



NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SCHOOLS FORUM

Date: Thursday, 22 June 2017

Time: 1.45 pm

Place: LB 41 - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG

Members are requested to attend the above meeting to transact the following business

Governance Officer/Clerk to the Forum: Phil Wye Direct Dial: 0115 876 4637

AGENDA

Pages

1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2017, for confirmation	3 - 8
4	WORK PROGRAMME	9 - 10
5	PUPIL GROWTH CONTINGENCY FUND UPDATE Update by Lucy Juby, School Organisation	11 - 12
6	CONSULTATION ON THE FUNDING REQUIREMENTS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR PUPIL GROWTH Briefing note	13 - 16
7	SEND STRATEGIC REVIEW 2017-2022 Report of the Joint Directors of Education and the Corporate Director for Children and Adults	17 - 20
8	SCHOOL EXCLUSION - MULTI AGENCY EARLY INTERVENTION PROPOSAL Report of the Joint Directors of Education	21 - 24
9	SCHOOLS FORUM SUB GROUP - TERMS OF REFERENCE & FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME Report of the Head of Commercial Finance	25 - 30
10	2016/17 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - OUTTURN REPORT	31 - 46

Report of the Corporate Director for Children and Adults and the Chief
Finance Officer

IF YOU NEED ANY ADVICE ON DECLARING AN INTEREST IN ANY ITEM ON THE
AGENDA, PLEASE CONTACT THE GOVERNANCE OFFICER/CLERK TO THE FORUM
SHOWN ABOVE, IF POSSIBLE BEFORE THE DAY OF THE MEETING

CITIZENS ATTENDING MEETINGS ARE ASKED TO ARRIVE AT LEAST 15 MINUTES
BEFORE THE START OF THE MEETING TO BE ISSUED WITH VISITOR BADGES

CITIZENS ARE ADVISED THAT THIS MEETING MAY BE RECORDED BY MEMBERS
OF THE PUBLIC. ANY RECORDING OR REPORTING ON THIS MEETING SHOULD
TAKE PLACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S POLICY ON RECORDING AND
REPORTING ON PUBLIC MEETINGS, WHICH IS AVAILABLE AT
WWW.NOTTINGHAMCITY.GOV.UK. INDIVIDUALS INTENDING TO RECORD THE
MEETING ARE ASKED TO NOTIFY THE GOVERNANCE OFFICER/CLERK TO THE
FORUM SHOWN ABOVE IN ADVANCE.

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM

MINUTES of the meeting held at Loxley House, Nottingham on 23 February 2017 from 13.46 - 14.40

Membership

Present

Sian Hampton (Chair)
Judith Kemplay (Vice Chair)
Bev Angell
Caroline Caille
Sally Coulton
David Holdsworth
David Hooker
Andy Jenkins
Tracy Rees
James Strawbridge
Sheena Wheatley

Absent

Maria Artingstoll
David Blackley
Gary Holmes
Chris Manze
Janet Molyneux
Terry Smith
Marcus Wells
Tracey Ydlibi

Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Alistair Conquer	- Head of Educational Curriculum and Enrichment
Julie Corner	- Strategic Finance Business Partner
Pat Fielding	- Director of Education
Julia Holmes	- Senior Commercial Business Partner
Kathryn Stevenson	- Senior Commercial Business Partner
Ceri Walters	- Head of Commercial Finance
Alison Weaver	- Service Manager, Inclusive Education Service
Anna White	- Nottingham City Secondary Education Partnership
Michael Wilsher	- Inclusion Officer
Phil Wye	- Governance Officer

40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Maria Artingstoll
Gary Holmes
Janet Molyneux
Marcus Wells

41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

42 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

43 WORK PROGRAMME

The work programme was noted.

44 PROPOSED NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA UPDATE

Ceri Walters delivered a presentation on the proposed National Funding Formula, highlighting the following:

- (a) the Education Funding Agency (EFA) have confirmed that there will be a new Central School Services Block in 2018-19, meaning that the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will now be split into four blocks: Schools, Early Years, High Needs and the new block;
- (b) all schools will move to a hard funding formula in 2019-20. Prior to this there will be transitional funding available. The Schools Block will be ring-fenced in 2018-19 but there will be some limited flexibility to this;
- (c) the schools formula will comprise the 12 proposed factors, with an additional factor for mobility. In 2018-19 they will fund growth on the basis of historic spend;
- (d) funding for Looked After Children will no longer be allocated through the DSG anymore but will be transferred to Pupil Premium Plus. The Central School Services Block will have a per-pupil formula with an additional factor for deprivation;
- (e) the EFA are proposing to include a funding floor to limit overall reductions as a result of the formula, and a minimum funding guarantee as part of the transition towards the formula's implementation;
- (f) the Department for Education (DfE) have published each school's baseline funding for 2016/17 and illustrative funding if the formula was implemented in full without any transitional protections. The impact for Nottingham schools shows a total reduction of 2.6%, or an average reduction per pupil of £133.33. In real terms, bearing inflation in mind, this equates to an actual cut of 11.3%, or an average of £578.34 per pupil. 98% of Nottingham schools will see a reduction in funding;
- (g) the deadline for the consultation is 22 March 2017. The Local Authority is in consultation with parents and schools are encouraged to reply to the consultation independently;
- (h) as a part of the proposed school formula, there will continue to be a substantial deprivation factor to reach a broad group of disadvantaged children. The weighting of the low prior attainment factor will increase, as well as the total spend

on English as an Additional Language (EAL);

- (i) the stage 2 consultation on the High Needs funding formula is also taking place. When fully implemented, Nottingham City would see a £5.9m (20.5%) increase in high needs funding, which is the highest percentage increase nationally.

The Chair commended the LA for its distribution of letters to inform parents of the proposed formula changes and to encourage them to respond to the consultation.

The Vice-Chair proposed that the Forum write a collective response to the consultation, expressing dissatisfaction that every school in Nottingham City will be losing funding through the new Formula.

The Trade Unions representative confirmed that the school-based unions have collated data, and written to all ward councillors about how their schools will be affected. They have also written to local MPs, including Lillian Greenwood who is on the Select Committee for Education.

RESOLVED to

- (1) note the information and thank Ceri for the presentation;**
- (2) request a timeline for funding approvals at the next meeting, and confirm timely establishment of the finance sub-group;**
- (3) write a letter the EFA in response to their consultation on behalf of the Forum by the Chair, to be shared with members before sending.**

45 SECONDARY HIGH NEEDS DEVOLVED FUNDING PILOT

Anna White, Strategic Director, Nottingham City Secondary Education Partnership (NCSEP), introduced the report providing the Forum with the outcome on the consultation with secondary schools on the future use of High Needs funding ring fenced for pupils who are at risk of or already permanently excluded from mainstream education. Anna highlighted the following:

- (a) the original proposal was to devolve funding to all secondary schools to give them a greater role in commissioning alternative provision and services, to ensure quality and improve outcomes;
- (b) unfortunately not all schools have agreed to opt into the pilot, as they are subject to a clawback clause for exclusions post April 2016 and would receive no funds or have to pay funds back to the Local Authority. This is because these schools have already permanently excluded pupils during the current financial year, the costs of which go beyond the agreed available funding;
- (c) the level of permanent exclusion in Nottingham has been high for a number of years, peaking in 2014/15. There are currently 105 pupils on roll at Denewood Learning Centre and 143 on roll at Unity Learning Centre which is unsustainable;

The following points were raised by members of the Forum during the discussion which followed:

- (d) there was originally a proposal for a primary pilot in Clifton as well, but this never happened as the secondary school didn't want to be involved which was frustrating for the primary heads;
- (e) the secondary heads that have not opted into the pilot are not against its principles and do recognise that the number of permanent exclusions needs to reduce;
- (f) quality assurance of the pilot will be scrutinised in a termly report to the Finance Sub-Group of the Schools Forum;
- (g) the pilot appears to benefit the schools that exclude the least rather than those that exclude a lot, however it should be seen as something that will eventually benefit the entire city school population, rather than individual schools. This will be easier to realise if or when all schools are on board.

RESOLVED to

- (1) note that three trusts comprising of six secondary schools have accepted the Local Authority's offer of their share of High Needs funding based on the July 2016 Finance Model and SLA presented by the LA. This group will form the High Needs Exclusions Pilot and is made up of the Greenwood Dale Academies Trust, Bluecoat Academies Trust and the Trinity Catholic School. Funding will be released for this current financial year (2016/17) prior to the end of the financial year and for financial year 2017/18;**
- (2) note that at present not all schools could agree to the pilot, due to high exclusion rates and an exclusion cost recovery clawback clause, and some schools in the city are not incentivised to join under the current finance model;**
- (3) note that NCSEP and the LA will continue to work together to find a position where all secondary schools in the city will participate in these arrangements;**
- (4) note the reinstatement of the Finance Sub-Group of the Schools Forum and that NCSEP will be expected to provide a termly update on progress in relation to the pilot proposal.**

46 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FAIR ACCESS FUNDING

Michael Wilsher, Inclusion Officer, introduced the report notifying the Forum of additional funding for secondary Fair Access and an increase in funding from the 2017/18 financial year for primary and secondary Fair Access processes. Michael highlighted the following:

- (a) over the last 3 academic years there has been a significant increase in the number of cases considered through primary and secondary Fair Access

protocols. The complexity of support required for pupils has also increased;

- (b) primary Fair Access is managed by the Local Authority. There is a need to increase capacity to create a sufficient service and develop primary Fair Access processes in line with that available for secondary schools;
- (c) an analysis of Fair Access processes will take place by the end of this academic year, including a review of service delivery and costs to ensure value for money and quality of the service;

The following points were raised during the discussion which followed:

- (d) the amount of support required for primary schools is decided in discussion between the school and the Local Authority. This is for immediate support to ensure quick admission to the school;
- (e) from September 2017 there should be a long-term plan in place with a service commissioned with a contract awarded for at least 3 years;
- (f) most Fair Access cases at secondary level are out of education or at risk of permanent exclusion. At primary level most cases are for families fleeing domestic violence or children out of education. It is complex to unpick the reasons for the increase in cases, as there are many factors.

RESOLVED to

- (1) note additional funding for secondary Fair Access for the 2016/17 financial year of £100k;**
- (2) note the proposal to increase the annual primary Fair Access funding to £100k from the 2017/18 financial year and to carry over any remaining funding to support these processes up to a maximum of £40k;**
- (3) note the proposal to increase the annual secondary Fair Access funding to £300k from the 2017/18 financial year and to carry over any remaining funding to support these processes up to a maximum of £70k;**
- (4) note the proposal to continue to fund £57k each financial year from 2017/18 to support managed moves as part of the broader Fair Access process and as a strategy to reduce permanent exclusions. Funding will be based on actual expenditure, with any underspend being unearmarked and will not carry over;**
- (5) note the proposal that each financial year £25,000 from within the Statutory School Reserve (SSR) will be allocated for emergency expenditure incurred by primary and secondary Fair Access by the end of the academic year. Any underspend will be unearmarked within the SSR;**
- (6) note that the local authority will take a strategic decision on the long term support and structure of the primary and secondary Fair Access processes and support from September 2017 onwards. This will be subject to internal**

decision making processes, procurement regulations and approval as required.

SCHOOLS FORUM WORK PROGRAMME

Title of report		Report or presentation	Author – name, title, telephone number, email address
9 November 2017			
1.	De-Delegation Requests	Reports	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance Tel: 0115 8764128 Email: ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
2.	ESG Funding Requests	Report	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance Tel: 0115 8764128 Email: ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
3.	Consultation with Schools Forum on High Needs places	Report	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance Tel: 0115 8764128 Email: ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Page 9	Pupil Growth Contingency Fund for Secondary Schools	Report	Lucy Juby, Project Manager, School Organisation Team Tel: 0115 8765041 Email: lucy.juby@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Deadlines for submission of reports

Date of meeting	Draft reports (10.00 am)	Final reports (10.00 am)
9 November	12 October	30 October
7 December	16 November	27 November
18 January	14 December	8 January
15 February	25 January	5 February
19 April	21 March	9 April
21 June	31 May	11 June

This page is intentionally left blank

Pupil growth contingency fund - 2017/18 breakdown of schools due to receive funding

School	Expansion/bulge/ In year	Funding criteria	Amount £	Next pay month	Funding start date	Funding end date
Dunkirk Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2012	Sep-2018
Fernwood Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2021
Forest Fields Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2019
Glade Hill Primary	Bulge / Expansion TBC	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2016	Sep-2022
Glade Hill Primary	Bulge year	Teacher (full year)	30,555	Sep-2017	Sep-2016	Sep-2018
Glenbrook Academy	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2017
Huntingdon	Bulge / PAN increase	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2020
Mellers Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2016	Sep-2022
Middleton Primary	Bulge year	Teacher (full year)	30,555	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2017
Middleton Primary	Bulge year / Expansion TBC	Teacher (full year)	30,555	Sep-2017	Sep-2017	Sep-2017
Victoria Primary Academy	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2012	Sep-2018
Roslyn Primary Academy	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2018
Rufford Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2019
South Wilford	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2021
Sycamore Primary	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	36,841	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2018
Seely	Late admission	Teacher	17,824	Apr-2017	Apr-2017	Apr-2018
Victoria Primary School	In year admission	Staffing	13,686	Apr-2017	Apr-2017	Apr-2017
Djanogly Northgate Prim	In year admission	Staffing/utilities/classroo	71,156	May-2017	May-2017	One-off payment
Classroom set up						
Fernwood Primary	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2021
Glade Hill	Bulge / Expansion TBC	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2016	Sep-2022
Glenbrook Academy	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2014	Sep-2019
Heathfield Primary	Expansion	Classroom set up x2	16,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2020
Mellers Primary	Expansion	Classroom set up x4	32,000	Apr-2017	Sep-2016	Sep-2019
Victoria PA (was Riverside)	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2014	Sep-2018
Roslyn Park	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2017

Rufford	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2013	Sep-2019
South Wilford	Expansion	Classroom set up x1	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2015	Sep-2021

Additional funding for academies to fund full financial years

(April '17 – August '17)

Blue Bell Hill	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2014	Apr-2017
Djanogly Northgate	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2014	Apr-2017
Glenbrook	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2014	Apr-2018
Huntingdon	Bulge / PAN increase	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2016	Apr-2021
Victoria PA	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2015	Apr-2019
Rosslyn	Expansion	Staffing	24,440	Apr-2017	Apr-2015	Apr-2018
Sycamore	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2017	Apr-2014	Apr-2019
South Wilford	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	26,315	Apr-2018	Apr-2016	Apr-2022

Secondary Schools (TBC)

Trinity	Expansion	Staffing / utilities	63,156	Sep-2017	Sep-2017	Sep-2021
		Classroom set up	8,000	Sep-2017	Sep-2017	Sep-2021

TOTAL SPEND	1,020,224
17/18 fund	1,052,000
Additional budget	300,000
16/17 C/F balance	10,322
TOTAL FUND	1,362,322
REMAINING BALANCE	342,098

BRIEFING NOTE

TO: Schools Forum

Consultation on the funding requirements of secondary schools for pupil growth

Purpose

The purpose of this briefing note is to notify Schools Forum of the requirement to review and update the Pupil Growth Contingency Criteria to include provision for the funding of secondary school pupil growth.

The current pupil growth criteria sets out how primary schools are to be funded for pupil growth. The City's significant pupil growth is now impacting on capacity requirements in the secondary sector. Trinity Academy will be the first secondary school to increase capacity from September 2017, following rebuilding work. Therefore, the pupil growth funding criteria needs to be reviewed / amended as a priority, to ensure it is relevant and appropriate for secondary school pupil growth.

To assist the LA in developing the criteria for secondary schools the LA is asking Schools Forum to give their opinions on what principles they think the funding of secondary schools should be based. This will be considered and will feed into a report to Schools Forum on 9 November 2017, seeking approval of a proposed revised criteria recommended by the LA.

Secondary School Places – background and requirements

The increased demand for school places is moving from the primary phase into the secondary phase. City secondary schools have historically runs with a significant surplus capacity. However, the growth in both birth rate and new arrivals to the city has resulted in a projected overall deficit of secondary school place provision. The primary phase demand has seen the Council deliver an additional 4000 primary school places, though a capital programme of approx. £40m. This has been achieved through a combination of adding capacity to existing buildings, refurbishment of mothballed premises and delivery of 3 new build schools sites. The delivery of the required secondary capacity is potentially far more challenging and complex.

The table below shows the projected number of pupils by year group (this excludes post 16 requirements) set against the current overall capacity of the city secondary estate and the annual Year 7 admission number (PAN – final column)

Pupil Age	11	12	13	14	15			
Year	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Capacity	PAN
2016/17	2830	2851	2779	2528	2527	13515	15790	3070
2017/18	3084	2832	2851	2772	2531	14070	15645	3070
2018/19	3163	3084	2832	2851	2772	14702	15500	3080
2019/20	3285	3163	3084	2832	2851	15215	15475	3080
2020/21	3460	3285	3163	3084	2832	15824	15450	3080
2021/22	3466	3460	3285	3163	3084	16458	15450	3080
2022/23	3564	3466	3460	3285	3163	16938	15500	3090
2023/24	3524	3564	3466	3460	3285	17299	15500	3090
2024/25	3451	3524	3564	3466	3460	17465	15500	3090
2025/26	3299	3451	3524	3564	3466	17304	15500	3090

The shaded cells in the table illustrate where projected demand outstrips capacity.

Summary of current situation

- These projections suggest that there is a need for the city to provide between 15 – 17 additional forms of entry as a minimum, to meet peak demand by 2022.
- There is potential for this need to increase further, dependent upon place planning demands in the wide County conurbation.
- To date, 5 forms of additional entry have been identified as available: 1 form from Sept 17 (Trinity) and 4 forms from Sept 18 (NUAST – subject to approval).

Context of the pupil growth funding model

As part of the National Funding Formula proposals The Government are proposing that in the financial year 2018/19, pupil growth will be funded based on 2017/18 historic spend. When this has happened in the past, the LA have been funded based on the budget rather than the expenditure.

As a result of the second stage consultation on the national funding formula not being published, there is currently no clear guidance on how the growth funding will work from the financial year 2019/20. However, based on the proposals set out by the Government in the Schools National Funding Formula – Consultation Stage 2, from the financial year 2019/20 the Government are proposing to fund pupil growth based on lagged pupil growth. The lagged growth method would count all pupil number increases in every school nationally, at a year-group level, based on the 2 previous years and use this to calculate the total amount of pupil growth in each local authority area. The Consultation Stage 2 states that this could involve counting pupil growth only above a set threshold, to ensure we are counting only growth that is likely to result in an extra class, rather than lower levels of growth that are more likely to be accommodated in existing classes. The total amount of funding available nationally for growth would be allocated to local authorities on a per-pupil basis, based on the distribution of the lagged pupil growth across the country.

As the LA does not know how much funding it will be receiving for pupil growth from the financial year 2019/20, the amount that will be allocated to an expanding school cannot be quantified. Moving forward, the LA will need to manage the growth funding they

receive from year-to-year and review the pupil growth contingency criteria when clear guidance is released from the Department of Education.

Therefore, Schools Forum representatives are being consulted to share their views on setting the pupil growth contingency funding criteria for secondary schools in the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19 only.

Author

Lucy Juby

☎ 01158 765041

✉ lucy.juby@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Other colleagues who have provided input:

Julia Holmes

☎ 01158 763733

✉ julia.holmes@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

13 June 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM - 22nd June 2017

Title of paper:	SEND strategic review 2017-2022
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Pat and Sarah Fielding, Joint Directors of Education Alison Michalska, Corporate Director for Children and Adults
Report author(s) and contact details:	Alison Weaver, Inclusive Education Service Janine Walker, Inclusion and Disability
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Kathryn Stevenson
Summary	
<p>The DfE requires all LAs, in consultation with stakeholders to carry out a strategic review of their high needs provision.</p> <p>The LA proposes to appoint experienced SEN professionals to work with schools, children and families and other partners to develop a shared SEN Strategy that will inform provision for children and young people with SEND in the city over the next 5 years.</p> <p>The review will be conducted during the financial year 2017-18, so that initial plans are in place for implementation from September 2018</p>	
Recommendation(s):	
1	That forum notes the proposal to develop an SEND Strategy 0-25, in line with DfE guidance for funding
2	To note that funding will be allocated to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase capacity to ensure high quality and collaborative implementation of the review - facilitate consultation with all partners, children and families - collation and analysis of relevant data
3	To note that the consultation and review process will ensure robust links to the high needs funding reforms, current activity to implement the SEND reforms, whole life disability review and capital programmes activity

1 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 These recommendations will enable the LA and partners to meet statutory duties in terms of strategic planning and provision for children and young people with SEND

2 BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

- 2.1 In December 2016, the DfE allocated funding to each LA to carry out a strategic review of their high needs provision. LA's are required to prioritise this review and planning activity working with schools, colleges and other providers and with parents and young people.
- 2.2 Local authorities should use the funding to increase their capacity so that their review and planning of provision is high quality and collaborative.
- 2.3 The review will link with neighbouring authorities.
- 2.4 Local authorities should publish the outcomes of the review in the form of strategic plans to demonstrate transparency and accountability.

- 2.5 This review will build on the work currently being undertaken as part of the SEND reforms and whole life disability review
- 2.6 The review will take into account:
- the high needs funding reforms which are currently under consultation
 - the capital allocations for SEND provision announced in March 2017
 - Place planning and sufficiency data
 - Gaps identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Analysis

3 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 There are no other options as to complete the work within existing resources would be contrary to DfE guidance and would limit the scope of the review.

4 OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

- 4.1 An agreed strategic vision for the city developed through a number of task and finish groups comprising schools, LA staff, parents and carers and other partners
- 4.2 Consultation and communication with all stakeholders, through a range of events and media.
- 4.3 A 5 year strategic plan that will inform allocation of SEND commissioning activity to 2022
- 4.4 As part of the strategic plan there will be a clear outcomes framework to support monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of provision and practice developed through implementation of the strategy.

5 FINANCE COMMENTS (INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)

- 5.1 On 14 December 2016, the DfE published their response to the stage 1 high needs high needs funding formula consultation and new proposals for consultation – stage 2. Alongside this they announced additional revenue funding in 2016-17 to help local authorities conduct a strategic review of their special educational provision and/or implement any changes, plus the intention to create a new special provision capital fund.
- 5.2 Nottingham City's allocation of the high needs strategic planning fund is £0.142m. This grant is not ring-fenced and approval to spend will be required from the Portfolio Holder for Schools.
- 5.3 This paper outlines the local authority's overall planned approach to conducting the high needs strategic planning review.
- 5.4 The DfE envisage that this strategic planning should take into account the level of high needs funding that the LA expects to receive in future under the new high needs national funding formula.
- 5.5 Under the proposed national high needs formula, which is the subject to the outcome of the stage 2 consultation, Nottingham would see a £5.9m increase (20.5%) in high needs funding once fully implemented. However, there is a proposed funding floor on high needs to ensure that no LA will see a reduction compared to their spending baseline. To make this affordable there is a 3% cap on gains which will limit our annual funding increases to around £0.8m for the first 2

years. There is no firm commitment to a level of increase from 2020/21 as this is subject to decisions in a future spending review.

- 5.6 In our stage 2 consultation response we have argued that the balance of the high needs proposals is too far skewed towards stability to the detriment of fairness. In addition, the way the cap has been designed unfairly and disproportionately penalises local authorities that are due to gain most under the new formula. We believe scaling the gains in proportion to the amount by which LAs are under-funded according to the formula, rather than a straight 3% limit on gains would be a much fairer approach.
- 5.7 Nottingham City's allocation of the special provision capital fund is £0.420m a year for 3 years from 2018/19.

6 LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT COMMENTS (INCLUDING RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES, AND LEGAL, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS)

6.1 Not applicable

7 HR ISSUES

7.1 Not applicable

8 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 Has the equality impact of the proposals in this report been assessed?

No

An EIA is not required because this report does not approve the establishment of new services.

(Please explain why an EIA is not necessary)

Yes

9 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

9.1 None

10 PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

- 10.1 High feeds national funding formula and other reforms consultation – December 2016 2017
High Needs Strategic Planning Fund Guidance DfE 2016
Capital Allocations and planning for pupils with SEND 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM – 22 June 2017

Title of paper:	School Exclusions – Multi –Agency Early Intervention Proposal
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Pat and Sarah Fielding, Director of Education
Report author(s) and contact details:	Nick Lee, Head of Access and Inclusion
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Kathryn Stevenson – Strategic Finance Alison Weaver – SEN Advisor
Summary: The overall rates of fixed term and permanent exclusions from Nottingham schools have risen above national rates and those of the majority of our statistical neighbours. The trend is increasing. The financial cost of managing the current approach is unsustainable, as well as failing to produce positive outcomes for increasing numbers of our children and young people. This report outlines a proposal for a multi-agency group to form and develop proposals for an early intervention pathway with the aim of identifying, at an early stage, children at risk of future exclusion. The group will also develop a strategy, based upon evidence of effective practice, to promote interventions that enables lower exclusion rates and reverse the current upward trend, with the long term aim of ensuring more pupils maintain places in their mainstream school and achieve better educational outcomes.	
Recommendation(s):	
1	Forum notes and supports the proposal to develop a multi-agency working group which will produce a fully costed plan for ensuring that an early intervention behaviour pathway is implemented to reduce the number of fixed term and permanent exclusions and reverse the current upward trend. The pathway will cover all key stages in order to ensure a sustainable approach to managing behaviours and/or special educational needs that are currently resulting in exclusion from mainstream schools and academies.

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1** The rate of permanent exclusions from Nottingham schools and academies is currently twice that of the national rate and higher than all but one of Nottingham's statistical neighbour group.
- 1.2** The exclusion trend over the previous five years shows an increasing rate and one that is accelerating.
- 1.3** Increased financial resources invested across the city, which has primarily being used to increase the capacity of PRU/Alternative Provision places, has failed to result in a reduction of numbers being excluded or reverse the trend of rising permanent exclusions. The funding that has been allocated to support the costs of Alternative Provision to 2021/22, based upon current spending profile, will be exhausted during 2018/19. An alternative approach to reverse the current trend is essential.
- 1.6** Whilst in certain individual cases positive outcomes are achieved following exclusion from mainstream settings, it is clear that access to quality post 16 education and training is less likely for those pupils who have a history of school exclusion.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1** The proposal is that a working group drawn from a multi-agency background is formed during June/July 2017 to develop a fully costed action plan to ensure an early intervention approach is embedded across city schools and academies. The Working Group will be headed by the City Council's Head of Access and Inclusion, and include representatives and expertise from primary and secondary schools/academies and PRU, Strategic Finance, Social Care/Early Help/Priority families, Behaviour Support, Educational Psychology, YOT, the Police, Targeted Youth Support, CAMHS, Lifeline Drugs and Explorer Families support agencies.
- 2.2** The working group will draw upon existing planning, evidence and outcomes of those secondary academies that have received the previous devolved funding; in addition to work that is currently being led in the primary phase by Educational Psychology and Behaviour Support to build capacity and effective early identification of pupils requiring specialist provision in the long term. The five year SEND strategy review that is due to commence will be fully referenced in the and aligned to the work of this group.
- 2.3** Drawing upon the, in principle, offer of the new Chief Constable to provide dedicated police officer support to schools, the Early Intervention plan will be able to strategically link issues such as drug misuse, knife crime and gang related activity to the exclusions agenda.
- 2.4** A key element of the plan will be to ensure that early identification and intervention is linked to improved transition planning, particularly at Key Stage 3, where there is currently work being undertaken by the Education Improvement board
- 2.5** A key strand of work will be to ensure that the work of the PRU is supported in developing effective reintegration strategies to ensure that the PRU operates on a "revolving door" model, rather than a final destination for excluded pupils
- 2.6** Project management resource has been identified within the Access and Inclusion Service to enable scoping and initial management of the development of the working group. As the plan emerges, longer term resource implications will be identified and require costed solutions.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1** None.

4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

- 4.1** A fully costed action plan that identifies evaluation methodology, performance indicators and key outcomes.

5. FINANCE COMMENTS (INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)

- 5.1** At the current level of permanent exclusions, around £2.4m per annum is required from the DSG reserve to supplement the annual high needs budget allocation. As at 1 April 2017, there is £3.827m remaining ring-fenced in the DSG reserve to support the costs of alternative provision to 2021/22. If recent trends continue, this ring-

fenced amount will be exhausted during 2018/19 leaving a funding shortfall in that year.

- 5.2 Proposals and anticipated outcomes identified by the new working group will need to be factored into a revised financial projection. This will feed into the exercise to update the risk register associated with the uncommitted DSG reserve balance.
- 5.3 It is essential that there is a robust business case associated with any new proposals, providing evidence that the additional spend incurred will reduce exclusions and the associated provision costs resulting in an overall saving.
- 5.4 It is anticipated that the costs will be met by a number of funding sources including the SEND strategic review grant, the funding ring-fenced in the DSG reserve for alternative provision costs, and funding that may be provided by partners. The costed action plan will identify the appropriate funding source specific to each element.

6. **LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT COMMENTS (INCLUDING RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES, AND LEGAL, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS)**

None.

7. **HR ISSUES**

None

8. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)



The final action plan will undergo a full EIA

Due regard should be given to the equality implications identified in the EIA.

9. **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION**

None.

10. **PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM - 22 JUNE 2017

Title of paper:	SCHOOLS FORUM SUB GROUP – TERMS OF REFERENCE & FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Alison Michalska, Corporate Director for Children and Adults
Report author(s) and contact details:	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance 01158 764 128 ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Sarah Molyneux Solicitor and Legal Service Manager 01158 764 335 sarah.molyneux@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Lynn Robinson HR Business Partner 01158 764 3605 lynne.robinson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Summary	
At the Schools Forum (SF) meeting on 23 February 2017 it was agreed that the Terms of Reference for a Schools Forum Sub Group (SFSG) would be established to formalise the requirements and membership of this group and a timetable of budget activity be presented for consideration by the Sub Group.	
This report sets out those requirements and membership.	
Recommendation(s):	
1	To approve the SFSG's Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A .
2	To approve the membership of the SFSG for financial year 2017/18 detailed in paragraph 2.2.
3	To agree at least one further member of SF from the secondary sector for the SFSG.
4	To note the work programme in Appendix B for 2017/18 which has required 2 SFSG meetings in accordance with other activities to ensure a robust budget setting process.

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 The recommendation will support the establishment and use of the SFSG on a more formal basis, undertaking the financial reviews required to support the development of school budgets. This group have no formal powers and are set up as a consultative group of the SF.

2. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

- 2.1 During the last few years a number of financial issues have arisen which have required a more detailed discussion with SF e.g. the implementation of the National Funding Formula, and the use of the SFSG in these instances has enabled:
- a detailed analysis/discussion of these issues to be undertaken;
 - the ability to undertake detailed consultation regarding budget issues;
 - a more detailed understanding of the budget to be gained by SF members and
 - recommendations to be presented back to SF that have been agreed with their representatives. This prevents SF from having to undertake lengthy detailed operational discussions ensuring that SF time is focused at more strategic educational issues.

2.2 Based on the discussions at SF the 2017/18 SF members assigned to the SFSG will be:

- Sian Hampton – Head - Secondary sector and Chair of SFSG
- Judith Kemplay – Head - Primary Sector
- James Strawbridge – Governor Primary sector
- Janet Molyneux – Business Manager – Primary sector

The group will also include Local Authority Finance Officers and, where appropriate, either other officers or Head Teachers.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Not establishing a SFSG would prevent the detailed discussions required on certain budget issues to be undertaken.

4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

4.1 To ensure that SF have the assurance that challenge and understanding of decisions being taken at SF has been achieved.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY)

5.1 The formal establishment of the SFSG will enable detailed budget discussions to be undertaken with members of SF. This reduced group size will facilitate more robust discussions ensuring the budgets set support value for money.

5.2 **Appendix B** sets out a number of areas requiring SFSG focus for the financial year 2017/18 in the context of other internal and external deadlines/activities and the required dates of those meetings.

5.3 These discussions will ensure budget construction is developed in accordance with the latest Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS)

6.1 There are no legal implications arising from the content of this report.

7. HR ISSUES

7.1 None

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 An EIA is not needed as the report does not contain new or changing policies or proposals or financial decisions

9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

9.1 None

10. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

10.1 Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Budget 2016/17 – 8 December 2016

10.2 Schools Forum – Central Expenditure Budget 2016/17 – 19 January 2017

10.3 DfE - Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2017.

**Schools Forum Sub Group (SFSG)
Terms of Reference**

1 The role of the (SFSG) is:

- 1.1 To act as a consultative group on all financial matters relating to schools and any wider education issues referred to it by the Schools Forum (SF).

Financial matters include areas such as the school funding formula, benchmarking analysis, review of use of reserves and any other financial issues that may require consultation with the group on behalf of SF.

2 Appointment of SFSG:

- 2.1 The membership of SFSG will align to financial years and the budget cycle. The membership and Chair of the group will be agreed by SF and members can remain on the SFSG for consecutive terms.

- 2.1 The membership of the group will not exceed 6 and the representatives will need to cover Primary Maintained (if applicable), Primary Academy, Secondary Maintained (if applicable) and Secondary Academy.

- 2.2 Chair of Schools Forum will be Chair of the SFSG.

3 Meetings

- 3.1 Finance officers will arrange, attend and set the agendas in consultation with the Chair of SFSG. There will be meetings where the Finance Officers request the attendance of other Local Authority officers and Head Teachers which are deemed appropriate to facilitate discussions. This will be after consultation with the Chair of the SFSG.

- 3.2 The agenda and supporting papers will be issued at least 3 working days before the meeting. The purpose and outcomes required from the meeting will be made clear on the agenda to enable the meeting to be as efficient and effective as possible.

- 3.3 Members are required to accommodate the meetings to ensure a balanced discussion is undertaken. No substitutes will be required and meeting dates will be issued with at least 4 academic weeks notice however, there may be exceptional circumstances where this timeline is not achievable.

- 3.4 In a majority of cases the meetings will be no more than 2 hours.

Meeting Date		Requirement
22 June 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016/17 Outturn Report/Reserves update • Discussion on pupil growth principles for secondary schools. This is to obtain Schools Forums views on what they think secondary schools should be funded once the increase in pupils feeds through to secondary schools. A paper will then be brought to Schools Forum on 9 November 2017 amending the pupil growth criteria to include funding for secondary school expansions.
W/C 10 th July 2017	Sub Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Sub-group meeting laying out the proposed changes to the formula and ask for the sub-groups opinions on the proposals.
11 th September 2017	Sub Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of formula SG meeting. • ESG replacement funding – to include managers of services. • Central expenditure funding – to include managers of services.
15 September 2017	Gov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation document must be completed
18 September 2017	Deadline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify schools on Scene of the consultation and ask for responses by 13 October 2017
9 November 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De-delegation requests • ESG funding requests • Revision of the pupil growth criteria • Consult with Schools Forum on high needs places
7 December 2017	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Formula changes 2018/19 report • Pupil Growth Contingency Fund request for 2018/19 • Central Expenditure requests
18 January 2018	SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools Budget Report 2018/19

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM - 22 JUNE 2016

Title of paper:	2016/17 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - OUTTURN REPORT
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Alison Michalska, Corporate Director for Children and Adults Geoff Walker, Chief Finance Officer
Report author(s) and contact details:	Ceri Walters, Head of Commercial Finance 01158 764 128 ceri.walters@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Sarah Molyneux Legal Service Manager and Solicitor 01158 764 335 sarah.molyneux@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
Summary This report sets out the 2016/17 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) outturn and the updated reserve balance.	
Recommendation(s):	
1	To note that the 2016/17 financial outturn position of the DSG was an underspend of £1.464m and the reasons for the material underspend are set out in Table 2 .
2	To note that this under spend has been allocated back to the Statutory Schools Reserve (SSR) resulting in a closing balance of £11.101m for 2016/17, as per Table 3 .
3	To note that the uncommitted balance on the SSR balance is £5.721m , as per Table 4 .

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 Enabling the formal monitoring of progress against the 2016/17 DSG budget.
- 1.2 Confirm the impact on the SSR as a result of the 2016/17 outturn.

2. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

- 2.1 The 2016/17 initial schools budget totalled £243.280m and gained approvals throughout the appropriate budget process. This budget was later confirmed at £243.076m.

2.2 The initial DSG allocations changed as pupil numbers and grant values become confirmed and the full impact of academisations are known. These figures are reported by the Education funding Agency (EFA).

Table 1 below provides a summary of these budgets including the actual spend.

TABLE 1: 2016/17 DSG FUNDING UPDATES				
	Budget as at April 2016 £m	Final Budget £m	Actual Spend £m	(Under)/ Over Spend £m
Budgets	230.354	233.526	232.643	(0.883)
Headroom		(0.009)	0.012	0.021
Central Expenditure	13.876	10.510	9.908	(0.602)
Sub Total	244.230	244.027	242.563	(1.464)
Less: Funding not included in DSG settlement	(0.951)	(0.951)	(0.951)	-
TOTAL	243.280	243.076	241.612	(1.464)

2.3 The total underspend of £1.464m has been allocated back to the SSR. Some of the under spend is ring fenced in accordance with Department for Education (DfE) guidelines or approvals at Schools Forum (SF).

2.4 **Table 2** provides a high-level summary of the material variances that contribute to the total underspend of £1.464m, with explanations and a comparison with 2015/16.

TABLE 3: MATERIAL BUDGET VARIANCES			
	(Under)/ Over Spend 2015/16 £m	(Under)/ Over Spend 2016/17 £m	
3 & 4 year old Pupil Premium	(0.278)	0.034	Funding is lagged and the adjustment is reflected in future years allocations.
BSF slippage	(0.619)	(0.582)	Slippage in capital programme now reflected in the 2017/18 budget.
Pupil growth slippage	(0.099)	(0.304)	Annual review undertaken in each year.
Unallocated HN Level 5+		(0.072)	Demand driven.
Early years		(0.430)	Underspend due to: 1. £0.246m in year adjustment on 2 year old funding. 2. £0.184m demand driven.
Early Years Contingency	(0.125)	(0.071)	Demand driven.
Early Years for PVI's		0.155	Demand driven.
Exclusions	(0.281)	0.140	Primary and secondary exclusions.
Home Tuition contingency	(0.100)	(0.035)	Not budgeted in 2017/18 as HT budget reflects actual activity.
Special School & Special Resource Unit top up's	(0.166)	(0.165)	In year adjustments. In 2017/18, budget is based on all places being filled.
Special Education Needs	(0.116)	(0.075)	Staffing vacancy levels higher in year. 2017/18 budget based on 2016/17 levels.
Headroom	(0.143)		Unallocated balance of final settlement.
Cost of vulnerable pupils	0.322	0.164	Increase in complexity of Children in Care and growth in population. The budget for 2017/18 is based on 2016/17 levels; this may create a risk for 2017/18.
Cross Border Top ups	0.385	-	Demand driven increase, budgeted for 2017/18.
Hard to place primary pupils		(0.036)	Demand driven. 2017/18 budget is set in accordance with exempt schools forum report dated 23 Feb 2017.
Copyright licences VAT reclaim		(0.034)	Reclaimed VAT for copyright licences.
TOTAL MATERIAL UNDERSPENDS	(1.220)	(1.311)	

2.5 The SSR balance as at 1 April 2016 was £14.260m, after in year movements and commitments the unearmarked balance is £5.721m.

2.6 **Table 3** below sets out:

- The expected position of the reserve;
- The actual position and;
- The uncommitted balance based on current approvals.

TABLE 3: RESERVE ANALYSIS	
	Actual £m
Opening Balance as at 1 April 2016*	(14.260)
Less: 2016/17 Commitments (see Appendix A)	4.208
Add: 2016/17 Under spends (See Table 3)	(1.464)
Closing Balance as at 31 March 2017	(11.516)
Less: Future Commitments (see Appendix A)	5.795
Uncommitted Balance as at a 1 April 2017	(5.721)

Appendix A sets out the commitments/ring fenced funding from the SSR resulting in an **unearmarked balance of £5.721m.**

- 2.7 The uncommitted element of the SSR is 2.36% of the 2016/17 DSG budget; this was 1.7% as at 31 March 2016. There is no statutory requirement for the levels of this reserve however; this percentage does align with the Local Authorities Medium Term Financial Strategy that is between 3-5%.
- 2.8 All recommendations within this report align to the Schools and Early Years Financial Regulations 2017. Future use of the reserve needs to align to the following expenditure categories set out in **Table 4.**

TABLE 4: EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES

HIGH NEEDS BUDGET

Top-up funding – maintained schools
Top-up funding – academies, free schools and colleges
Top-up and other funding – non-maintained and independent providers
Additional high needs targeted funding for mainstream schools and academies
SEN support services
Hospital education services
Other alternative provision services
Support for inclusion
Special schools and Pupil Referral Units (PRU's) in financial difficulty
PFI/ BSF costs at special schools and AP/ PRUs
Direct payments (SEN and disability)
Carbon reduction commitment allowances (PRUs)

EARLY YEARS BUDGET

Central expenditure on children under 5

CENTRAL PROVISION WITHIN SCHOOLS BUDGET

Contribution to combined budgets
School admissions
Servicing of schools forums
Termination of employment costs
Falling Rolls Fund
Capital expenditure from revenue (CERA)
Prudential borrowing costs
Fees to independent schools without SEN
Equal pay - back pay
Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes
SEN transport
Exceptions agreed by Secretary of State
Other Items

2.9 A risk register needs establishing with the Schools Forum Sub Group by September 2017.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 No other options were considered as part of this report.

4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

4.1 To provide SF with the 2016/17 outturn position and to confirm the opening balance of the SSR for 2017/18.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)

5.1 This report contains financial implications.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS)

6.1 The current law in force in this area is the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2017. Spend from the SSR needs to align with the requirements of the Regulations.

7. HR ISSUES

7.1 Not applicable

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 An EIA is not needed as the report does not contain proposals or financial decisions.

Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)

No

x

Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached

Due regard should be given to the equality implications identified in the EIA.

9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

9.1 None

10. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

10.1 Schools Forum 21 April 2016 – Alternative Provision Model 2016/17

10.2 Schools Forum 19 January 2017 – Schools Budget 2017/18

2016/17+ RESERVE COMMITMENTS						
No		Date Approved	Funding Narrative	2016/17 £m	2017/18 £m	Other Comments
1	Re-phased BSF Wave 5 funding	29 March 2012 - Agenda Item 12-03-10		0.620	0.582	2016/17 spend is carried forward from 2017/18 underspends.
2	Development of Modern Languages and International Education	29 March 2012 - Agenda Item 12-03-07	The retention of a post responsible for International Dimension and Modern Languages as a means of providing schools with the necessary expertise and support to develop their curriculum and external outlook.	0.100 0.040		No further underwrites will be requested. Slippage into 2016/17.
3	Increased capacity at Westbury School	18 July 2013 - Agenda Item 7	The Local Authority (LA) has increasingly limited capacity in specialist maintained provision for pupils with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties whose needs cannot be met within mainstream schools. £0.094m will be required to fund a modular building to accommodate 16 additional learners at Westbury.	0.018		Slippage into 2016/17.
4	Sustainable Schools Co-ordinator (Sep 14 - Aug 16)	26 August 2013 - Agenda Item 7	The funding will enabled the implementation of technical and behavioural change measures, coupled with teaching from foundation aged children upwards and advice sessions for adults, using available data, over a six month period the project has reported the following savings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £42,000 energy savings pro rata inclusive of CRC • 132 tonnes of CO₂ savings pro rata 	0.034		Service now ceased.
No		Date	Funding Narrative	2016/17	2017/18	Other Comments

		Approved		£m	£m	
5	Education Service Grant reduction	23 Feb 2012	Aligns to academising schools and the impact to LA services.	0.484 0.137	0.347	Academisation of schools late in year affects achievement of service reduction.
6	Inter authority recoupment	DfE financial regs	This relates to children who cross borders to attend special schools. There will be no new commitments associated with this based on the new funding formula and any future charges will relate to outstanding charges from other authorities.	0.240 0.111	0.129	Under spend carried forward to support future liabilities.
7	Contribution to Nottingham Safeguarding Children's Board	5 Dec 2013 - Agenda Item 6	Approve an annual contribution of £13,000 from the Dedicated Schools Grant to the NCSCB on an ongoing basis to ensure the shortfall between the income generated by the Schools and Education Safeguarding Team through the safeguarding training and the £33,000 committed is met.	0.013	0.013	
8	Additional growth funding	16 Oct 2014 – Agenda item 10	To fund the shortfall of funding required so support the growth of school places in 2014/15.	0.099 0.335	0.304	Slippage of £0.099m from 2014/15 into 2015/16 as per report to Schools Forum 23 April 2015. Underspend included in £5.815m.
9	Secondary Fair Access	5 Nov 2015 – Agenda item 7	NCSEP Fair Access funding support and managed move strand	0.157	0.057	
10	St Mary's temporary classroom funding	21 January 2016 – Agenda item 6	Funding to support temporary accommodation at Bulwell St Mary's CE Primary School	0.052	0.217	Funding period is Sept 2015 to July 2020.
11	Alternative Provision – New model & contingency (£0.750m)	21 April 2016 – Agenda item	New model for alternative provision for Nottingham. Funding to support 2016/17 to 2021/22.	5.565 2.488	3.827	

No		Date Approved	Funding Narrative	2016/17 £m	2017/18 £m	Other Comments
12	Early Years Pupil Premium	DfE financial regs	This unallocated amount may be clawed back by the EFA	0.278	0.278	
14	Funding to support an expanding school – exempt report		Funding to support an expanding school	0.146		
15	Forest Fields Primary business rates adjustment 15/16 & 16/17	DfE financial regs	Material in year business rate changes in accordance with financial regulations.	0.024	0.016	
16	Heathfield Primary business rates adjustment 16/17	DfE financial regs	Material in year business rate changes in accordance with financial regulations.	0.033		
17	Fair Access contingency	23 Feb 2017 Agenda item 7	Contingency for emergency expenditure incurred by primary & secondary in year		0.025	This is on on going annual commitment with any in year under usage being allocated back to the SSR.
TOTAL COMMITTED			Estimate at 2014/15 outturn Estimate at 2015/16 outturn 2016/17 outturn commitment	4.212 7.516 4.208	5.795	

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum

22 June 2017

2016/17 Outturn

Key points

- Overall budget allocation for 2016/17 was **£243.076m.**
- Underspend of £1.464m – 0.6% of total budget.
- Underspend allocated back to the reserve.
- Opening balance of the reserve was **£14.260m.**
- Uncommitted balance is **£5.721m.**

Underspend analysis

TABLE 3: MATERIAL BUDGET VARIANCES

	(Under)/ Over Spend 2015/16 £m	(Under)/ Over Spend 2016/17 £m	
3 & 4 year old Pupil Premium	(0.278)	0.034	Funding is lagged and the adjustment is reflected in future years allocations.
BSF slippage	(0.619)	(0.582)	Slippage in capital programme now reflected in the 2017/18 budget.
Pupil growth slippage	(0.099)	(0.304)	Annual review undertaken in each year.
Unallocated HN Level 5+		(0.072)	Demand driven.
Early years		(0.430)	Underspend due to: 1. £0.246m in year adjustment on 2 year old funding. 2. £0.184m demand driven.
Early Years Contingency	(0.125)	(0.071)	Demand driven.
Early Years for PVI's		0.155	Demand driven.
Exclusions	(0.281)	0.140	Primary and secondary exclusions.
Home Tuition contingency	(0.100)	(0.035)	Not budgeted in 2017/18 as HT budget reflects actual activity.
Special School & Special Resource Unit top up's	(0.166)	(0.165)	In year adjustments. In 2017/18, budget is based on all places being filled.
Special Education Needs	(0.116)	(0.075)	Staffing vacancy levels higher in year. 2017/18 budget based on 2016/17 levels.
Headroom	(0.143)		Unallocated balance of final settlement.
Cost of vulnerable pupils	0.322	0.164	Increase in complexity of Children in Care and growth in population. The budget for 2017/18 is based on 2016/17 levels; this may create a risk for 2017/18.
Cross Border Top ups	0.385	-	Demand driven increase, budgeted for 2017/18.
Hard to place primary pupils		(0.036)	Demand driven. 2017/18 budget is set in accordance with exempt schools forum report dated 23 Feb 2017.
Copyright licences VAT reclaim		(0.034)	Reclaimed VAT for copyright licences.
TOTAL MATERIAL UNDERSPENDS	(1.220)	(1.311)	

Reserve Summary

TABLE 3: RESERVE ANALYSIS

	Actual £m
Opening Balance as at 1 April 2016	(14.260)
Less: 2016/17 Commitments	4.208
Add: 2016/17 Under spends	(1.464)
Closing Balance as at 31 March 2017	(11.516)
Less: Future Commitments	5.795
Uncommitted Balance as at a 1 April 2017	(5.721)

Next steps

- Review the risk register with the SF Sub Group
- Impact of future risks on the reserve.
- Strategy for further use – bigger picture.

Report recommendations

To note:

- That the outturn position was an underspend of £1.464m against a budget of £243.076m.
- The under spend has been allocated back to the Statutory Schools Reserve (SSR) resulting in a closing balance of £11.516m for 2016/17.
- That the **uncommitted balance** on the SSR balance is **£5.721m**.