs Block</b>	<b>(94)</b>
EYB	Payments for 3 & 4 year olds	(425)
EYB	Payments for 2 year olds	(95)
EYB	Other Early Years areas	(38)
	<b>Total Early Years Block</b>	<b>(558)</b>
Ex1	Exception 1 – de-delegated from mainstream schools – this mainly relates to an underspend in the schools contingency budget, which is partly offset by an overspend in the EMAS	(89)
CSSB	Central Services Schools Block – Historic pension costs	38
	<b>Total DSG Budget Underspend</b>	<b>(703)</b>

4.3 The £0.703m underspend is carried forward to support the DSG in 2020/21. The significant underspend relating to the Early Years Block will be subject to retrospective clawback by DfE to reflect the reduction in the number of children recorded in the early years census in January 2020. This amount is due to be notified to the LA in July 2020.

**Appendix 1 - School Carryforward Position 2019/20 and Movement from 2018/19**

School	2019/20 Formula Budget	2019/20 Expenditure	2019/20 Over (-) / Underspend	2019/20 Carryforward as a percentage of budget	Sum in excess of 5% (secondary) and 8% (primary, nursery and special)	Notes	2018/19 Over (-) / Under spend	Change in Carry Forward (minus is a reduction)
Royal Spa Nursery	£326,851	£323,588	£3,263	1.0%			£13,668	-£10,406
Tarnerland Nursery	£469,306	£432,302	£37,004	7.9%			£50,353	-£13,349
Aldrington CE Primary	£1,520,609	£1,435,383	£85,226	5.6%			£65,732	£19,494
Balfour Primary	£2,813,694	£2,774,728	£38,966	1.4%			£134,387	-£95,420
Benfield Primary	£1,186,986	£1,093,664	£93,322	7.9%			£138,407	-£45,085
Bevendean Primary	£1,840,520	£1,584,277	£256,243	13.9%	£109,001		£264,805	-£8,562
Carden Primary	£1,626,196	£1,573,499	£52,697	3.2%			£44,777	£7,920
Carlton Hill Primary	£1,003,142	£1,009,183	-£6,041	-0.6%			£19,328	-£25,369
Coldean Primary	£1,850,307	£1,733,595	£116,712	6.3%			£240,301	-£123,588
Coombe Road Primary	£927,730	£925,057	£2,673	0.3%			£34,676	-£32,003
Cottesmore St Mary RC Primary	£1,665,473	£1,520,417	£145,056	8.7%	£11,818		£120,425	£24,631
Downs Infant	£1,363,341	£1,309,526	£53,815	3.9%			£69,423	-£15,609
Downs Junior	£1,866,880	£1,858,330	£8,550	0.5%			£28,593	-£20,044
Elm Grove Primary	£1,616,252	£1,549,186	£67,066	4.1%			£33,280	£33,786
Fairlight Primary	£1,873,615	£1,764,911	£108,704	5.8%			£107,030	£1,675
Goldstone Primary	£2,594,362	£2,552,990	£41,372	1.6%			£1,759	£39,612
Hangleton Primary	£2,274,367	£2,171,192	£103,175	4.5%			£55,124	£48,051
Hertford Infant	£577,177	£617,874	-£40,697	-7.1%			-£99,317	£58,619
Hertford Junior	£897,378	£917,790	-£20,412	-2.3%			£22,963	-£43,374
Middle Street Primary	£812,558	£826,337	-£13,779	-1.7%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £16,621	-£72,054	£58,275
Mile Oak Primary	£2,156,384	£2,023,822	£132,562	6.1%			£66,027	£66,535
Moulseccomb Primary	£1,266,035	£1,372,787	-£106,752	-8.4%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £204,979	-£138,915	£32,163
Our Lady of Lourdes RC Primary	£827,098	£772,806	£54,292	6.6%			£47,998	£6,294
Patcham Infant	£1,177,853	£1,083,771	£94,082	8.0%			£115,154	-£21,073
Patcham Junior	£1,490,084	£1,383,341	£106,743	7.2%			£134,439	-£27,696
Peter Gladwin Primary	£781,260	£819,869	-£38,609	-4.9%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £15,274	-£4,233	-£34,376
Brackenbury Primary	£870,872	£853,575	£17,297	2.0%			£63,656	-£46,359
Queens Park Primary	£1,884,234	£1,819,340	£64,894	3.4%			£124,706	-£59,812
Rudyard Kipling Primary	£1,681,222	£1,617,242	£63,980	3.8%			£110,491	-£46,511
Saltdean Primary	£2,119,248	£2,070,693	£48,555	2.3%			£76,133	-£27,578
Brunswick Primary	£3,526,258	£3,217,174	£309,084	8.8%	£26,983		£326,678	-£17,593
St Andrews CE Primary	£2,294,316	£2,076,448	£217,868	9.5%	£34,323		£192,183	£25,686
St Bartholomews CE Primary	£797,029	£792,967	£4,062	0.5%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £43,189	£38,683	-£34,621
St Bernadettes RC Primary	£855,774	£833,619	£22,155	2.6%			£44,571	-£22,416
St John the Baptist Primary	£950,755	£891,930	£58,825	6.2%			£71,385	-£12,561
St Josephs RC Primary	£749,719	£727,124	£22,595	3.0%			£72,687	-£50,092

St Lukes Primary	£2,353,027	£2,253,723	£99,304	4.2%		£139,373	-£40,069
St Margarets CE Primary	£781,110	£753,714	£27,396	3.5%		£45,126	-£17,730
St Marks CE Primary	£805,710	£833,860	-£28,150	-3.5%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £33,082	-£56,319 £28,169
St Martins CE Primary	£1,035,492	£1,023,471	£12,021	1.2%		£19,777	-£7,756
St Mary Magdalen RC Primary	£973,457	£947,143	£26,314	2.7%		£68,323	-£42,009
St Marys RC Primary	£947,560	£889,626	£57,934	6.1%		£56,771	£1,163
St Nicolas Primary	£1,567,427	£1,492,653	£74,774	4.8%		£98,925	-£24,150
St Pauls CE Primary	£840,717	£830,933	£9,784	1.2%		£20,524	-£10,740
St Peters Community Primary	£988,393	£966,085	£22,308	2.3%		£16,064	£6,244
Stanford Infant	£1,010,732	£1,001,295	£9,437	0.9%		£32,320	-£22,883
Stanford Junior	£1,367,247	£1,278,608	£88,639	6.5%		£107,872	-£19,233
West Blatchington Primary	£1,162,557	£1,197,327	-£34,770	-3.0%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £19,282	-£4,130 -£30,640
West Hove Infant	£2,466,774	£2,252,399	£214,375	8.7%	£17,033	£176,817	£37,558
Hove Junior	£3,281,521	£3,078,329	£203,192	6.2%		£187,927	£15,266
Westdene Primary	£2,452,685	£2,352,127	£100,558	4.1%		£111,554	-£10,995
Woodingdean Primary	£1,799,087	£1,451,853	£347,234	19.3%	£203,307	£239,743	£107,491
Blatchington Mill	£7,440,550	£7,449,076	-£8,526	-0.1%			-£41,726 £33,200
Cardinal Newman*	£8,664,901	£8,652,197	£12,704	0.1%			-£990 £13,694
Dorothy Stringer	£8,147,108	£8,035,468	£111,640	1.4%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £159,806	-£97,747 £209,387
Hove Park*	£7,587,430	£7,411,692	£175,738	2.1%		£142,537	£33,201
Longhill	£4,904,135	£4,907,286	-£3,151	-0.1%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £250,000	-£158,530 £155,379
Patcham High	£5,350,022	£5,326,147	£23,875	0.4%		£1,221	£22,654
Varndean	£7,073,260	£6,601,386	£471,874	6.7%	£118,211	£144,412	£327,462
Homewood College*	£414,138	£399,272	£14,866	1.3%		Agreed LD 2019/20 of £118,904	-£35,862 £50,728
Downs View Hub*	£2,158,978	£2,155,533	£3,445	0.1%		£237,311	-£233,865
Hill Park*	£2,094,662	£1,993,844	£100,818	2.5%		£116,566	-£15,748
Central Hub Brighton	£764,763	£755,663	£9,100	1.1%		£41,699	-£32,599
<b>Nursery Total</b>	<b>£796,157</b>	<b>£755,890</b>	<b>£40,267</b>	<b>5.06%</b>	<b>£0</b>		<b>£64,022 -£23,755</b>
<b>Primary Total</b>	<b>£75,572,224</b>	<b>£72,177,593</b>	<b>£3,394,631</b>	<b>4.49%</b>	<b>£402,465</b>		<b>£3,811,949 -£417,318</b>
<b>Secondary Total*</b>	<b>£49,167,406</b>	<b>£48,383,252</b>	<b>£784,154</b>	<b>1.51%</b>	<b>£118,211</b>		<b>-£10,822 £794,976</b>
<b>Special Total*</b>	<b>£5,432,541</b>	<b>£5,304,311</b>	<b>£128,230</b>	<b>1.19%</b>	<b>£0</b>		<b>£359,714 -£231,484</b>
<b>Overall Total*</b>	<b>£130,968,328</b>	<b>£126,621,047</b>	<b>£4,347,281</b>	<b>3.12%</b>	<b>£520,676</b>		<b>£4,224,862 £122,419</b>
Total Schools with Overspend			10				11

\* For schools marked the percentage carryforward of budget has been adjusted to reflect significant income areas such as sixth form funding and high needs top-up income

**Brighton & Hove City Council****Meeting: Schools Forum****Date: 15 June 2020****Report of: Head of Health, Adults, Families, Children and Learning Finance****Subject: High Needs Block 2020/21****Wards Affected: All****1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To update the Schools Forum on the composition and distribution of the High Needs Block (HNB) within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2020/21.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the distribution of the HNB across service areas for 2020/21.

**3. Background and Information**

- 3.1 The DSG is split into four blocks by the Department for Education (DfE): the Schools Block, the Central School Services Block, the Early Years Block and the High Needs Block (HNB).
- 3.2 As detailed in the January 2020 HNB report presented to Forum, the DfE now operates national funding formulae for each of the schools, high needs and central school services areas.
- 3.3 The HNB includes funding for education provision for high needs pupils and students from birth to 25. The intention is to deliver an integrated and coherent approach to assessment and provision across this age range – the Local Authority's responsibility for the education provision of young people subject to a learning difficulty assessment now applies up to the age of 25.
- 3.4 The Local Authority 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 paid directly to establishments for the provision of education.
- 3.5 In December 2019, the Department for Education (DfE) announced the provisional HNB allocation for the 2020/21 financial year. This has subsequently been subject to a minor adjustment and the latest allocation is summarised as follows:

2020/21 Actual NFF allocation excluding basic entitlement and import / export adjustments	£26.363m
Basic entitlement factor	£1.967m
Provisional 2020/21 Import/Export adjustment	(£0.258m)
Estimated deduction for direct funding of post-16 maintained places by Education & Skills Funding Agency	(£0.116m)
<b>Total Provisional 2020/21 HNB</b>	<b>£27.956m</b>

- 3.6 This settlement results in an increase in allocation to Brighton and Hove of c. £2.6m compared to 2019/20. The additional allocation is recognition of the increasing costs of supporting children and young people with SEND and will help the LA manage pressures in this area, particularly in view of no transfer of funds having been made from the Schools Block in recent years. For some time head teachers and other partners have been raising with the LA concerns about the adequacy of funding for SEND. These include mainstream schools top-up, and the challenges facing special schools, both in terms of capacity and the growing complexity of pupils' needs. Receiving this additional funding allows the local authority to address some of these concerns and the growing pressures for colleagues in schools.
- 3.7 It should be noted that from the academic year 2019 to 2020, starting in August 2019, there is a technical adjustment whereby funding for post-16 places in maintained schools (including maintained special schools) will remain in the DSG paid to local authorities, rather than being deducted from local authorities' DSG allocations and paid as sixth form grant
- 3.8 Following the announcement of the additional funding the LA undertook a consultation in December 2019 to seek the views of schools regarding priorities for the use of the new funding.
- 3.9 A summary of the original LA proposals and the views of schools is included in appendix 1. The areas which schools supported most strongly included:
- Top-up funding for mainstream schools
  - Investment in the city's specialist provision
  - Develop range of provision within the city, particularly in the areas of ASC and SEMH
  - Develop additional alternative provision
- 3.10 Conversely there was less support for the following areas:
- Building in capacity to identify, monitor and meet the need of hidden children;
  - Assessing specialist needs for Home To School Transport

However, the Hidden Children agenda is incredibly important to the local authority and the parent/ carer community. Both PaCC and Amaze (Brighton and Hove representative parent groups) have raised this issue at the SEND Partnership Board and in other forums on numerous occasions. They are very keen that the local authority have a sharp focus on Hidden Children and have a robust process in place to ensure that these children are identified, supported and monitored so they access an appropriate educational offer. Therefore, it remains a priority for the council.

It has become apparent through the recent home to school transport issues, that there is not adequate capacity within the local authority to properly support this area of work. In particular there needs to be a focus on working more closely with schools, parents, social care and health professionals to accurately assess what is required in terms of the individual needs of children and young people who are transported to and from school. It is key that children and young people attending school arrive ready to learn and that they are not overly fatigued or anxious before they enter the classroom.

- 3.11 At this stage the HNB allocation issued by DfE is only indicative and may be subject to further adjustments to reflect updated information relating to the import/export adjustment (where pupils with high needs who live in Brighton and Hove are educated in other LAs and vice versa).

#### 4. Distribution of HNB 2020/21

- 4.1 The LA has reviewed budget allocations within the block to ensure these reflect changing commitments. The increase in funding has allowed the LA to plan new initiatives or extend existing specialist provision, taking into account the views of schools and the priorities of the council to ensure it has the greatest benefit to the most vulnerable children and young people in the city.
- 4.2 A summary of the breakdown of the 2020/21 HNB is shown in appendix 2, together with the comparative allocations for 2019/20.
- 4.3 There are some notable changes in allocations for 2020/21, mainly as a result of the significant increase in funding to the HNB.
- 4.4 Special school related funding shows an increase of c. £600k, however over £150k of this is presentational and is due to the technical funding adjustment referred to in paragraph 3.7 above. The demand for places in special schools in the city continues to increase and the number of high cost commissioned places from September 2020 has risen. The LA is also providing additional bespoke funding for individual pupils to supplement the regular top-up funding. At the same time the council is continuing to allocate therapies provision across the hubs, and in the 2020/21 financial year each hub continues to be in receipt of an allocation of £100k for therapies.
- 4.5 For mainstream schools the budget for top-up funding has continually overspent for a number of years. Additional resource has been allocated to this area for 2020/21 and the budget has been rebased to reflect the baseline position and allow for ongoing expected demand growth in 2020/21. Furthermore additional funding for SEN support has been allocated to 1 Form Entry primary schools in 2020/21 to recognise the disproportionately large impact of SEN reforms and related budget pressures on smaller schools.
- 4.6 There has been an increase in funding for the resource bases located in mainstream schools. This is mainly due to the expansion of the specialist ASC facility at Hove Park in September 2020.
- 4.7 The area categorised as 'SEN Interventions' in appendix 2 has also seen additional investment which includes the following:

Support Area	Additional Funding
Every Child a Reader	£0.100m
Every Child Counts	£0.100m
Autism strategy (mASCot and funding linked to the Integrated team for Families)	£0.145m

## Appendix 1 - High Needs Block (HNB) 2020/21 Consultation Response Summary

### Collated Responses 38 responses

It should be noted in the summarised totals below there are multiple responses from individual schools (particularly in the special school phase) and this may distort the overall headline figures.

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
Top up funding for both primary and secondary sector to ensure that the top up budget is sufficient to meet the increase in requests from maintained schools and academies through the EHCP process.	<b>Yes - 24</b> <b>No - 9</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Perhaps - 1</b> <b>N/A - 1</b> <b>Blank - 2</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Blank x 2 Yes x 1 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 15 High x 1 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 5 <b>Special Schools</b> No x 9 Yes x 2 Perhaps x 1 <b>College</b> N/A x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Investment in the cities specialist provision to prevent CYP with the most complex needs having to attend agency placements.	<b>Yes - 29</b> <b>No - 3</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Blank - 5</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Blank x 2 Yes x 1 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 10 High x 1 No x 3 Blank x 2 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 4

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
		Blank x 1 <b>Special Schools</b> Yes x 12 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Develop further the range of provision within the city, in particular, there is an increasing need for more ASC specialist provision from both schools and parents. This includes additional specialist facilities across both primary and secondary for those pupils who are on the spectrum but who also have social, emotional and mental health needs and possibly some learning difficulties.	<b>Yes - 35</b> <b>No - 1</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Blank - 1</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 2 Blank x 1 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 14 High x 1 No x 1 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 5 <b>Special Schools</b> Yes x 12 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Support for one form entry schools, with high levels of SEND.	<b>Yes - 13</b> <b>No - 6</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Perhaps - 3</b> <b>N/A - 6</b> <b>Blank - 7</b> <b>To a lesser degree - 2</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 1 Blank x 2 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 9 High x 1 No x 4 Blank x 2 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 1 No x 1

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
		Blank x 3 <b>Special Schools</b> Yes x 1 No x 1 To a lesser degree x 2 Perhaps x 3 N/A x 5 <b>College</b> N/A x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Additional EP support.	<b>Yes - 13</b> <b>No - 16</b> <b>Medium - 1</b> <b>Varied - 1</b> <b>Blank - 7</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> No x 1 Blank x 2 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 9 Medium x 1 No x 3 Blank x 3 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 2 No x 1 Blank x 2 <b>Special Schools</b> Yes x 1 No x 11 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Varied x 1
Assessing specialist needs for Home To School Transport.	<b>Yes - 5</b> <b>No - 22</b> <b>N/A - 3</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 1 Blank x 2

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
	<b>Blank - 6</b> <b>Maybe - 1</b> <b>Low - 1</b>	<b>Primary</b> Yes x 3 No x 7 Blank x 3 N/A x 1 Low x 1 Maybe x 1 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 1 No x 3 Blank x 1 <b>Special Schools</b> No x 12 <b>College</b> N/A x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> N/A
Capacity to identify, monitor and meet the need of hidden children.	<b>Yes - 7</b> <b>No - 15</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Maybe - 1</b> <b>N/A - 1</b> <b>Blank - 11</b> <b>Possibly - 1</b> <b>Unsure - 1</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 1 Blank x 2 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 3 High x 1 No x 4 Blank x 5 Unsure x 1 Maybe x 1 N/A x 1 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 2 Blank x 3 <b>Special Schools</b>

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
		Possibly x 1 No x 11 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Blank x 1
Providing resource to schools early to prevent exclusion and meet the needs of those children with SEMH.	<b>Yes - 32</b> <b>No - 2</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Blank – 3</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 2 Blank x 1 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 11 High x 1 No x 2 Blank x 2 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 5 <b>Special Schools</b> Yes x 12 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Development of additional alternative provision.	<b>Yes - 22</b> <b>No - 4</b> <b>High - 1</b> <b>Blank - 4</b> <b>Some - 7</b>	<b>Early Years (inc Nursery Schools)</b> Yes x 1 Blank x 2 <b>Primary</b> Yes x 11 High x 1 No x 3 Blank x 1 <b>Secondary (inc 1x special unit)</b> Yes x 5 <b>Special Schools</b>

Area of focus	Do you agree this is a priority	Categories of Response
		Yes x 3 No x 1 Blank x 1 Some x 7 <b>College</b> Yes x 1 <b>SEN Team</b> Yes x 1
Other areas.  Support inclusion / additional support funding for early years children with additional needs	<b>Yes - 10</b> <b>No - 1</b> <b>(although lots of comments without a Y/N answer)</b>	<b>Yes</b> Early Years (inc Nursery Schools) x 1 Secondary x 1 Special Schools x 7 SEN Team x 1 <b>No</b> Primary x 1

<u>High Needs Block 2020/21</u>			
<u>Summary Breakdown of 2020/21 HNB for Schools Forum</u>			
	£	£	2019/20 Comparison
			Budget £
Special Schools related budgets (inc. insurance). Now inclusive of funding for post-16 previously paid by separate grant		10,318,900	9,705,300
Agency Placements and High Needs Provision for pupils up to the age of 25 (including direct payments)		5,916,400	5,832,300
Early years additional support funding and Mainstream High Needs top up and direct SEN support funding		3,464,600	2,793,700
Alternative Provision (Central Hub, Behaviour Inclusion, Access to Education)		1,467,300	1,331,600
Resource Bases in mainstream schools:			
- Carden	256,500		157,300
- Hove Park and Longhill	502,500		316,900
- Swan Centre	336,800		318,500
- Bevendean Hearing Support Facility	184,900		130,800
		1,280,700	
		22,447,900	
Brighton and Hove Inclusion Support Services		2,456,500	2,312,300
SEN Interventions (PRESENS, Travellers, ECAR, Inclusion, Autism etc)		980,300	617,700
Contribution to therapy for SEN		147,400	137,300
Virtual School		443,000	440,200
Children with Medical Needs		573,100	529,900
DSG Recharges* (SEN team etc.):			
- SEN Team	548,400		537,300
- SEN Home to School Transport	131,900		96,700
		680,300	
Balance of Funding to be allocated		187,300	35,800
Other HNB Funding		40,200	56,400
<b>Total</b>		<b>27,956,000</b>	<b>25,350,000</b>
*DSG recharges represent areas where DSG is used to part fund the cost of LA functions			
Budgets for BHISS includes all areas previously separately identified under Learning Support Services			

**Brighton & Hove City Council****Meeting: Schools Forum****Date: 15 June 2020****Report of: Head of School Organisation****Subject: Contingency Funding and LTS/Maternity Schemes****Wards Affected: All****1. Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To seek the comments of the Schools Forum on proposals for the delegation of the balance of the contingency fund 2019/20 and the on-going provision of the Long Term Sickness and Maternity schemes.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To comment on the proposals for the allocation of contingency funding and the proposals to address the exiting of four schools from the LTS/Maternity schemes.

**3. Background and Information**

- 3.1 The contingency fund in 2019/20 was allocated £300k of funding but was left with an underspend at the end of the financial year of £119k. This has been carried forward as part of the central DSG underspend of £703k into 2020/21.
- 3.2 The impact of Covid-19 has meant that a further discussion on the use of this underspend could not take place as planned.
- 3.3 At the Schools Block Working Group meetings there was discussion about returning this unspent balance to schools (as it is directly de-delegated from schools' budgets in the first place). However, this was then re-considered due to the significant central overspend that the council has incurred in running the LTS and maternity scheme for nursery, primary and special schools.
- 3.4 One of the main concerns was that many schools would opt out of the scheme in 2020/21 due to the large increases in premiums used to start to address the deficit. With only a small number of schools opting out of the scheme it is not considered necessary to consider using the contingency funding element of the DSG underspend in this way.
- 3.5 As the contingency fund is de-delegated from primary and secondary school phases based on an amount per pupil, it is proposed that the sum of £119k is returned in the same proportions to how the de-delegation was initially applied. This was the principle discussed at a previous SBWG meeting.
- 3.6 The proposed allocation per phase is:

<b>Primary Total</b>	<b>£62,277</b>
<b>Secondary Total</b>	<b>£56,723</b>

- 3.7 The two 'insurance' schemes for long term sickness and maternity pay have been running at a deficit for several years and a detailed summary had been supplied to schools in March 2020.
- 3.8 At the outbreak of Covid-19 it was anticipated that several schools would opt out of the scheme and this would threaten the viability of the 'insurance' scheme and leave a deficit that would need to be settled.
- 3.9 Following the deadline to notify the council of changes to services being purchased by schools a total of four primary schools have decided to withdraw in 6 months' time. An analysis of the previous three years' allocations shows that none of those schools have contributed to the shortfall in the scheme.
- 3.10 It is therefore proposed that those schools do not need to make any contribution to the shortfall upon their departure.
- 3.11 In addition, it is proposed that £200k of the DSG carry forward from 2019/20 is used to reduce the overspend on LTS/Maternity with the balance being met from the increased premiums. The remaining DSG carry forward underspend will be put aside for the claw back of Early Years funding and Early Years pressures.
- 3.12 The scheme will need to be kept under review as it may become uneconomic to run should more schools leave. The SLA will also need to be reviewed to address the effect of a school withdrawing from the scheme who have made claims in excess of their premiums should the scheme be in deficit upon their withdrawal.