

**Total Membership 25**  
**The Forum is quorate if at least 40% (10) of the members are present**



## London Borough of Waltham Forest SCHOOLS FORUM

Day/Date/Time	Venue
Wednesday 11 November 2020, 5.30 pm	VIA TEAMS
<b>Contact:</b>	
<b>Clerk to Schools Forum</b>	<a href="mailto:schoolforum@walthamforest.gov.uk">schoolforum@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>
<b>Maintained Primary Headteacher Representatives (5)</b>	
Claire Nairn	Handsworth
Lindsey Lampard	Chingford C of E Primary
Rosie McGlynn	Our Lady and St George
Tracey Griffiths	Barn Croft Primary School
Zakia Khatun	Whitehall Primary School
<b>Primary Academies and Primary Free Schools Representatives (4)</b>	
Amanda Daoud	Lime Trust (Larkwood, Hornbeam)
Anne Powell	Griffin Trust (Riverley, Willow Brook, Lammas)
Maureen Okoye ( <b>Chair</b> )	Arbor Trust (Davies Lane, Selwyn, Woodford Green, Acacia Nursery)
Iram Malik	Genesis Trust (St Marys and St Saviours)
<b>Maintained Primary Governor Representatives (1)</b>	
Aktar Beg	Edinburgh Primary
<b>Nursery School Representative (1)</b>	
Helen Currie	Forest Alliance Nursery Schools (Church Hill, Low Hall)
<b>Maintained Secondary Headteacher Representatives (2)</b>	
Clive Rosewell	Willowfield School
Jenny Smith	Frederick Bremer School
<b>Secondary Academies and Secondary Free Schools Representatives (4)</b>	
Jane Benton	Chingford Trust (North Chingford and South Chingford)
John Hernandez ( <b>Vice Chair</b> )	Exceptional Education Trust (Norlington School and Sixth Form)
Rob Pittard	Exceptional Education Trust (Norlington School and Sixth Form)
Tracey Penfold	Highams Park Trust
<b>Maintained Secondary Governor Representative (1)</b>	
Gillian Barker	Walthamstow School for Girls
<b>Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)</b>	
Kirstie Fulthorpe	Whitefield Trust (Joseph Clark, Whitefield)
<b>PRU (1)</b>	
Bridget Solecka	Hawkswood Group
<b>Non School Members (4)</b>	
Early Years Providers	Sarah Kendrick (Redwood Pre-School)
16-19 Providers	Janet Gardner (Waltham Forest College)
Trade Unions	Katharine Lindenberg (NEU)
Diocesan	Andy Stone (Holy Family)

**Total Membership 25**  
**The Forum is quorate if at least 40% (10) of the members are present**

## AGENDA

Agenda Item	Report Name	Report Authors
1	Welcome all and Apologies.	Chair
2	Declarations of Interest	All
3	Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 September 2020 and Matters Arising	Chair
3a	Decision Sheet from Meeting 16 September 2020	For the record
4	Early Years Block: Early Years funding formula planning for free education payments for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds for 2021-22	Eve McLoughlin
5	Home Hospital Teaching Service	Eve McLoughlin
6	High Needs Update	Raina Turner
7	LFF Update	Duncan James-Pike
8	Notional SEND	Hiran Perera
9	Growth Fund	Harun Gulied
10	Funding relating to excluded pupils	Duncan James-Pike
	<b>Date of Next Meetings:</b> Wednesdays, 5:30pm  <b>On TEAMS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 December 2020</li> <li>• 13 January 2021</li> <li>• 10 February 2021</li> </ul>	

## MINUTES OF SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Wednesday, 16 September 2020

Norlington School and Sixth Form

5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	
Masefan Agera	Clerk to Schools Forum <a href="mailto:meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk">meetingsandevents@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>
<b>Maintained Primary Headteacher Representatives (5)</b>	
Claire Nairn	Handsworth
Lindsey Lampard	Chingford C of E Primary
Rosie McGlynn	Our Lady and St George
Tracey Griffiths	Barn Croft Primary
Zakia Khatun	Whitehall Primary
<b>Primary Academies and Primary Free Schools Representatives (4)</b>	
Amanda Daoud	Lime Trust Larkwood
Anne Powell	Riverley Primary
Maureen Okoye (Chair)	Davies Lane Primary Academy & Selwyn Primary Academy
Iram Malik	St Marys and St Saviours
<b>Maintained Primary Governor Representatives (1)</b>	
Aktar Beg	Edinburgh Primary
<b>Nursery School Representative (1)</b>	
Helen Currie	Forest Alliance Nursery Schools
<b>Maintained Secondary Headteacher Representatives (2)</b>	
Clive Rosewell	Willowfield School
Jenny Smith	Frederick Bremer
<b>Secondary Academies and Secondary Free School Representatives (4)</b>	
Jane Benton	Chingford and South Chingford Foundation
John Hernandez (Vice-Chair)	Norlington School and Sixth Form
Rob Pittard	Norlington School and Sixth Form
Tracey Penfold	Highams Park
<b>Maintained Secondary Governor Representative (1)</b>	
Gillian Barker	Walthamstow School for Girls
<b>Special School and Special Academies Representative (1)</b>	
Kirstie Fulthorpe	Whitefield Academy Trust
<b>PRU (1)</b>	

Bridget Solecka	Hawkswood Group
<b>Non-School Representatives (4)</b>	
<b>Early Years Providers</b>	Sarah Kendrick (Redwood Pre-School)
<b>16-19 Providers</b>	Janet Gardner (Waltham Forest College)
<b>Trade Unions</b>	Katharine Lindenberg (NEU)
<b>Diocesan</b>	Andy Stone (Holy Family)
<b>LBWF Officers</b>	
David Kilgallon	Director of Learning and Systems Leadership
Duncan James-Pike	Strategic Finance Advisor, Children and Young People Services
Eve McLoughlin	Head of Early Years, Childcare and Business Development
Hiran Perera	Senior Accountant Education Finance
Jerome Francis	Principal Accountant Education Finance
Lindsay Lampard	Head of Education Business Effectiveness
Masefan Agera	Clerk to Schools Forum
Mohammad Akhtar	Early Years finance and Business Manager
Raina Turner	Head of Education Finance
<b>Observers</b>	
Graham Jackson	Willowfield
Gurpreet Kamora	Leytonstone School
Katie Jennings	Mission Grove Primary
Shermaine Lewis	Frederick Bremer School
<b>Apologies</b>	
Imran Malik	Genesis Trust/ St Mary's & St. Saviours

# 1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed and thanked all present for attending the meeting. Apologies were noted as above.

# 2. Declaration of Interest

None

# 3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 February 2020 and Matters Arising

Amendment of 3.5 to state “maintained nursery schools.”

Amendment of 4.15 to state “early years pupil premium.”

Amendment to SEND from SEN throughout minutes.

## 3a. Decision Sheet from Meeting 12 February 2020

- 3.1 For the record, The Chair reminded members of items that were agreed and noted at the previous Schools Forum.

## 4. Schools Forum Membership

- 4.1 Apologies were extended to the group as the appendixes had preceded the reports and could have caused some confusion upon circulation. The Strategic Finance Advisor reassured the group that the papers had been collated in the expected order in the published version which would be assessable via the Hub.  
This report reviews the representation of maintained schools and academies / free schools at Schools Forum following the October 2019 census. The Appendix sets out the powers and responsibilities of the Schools Forum.
- 4.2 **Comment:** I forgot I did say at the beginning of the meeting that I was going to make people aware that we are recording just for the sake of the minutes. We are going to follow the conventions of recording. This is only going to be used for the accuracy of the minutes and it will be destroyed afterwards in accordance to what we should do. Thank you.
- 4.3 **Comment:** Are any questions, comments about what has been presented? : I have personally looked at it quite thoroughly, I do not have any questions but it would be good to type a question or raise your hand and ask a question, or turn on your microphones and just ask a question.
- 4.4 **Comment:** Hello, I just wanted to introduce myself, I haven't met the group before. I'm the new principal of Waltham Forest College. So firstly, hello everyone and thank you for having me on this committee. Secondly is it worth just mentioning, I would be representing 14-19 provision on behalf of the borough.
- 4.5 **Comment:** Can I just welcome you to Waltham Forest to start with.
- 4.6 **Response:** Thank you.
- 4.7 **Response:** Thank you for joining us. Carry on.
- 4.8 **Comment:** Just to say that it may be worth just mentioning on the kind of terms of reference for the group, that obviously there is a 14-19 representation from the borough as well as well the primary and secondary schools.
- 4.9 **Response:** So, when we are recording membership, we need to have that in addition and not omit it as previously done.

- 4.10 **Comment:** Yeah, I think it gives an overview then that the whole age range is represented within the borough.
- 4.11 **Response:** I do think that this was mentioned at 4.5.1 where we have representatives from Early Years, PVI sector, 16-19, trade unions and the diocese.
- 4.12 **Response:** Perfect, Thank you.
- 4.13 The group needed to vote to agree. As it was the first virtual Schools Forum the Chair detailed how the new voting system would be conducted going forward to ensure all votes were being counted and logged accurately.
- 4.14 **Comment:** If you are against, please raise your hand. If you are for, don't raise your hand. If you are abstaining, please put on the microphone and make it clear that you are abstaining.
- 4.15 The Forum had voted regarding the membership and powers:
- Against - 0
  - Abstain – 0
  - Agree - All attendees

## 5. DSG Outturn 2019-20

- 5.1 This report updates School Forum on the 2019-20 final outturn for the Dedicated School Grant; the balances held for each block at the end of March 2020; and the forecast balances for March 2021.
- 5.2 **Comment:** Thanks for the report. It's quite clear. I know you've talked about the long-term plans to recover from the deficit. I'm just a bit concerned about the fact that we do need to report this to the DfE, were going to be on their radar and they're going to be watching what we do. So, I would be really interested in how you plan this out. Because although we look at it as a year, our last meeting will be February, so we really don't have that much time to get together what our response to this will be and how we communicate that to all schools. So, I think a clear plan of when and what would be great, even if you don't have the details of it.
- 5.3 **Response:** Well we have a substantial increase to the High Needs Block coming through for next year. The Head of Education Finance will be telling you about that later on. Everything on the High Needs Block depends on the rate of growth, If the rate of growth continues at 10% per annum or higher, it blows any increase that we get. But it would be strange I think, if the rate kept on increasing exponentially in that way. But that said, there should be some resources, so even if we are making small contributions towards clearing the deficit each year, I think that that is something that we will have to do. So, this year was about proposals to try and balance the budget and try and live within our means for this year. There is a new Resource Ladder that's being introduced from 1 September 2020 and we have to see what the financial implications are of that.

- 5.4 **Question:** Then it's what do we do with the increased funding?
- 5.5 **Response:** I would say part of that is likely to be applied towards the deficit and also, we've got substantial investment in alternative provisions and so on. We will be coming back to Schools Forum later in this session with some proposals and more thinking around what it's going to be like next year and how much contingency we're going to need for growth and so on. Part of the package of 21-22 onwards is really going to have to think about making some provision towards the historic deficit as well as what we have got going forward. But we haven't really discussed this as officers, so I'm really not speaking for the Local Authority as a whole, this is my view.
- 5.6 **Response:** Ok that's fine.
- 5.7 **Comment:** Just wanted to make the point, a follow up from the Strategic Finance Advisor in terms of growth. One of the things that people need to understand is in a normal cycle, we would expect small growth each year, where what we've got it a situation where the growth has all been over the past few years. So, if you think about it with school and planning and things like that, we have lots of numbers in our lower years and less in our elder ones. So, at the moment were still in the cycle of losing fairly low numbers when they leave their provision, or they don't need their EHCP anymore. Whereas we're still increasing a very high rate of staff and the reality is that we have to accept that that's not going to change quickly. It will be a number of years before those big groups come to the point where they will start to not need their EHCP's and lose them. Sorry to put a negative connotation on it, but we do need to be completely open about it and our profile is very much focused towards the younger children, so the issue of cycle is not going to go away quickly.
- 5.8 **Response:** I think everybody here would prefer to hear the honest truth, so we know how we are going to move forward. Thank you.
- 5.9 **Response:** Waltham Forest had been less financially affected compared to a large number of Local Authorities in the capital. Although details will be reported to the ESFA, the Local Authority had worked towards having no significant intervention from the ESFA. In DSG terms it had been projected that by the end of the year the Local Authority would have only just tipped into a deficit. Other local authorities had seen deficits in excess of £20 million overall.
- 5.10 **Comment:** That is reassuring. Thank you.
- 5.11 **Question:** Just to say that a question was written in the chat, which was asking how this deficit would be addressed, the ESFA's views and what impact would be on schools and academies? I think that was touched upon by the Director of Learning and System Leadership and the Strategic Finance Advisor, I'm not sure if there is really more to say.
- 5.12 **Response:** I think the other thing as well is we are, when local authorities are to come up with a recovery plan, it can be anything from three to five or seven years, so we have to just start that dialogue within the Local Authority and then have that, carry that dialogue on with the DfE. So, the recovery plan is an ongoing preparation as it were, an ongoing working document.



5.13 **Comment:** Sorry just to add before we go to that, is just that people are, well I am certainly concerned particularly because I want to know how much of an impact it will have on each of our schools if we have to make adjustments. So, it's really reassuring to hear that we won't be made to pay this back in two years, there is a longer period. If we have to pay it back, I don't know.

5.14 It was reiterated to the group that Item 5 was to be noted by all, and no voting would be involved.

## 6. DSG 2020-21 and update on 2021-22

6.1 This report updates School Forum on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) ESFA allocations for 2020-21 and the July 2020 announcement by the Department for Education (DfE) on the provisional allocations for School, High Needs and Central Services blocks for 2021-22.

6.2 **Question:** I've got just a comment on behalf of maintained nursery schools, if that is ok? It is really good news for our primary and secondary colleagues that you're getting your pay and pension grants. Just to talk about how Maintained Nursery Schools are funded; obviously I have, the Chair has as well, qualified teachers that we have to pay, we get a top up, that is allocated from the government into the Early Years and all three nursery schools have £77,000 in total to share. We are expected to pay for our teachers through that. So, I need it noted please, that nursery schools are not getting any extra money for the increase that we are going to have to pay our teachers and the increase in their pensions. This is going to put nursery schools in further financial jeopardy and could push us over the edge. We could end up losing your Maintained Nursery Schools who were responsible last year, for a significant amount of the two-year old places within Waltham Forest and a significant number of the Education Health Care Plans. So, I would just like it noted please. That that doesn't look like it is going to increase for us. We know that we have funding next summer term, and the government have said that they will review the major spending within nursery schools. So, we know that might be coming, but I've got to pay my staff the increase and it's going to be really challenging for The Chair and myself. Thank you.

6.3 **Response:** I just wanted to say that we are mindful of that and the Early Years Finance and Business Manager and I are going to be starting the consultation process shortly. With regards to the Early Years Funding Formula for this year and our usual Early Years Task and Finish Group, were trying to collate responses from Early Years colleagues around what they think are they key things that we need to be considering as part of that Funding Formula, and happy to discuss later. Forest Alliance Nursery Schools, I know you generally do join that group and your contributions are always welcome but, please make sure that you do join it this year and we can look at all of this as part of the Funding Formula setting for the coming financial year.

6.4 **Question:** Can I just check with the Head of Early Years for Childcare and Business Development that the Task and Finish Group, yes, but what Forest Alliance Nursery Schools is specifically talking about, although it leans to the group, is how as a borough we raise our voices to the DfE and our concerns specifically about how, you know, I have Acacia but I have other schools, why would Acacia not get what Davies Lane would get? That's the question.



6.5 **Response:** And that's something that we started to talk about last year, and we need to pick up again because some of this issue is around the fact that the way in which the government have set these Maintained Nursery Schools supplements is based on the level of funding that the Maintained Nursery Schools were in receipt of from their Local Authority at the time in which they changed the Funding Formula. And some Local Authorities were paying massive amounts of supplements to their Maintained Nursery Schools at the time and others weren't. So there are some local authorities where the Maintained Nursery Schools supplementary grant is significantly higher than ours and that is just because of the way they did the formula at the time when the formula was set, and that's not fair in our view and it is something that we have raised with the DfE on several occasions but we need to raise it again. Happy again to raise it on behalf of Maintained Nursery Schools in Waltham Forest with the DfE and to look up in the interim what we can do as a Local Authority within the Funding Formula which is within our gift to support Maintained Nursery Schools in the interim.

6.6 The group were requested to note 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 to which the Head of Education Finance agreed.

## 7. Hawkswood Funding Proposal

7.1 This report reviews the current funding for PRU places and discusses bringing the funding closer to the London average.

7.2 **Question:** I've got a couple of points I'd want to make about this proposal. I'm going to speak bluntly. First of all I think there was significant mismanagement at the resources within the Hawkswood group over a long period of time and I'd be concerned that any increase in funding that's proposed isn't simply a matter of sorting out a short term deficit situation the place has found its self in. Secondly while I accept the level of funding they're in receipt of appears to be below the London average, I'd like to look at what is actually required because I think there is a risk otherwise that they think they're going to move up from £18,000 to £23,000 and its sort of like happy days instead of looking at what's needed and what's required. I think thirdly the Hawkswood Group exist to provide services essentially for the London Borough of Waltham Forest. I mean correct me if I'm wrong but I don't know that they have many places that are taken up by young people outside of that, of our borough, and I'm concerned that what is the influence that we will have on the whole process of the restructure? What's the influence that we will have on the management of this organisation? I'm concerned that they want to academise or join a different academy trust, I think that's a bad idea. I think as a service that is fundamentally paid for by Waltham Forest, they should sit within the Waltham Forest Local Authority structures. I have no confidence in the proposals about them potentially joining another trust at all! If we are funding you via Schools Forum, then we want significant influence at board level on the Hawkswood Group otherwise I don't see why we would play ball at all with them.

7.3 **Response:** The state of the group at the moment is in a factual sense, they are seriously in debt, were talking about £1 million by the end of March 2021 although colleagues may correct me, it's certainly no better than that. That's basically down to, I don't want to go too much into the past, it's basically down to not restructuring this time last year when we had conversations with the leadership of the group to talk about what was coming and they chose to take a different path now those leaders are

gone, it had to be said, so it is quite difficult to give you a robust explanation as to why we've ended up in some of these places to be fair and that's quite often the way these things work. In relation to academisation they are very open about now, that as a management committee they have voted to academise and they have voted to go with a named academy trust that they have found. We raised concerns with the Regional Schools Commissioner about the process that they went through however the response that we got from the Regional Schools Commissioner was that they felt that the best option was for this group was to academise. I don't have the authority to stop that or do anything about it. We believe, and I am told by the chair who has been open with us, that they are going to the RSC Headteacher board, that you will all know about on 24 September 2020 and they are at this moment in time not planning to change that. Even though we have asked them to, we wanted them to stay as a maintained school, their stance at the moment is that they've passed those votes and they want to pursue that and carry on with it. That's all I can say on that, because obviously as a school, any school has the right to make that decision. I understand your concerns, I think at the moment they have virtually no or very few children from out of borough and historically they never have a great number from out of borough. I'm not aware of anyway, and that kind of comes back again to last bit about In relation to academisation they are very open about it now, that as a management committee they have voted to academise and they have voted to go with a named academy trust that they have found. This is in light of things like the college placements and that was due to us thinking that we weren't getting value for money there and we thought that we could deliver those in a better way. I'm happy to go through that at another point. But that's the context of how they are operating now. Should they academise clearly, we would expect them to take that debt with them and repay us, but obviously all those things have an impact on how effective they can be and how well they can run.

- 7.4 **Response:** We totally take on your point on regarding needing to know the actual cost of delivering a place. As was said earlier, the school are currently doing a significant amount of work to reduce the expenditure to make it more in line with their current income, part of that does involve a restructure, but until that restructure is actually completed we wouldn't be able to give you a per place cost because that's going through its due process at the moment. But we totally take on board and that is why we haven't been able to include any of that information right now, but as we say, that's what we would be hoping to use the Task & Finish group to kind of unpick that more for you and to also provide details from Hawkswood Group about what would be provided and what is the offer. Just to confirm the deficit is higher than £1 million its more towards £1.9 million. That as with any other school that academises will be going with the school. The Local Authority does not hold onto that.
- 7.5 **Comment:** The current £18,000 income for student in the structural plan, well restructure that's has been put in place is unsafe. There is massive health and safety risks to it. You can't do it. You can't run a structure like that with that funding. There is no question the school needs the funding, but we just need to make sure the funding goes to the restructure plan now so we can make sure the staff are in place so that's it is not a health and safety risk and not a safeguarding issue.

- 7.6 **Response:** I'm led to believe that if they had £23,000 per student, we believe there would be an appropriate and safe structure across the group to deliver that provision. In terms of whether it goes on, two things I would say to that, one of the reasons why we are in this situation, is that there has been no change in that funding for a while other than very minor tweaks to it. The second one is absolutely whilst we could have an agreement with the school if they do academise about an agreement for pricing that would be fixed for three years or four years or two years, I can't sit here as you all know and say that as an academy I can guarantee to you what the prices will look like in five years' time, because as an academy they will make their own decisions about their funding once we get past any agreement.. However, at this moment in time they are saying that they want to be a part of the Waltham Forest family. whether they're an academy or a maintained school, they are saying that they want to be part of our provision, they want to work with us, they want to get a pricing/costing strategy that we can live with, but then also it means they can deliver the quality and type of provision that they feel is appropriate and safe for those young people.
- 7.7 **Response:** I have modelled a variety of figures and a variety of models to see what would work and to answer Chingford and South Chingford Foundation's question, £23,000 will be our model that will be safe on the ground that will be effective and provide the offer required but I am going to say again if it used appropriately now with restructure that we have going.
- 7.8 **Question:** I think the other thing I just want to add, it has been immensely useful having The Vice-Chair in there on the ground to kind of really get stuck into this. We're not asking schools to commit to pay this gap now. What we are saying is do we in principle agree that it is right that we should be funded at that sort of level? Given what you have heard from the Director of Learning and Systems Leadership, The Vice Chair and the Head of Education Business Effectiveness? And then can we basically work out therefore how we do that? Again, I'm not saying or promising, but is that a reallocation of some high needs block? Is it an increased contribution from schools? Is it a mixture of both? Is it phased over one year, 18 months? All those things are, in a sense, possibilities. What we really need is agreement on the principle to take that forward.
- 7.9 **Comment:** I think before, I have heard what everyone has had to say but in support for the Diocesan's questions, at the transition point of whether or not they are going to become an academy, that decision we make has to be very clear because are we putting money into something that we would have no control once we put the money into knowing we've already invested quite a bit into the school.
- 7.10 **Response:** So just to be clear Chair, at this moment in time, none of the plans that we have got have, in a sense repaid the debt. This price means that they can pay us more each year to get back. Clearly that's what is going to have to happen. Whether they're a maintained school or whether they academise. Unless there is a sponsored solution, but a conversion which is what they are talking about and what they have applied to be, means that that debt has to go with them and then we would then have to agree with the trust an amount each year for them to pay back to us. What we wouldn't be doing is coming back to Schools Forum and say "Hawkswood need another £200,000 per year to pay us back, you've got to increase your payments, so that they can have the money to pay us". That would absolutely not be anything that we would be considering.

- 7.11 **Comment:** I think I kind of have the same view as The Chair, I just don't understand that a board that is overseeing a group of schools going into a £1.9 million deficit, then feels it's got the right to have the autonomy to come up with some academisation solution, that probably to many of us in the profession, doesn't make much blooming sense and I don't see why we go along with it and I would say that I would only support this in principle if it's with the strings attached saying they defer this decision about academisation until were satisfied. Because I don't think that that should go ahead, that could go ahead a week on Friday and then were in a rather different scenario and I don't think that that is acceptable.
- 7.12 **Response:** I hear your frustrations, clearly were not in position to instruct the management, all I would say, two things, one is it's basically a different management committee now largely to the one that was there before, albeit a couple of staff members are the same, the rest, new chair, other staff members are new. I am more than happy to go back and have conversations with the chairs, as would The Vice Chair and the Head of Education Business Effectiveness. I don't think we can go back and say, "we will consider increasing the money if you don't academise." It doesn't work like that. In a sense we might be able to have some off the record conversations with the chair, but it is not something that we would formally be able to request. That's not something that I would be able to request at all that they do.
- 7.13 **Comment:** Can I just clarify my position, I'm not against them academising, but we just want to be very clear on the position.
- 7.14 **Response:** Sorry, to reiterate, particularly on the basis of what's been said, we have spent a long time from the previous leaders last summer up to very, very recently trying to persuade this group not to academise. We have been really strong in our representations, we've spoken to the chair on numerous occasions, the Head of Education Business Effectiveness has been in those meetings as well, we have made the strongest representations not just to them but to the ESFA, the RSC as well. At this moment in time what we know is that they are going to that board and they are not minded to change that decision to go to it, and I know from my conversations with the RSC that they are minded to approve it. They said that a year ago so they are now going to have a lot more information about it, but given that the person that they're sponsoring is presumably still supported going forward it's clear that those concerns are not stopping the process from moving forward.
- 7.15 **Question:** I just wanted to ask and clarify something. I think you said , that Hawkswood are keen to keep working with the Local Authority, Waltham Forest as their customer or their client. I mean, it sounds to me as though on the one hand they've decided that they want to academise , on the other hand we seem to be giving them a sort of free ride in terms of saying "oh yes, we will still use you." I mean, and I know you said you can't sort of say " We'll ..only do this if you don't academise", but we could say surely that we will go to the market and we will market test and we will look at other suppliers.
- 7.16 **Response:** Absolutely and that is part of our AP strategy it very clearly says "The Provider" at the moment its Hawkswood and we are more than happy for that to continue, but should they present figures and start to operate in a way, if they



academised that we were not comfortable with, then absolutely we could go out and look to procure that or develop our own provision elsewhere in our other schools, to some extent we are looking at developing some secondary inclusion units now. I think there is quite a difference between that and for example a large 46 place PRU that would be quite difficult to see how we could deliver that from within our current estate but we would be entitled to do that, if we didn't like the way of the direction that they chose to go. Now coming back to the critical point, if they become an academy clearly and absolutely with your, we can't stop that school from academizing if they want to. We clearly are at the hands of them in terms of the direction they want to go, and they are saying that they want to work with us, but clearly, they will make decisions based on their interest as would any academy going forward.

- 7.17 **Question:** So, can I just as follow up question, has there been any work done in terms of a contingency plan should they... I mean I just feel like we've only really gone down one route at the moment and that's looking at staying with Hawkswood rather than looking at alternatives that we can put in place if they pull the rug out from under our feet?
- 7.18 **Comment:** In fairness to them we have to make a decision based on what suits us, they must also make decisions that suit them. I think that is the balance.
- 7.19 **Response:** So just to answer this question about have we looked at any other options, at the Task and Finish Group that is what we are intending to look at because we are aware that there will be an increase of funding to all of us potentially and so we need to be looking at our options so there will be an options paper that will be presented as part of that task and finish group work.
- 7.20 **Response:** I understand that it is frustration in peoples comments round academisation. I don't think we have any way of actually challenging that in terms of their call, and certainly not funding should be touched, if the school chose to do that then it is their choice, and that's the way I see it. The power this group has centres around the three SLAs which are agreed and reviewed every three years and the fact that schools have the ability to opt out if the provision is not being provided then we can hold them to account that way. For me the issue here centres around if we do agree this funding, how is this funding going to be spent? Is just going to go through to the academy conversion or is, it going to be used properly for maintaining a staffing structure which provides the offer we need on the ground, therefore when the offer happens when they move to academy, which in theory would be January 2021, then the staff on the ground would lead that forwards. For me that's the question at the moment. For me there are structures in place already that will protect this group and schools in the borough to hold to account, the borough has that, that's why I know the Head of Education Business Effectiveness is working on a very tight SLA at the moment and its absolutely key about what takes place. It's are we agreeing funding, which is then not used appropriately, so therefore at the point of conversion everything is in place or are we agreeing funding then which effectively goes towards the academy's coffers. I'm afraid that is my position and I know it's not a popular one with certain people but that's my position, and if any agreement is done, it's got to be done in a way which says "yes, but we expect to look at the restructure that is taking place at the moment, one that is actually is safe, follows health and safety grounds, the safeguarding issues have gone and it offers us what we need on the ground, is in

place now and is in place at point of conversion. Then we can hold to account against that. For me that's the position, that's from me from my role I play at the moment.

- 7.21 **Question:** Just a simple question, is the academy trust that they are going with does that have a lot of schools out of borough that would use Hawkswood and would we be in position where there wouldn't be enough places for our Waltham Forest young people?
- 7.22 **Response:** So, I can't give you a definitive answer on that, the reality is that they do attach schools, but they are a PRU based mat, the one that they are suggesting. So, they run three or four other PRUs one of which is in London, I think two are in Brighton, I think anyway. It's an open thing that they have applied to, it's the Olive Multi Academy Trust, if you want to go and have a look and find it. They are a specialist provider, but clearly, they take from other authorities but then again Hawkswood has the ability to take from other authorities, it doesn't do much of it, but you know that would be up to them to manage that afterwards. I think the bottom line is, that if we want to have a three year deal with them, it's probably going to have to be based on the £23,000 and not the £18,000 based on what we've seen and their running costs at the moment. So regardless of whether it's an academy or not, were thinking that if we want the quality of provision for our children, right, that's the kind of level of funding that would enable us to do that. Could we buy that into a three-year contract? Yes. What we wouldn't be able to do I think, and I know the Vice Chair has got very strong views on this, we wouldn't be tying them into a three-year contract based on the £18,000 because we're not sure that's safe and would enable them to run this service for our young people, and it is our young people. And my last point is a more generic one, because I can see people want to say things, if we have this task and finish group and it basically comes out that we don't think that at that sort of level were going to get value for money from Hawkswood then quite clearly I'll be tasked with looking at those other options and saying "well ok if we might have to use Hawkswood for the next year but then after that, what are our alternatives? What could we do about looking elsewhere? That's the reality so, as officers we will be guided by that task and finish group.
- 7.23 **Comment:** It does sound like if we are going to move forward the principle of going forward with this, but the SLA bit is going to be key, which is the protection for all of us that we don't have somebody coming in and rush all over us. So I think for me it is yes, in principle we have got to this enhanced level but if we get this SLA right, then it will protect all of us going forward and allow us to potentially to then have a get out and then to also explore looking elsewhere.
- 7.24 **Response:** I noticed there is a question on the message board about the inherited costs of the deficit being built into costs moving forward. I mean as with any school that I have worked with knows, one of the aspects that we always look at is how to create an income, so obviously what we would be looking at is the money that you are paying towards the places, that's one aspect, but actually in terms of paying off the debt, we would be looking at having quite a strong business plan for them in terms of whether they have services and expertise that they can source out to other boroughs or if there are places available that we aren't commissioning from them. Whether they are paying, or other children from other boroughs are paying to come and utilise those and obviously that wouldn't be at the same level as our borough. So,



we are sort of looking at the moment at the first stage, but the second stage would be what other additional income could be generated by that school to pay off their debt?

- 7.25 **Question:** Can I just ask a question that with, so you have looked at a business continuity plan and what's the role of FAP in terms of the numbers going to the PRU, have we used the FAP numbers to project what income would be?
- 7.26 **Response:** Yes. So, what based it on our numbers. One of the things that we haven't taken into account yet which is interesting and we are working on it at the moment, is if we create the in-school units that we've talked about, would that mean we would have to commission less from Hawkswood? So were still at that phase of looking at that, but yes absolutely, we've now got real clarity on the numbers and we've based that on what we think it is going forward. So, there might be one part of , for example what Hawkswood deliver that we think we could deliver that in different way, but that part we want to carry on buying. So, we want all options on the table so that when we get the SLA, we are really clear about what we are buying. The reality is we will only have conversations with the MAT if it had been approved by the RSC, so we don't get to talk to them before they actually choose. Of course, the RSC could decide to approve the academisation but not name a MAT at this point. They could basically say "ok we will approve you; we will write an academy order, but we will leave the name of the MAT that you're going into open" to give them the chance to explore other things afterwards. But when we do have those conversations, whilst I can ask them no MAT has to tell me what percentage their top slicing is. We can look through companies house and things like their structures and try to work it out and then some of that finance is then available for us, but we would have to get it and analyse it ourselves and I think as we've already heard the Vice Chair say, I think they are above 12% but I wouldn't put that as a figure that's only talking to a couple of colleagues that I know. We would have to really look into that, but it would only be from a point of view of whether we continued to commission them, it would be nothing to do with the academisation argument. That would be of no relevance to the Local Authority view on that.
- 7.27 **Comment:** As the Director of Learning has said, we have our own reservations around the academisation but that aside, I think what the main sort of thing that we need to be discussing as a borough is the fact that actually when you look at the average cost of a quality AP place, it's around £23,000 and that is not what we are paying at the moment towards our provision, so whoever we end up with, because I can see the academisation thing is going to be emotive, but actually whoever we are paying towards, I think that's what we need to be looking at, is the likelihood that we are going to need to increase our contributions from schools and it's just about looking at our options and then looking at how we could potentially pay for that than increase. I think it's the main focus of what we need to be considering at the moment.
- 7.28 **Comment:** Just to follow on from what the Head of Education Business Effectiveness said, I'm going to repeat what I said before to a certain extent so my apologies, we don't have any power to stop the conversion, that's their choice, the governors choice, they will get on and they will do that. We merely have the power to put the structures in place to ensure that what happens between now and the conversion number one, and number two, beyond that and that's why the Head of Education Business Effectiveness's work with the SLA's is so important at the moment on that to pin them down so that there is nowhere to go. I'm also going to add in there and say again, the

restructure at this point in time taking place is unsafe. Any funding that is agreed in the increase has to be linked to the restructure being looked at again now before this is implemented because that will be implemented and then that is what effectively will put in place of academisation from January 2021 and that is what will be accepted as norm and any change from that will be a problem.

- 7.29 **Comment:** Thank you Vice-Chair. I think for me, it's really cutting us away from academisation or non-academisation to the fact that this is the Waltham Forest Children we are talking about, and that we are in a period when the risk to our children will be rising, it's not going to get better for a little while so that should be our focus. Would our children be safe? And with the Vice-Chair working closely with them and saying emphatically that it is not safe yet, those are things that should concern us. I really don't care if it's an academy or not. I think it's about the safety of our children and I think if we focus on that and not on their conversion then we might be onto something.
- 7.30 **Response:** What I am saying Chair, is that if they agree the funding, we have to be sure the decision is taken by the management committee, make it safe and that is what I'm saying this group needs to enforce. We agree the extra funding, that has to be agreed.
- 7.31 **Comment:** So the reality is there are a couple of questions at the side, I understand the frustration, I have to be completely clear here, we did not want this academisation and fought it as much as we can, but you will all know that our ability to stop it is very, very limited. The financial mismanagement again the reality is the people who are responsible for that have gone. They are no longer here. So whilst we can hold people to account in the group, I have to say the group are working really well with us now, unfortunately we're saddled with things that historical decisions were made by people who are no longer there and that does make it incredibly difficult for people to own those decisions. At the end of the day, should we look at other alternative local provisions? Absolutely. Would we be able to get a 46 place PRU elsewhere? It's highly unlikely. So all these things are important things and factors, that we have to take into account when we are looking at this, so we might want to almost put it up from a philosophical point to say "we don't like the way they've operated, actually let's stop using them." But the reality is, we will then have 100 children for whom we will have nowhere to place, and they are our needy children and so to me the better solution is to try to sort out Hawkswood. I would love it if they chose to stay as a maintained school, they're not pursuing that. I still think it's a positive option to look at creating a new relationship with them. It will be far, far tighter than the past and previous regime, I'll tell you now. There will be real accountability, there will be a service level agreement, and absolute key performance indicators, and the ability in the future to reduce the places we buy from there and go elsewhere if we want to. But I'll come back to the original bit at the start, what the Vice- Chair is saying, is the reality is if we want, the starting point for that has got to be a recognition that at the moment they are not funded in a way that enables them to deliver and that's what we are looking to get really, however we do it.
- 7.32 The Chair concluded that no further questions would proceed on the item. The group were required to agree and note 2.3.1. Decisions were required for 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.2.1. The Chair confirmed and agreed with the Financial Advisor that votes would be taken separately as they were individual items.

- 7.33 The Chair advised that the group were to be clear on their votes.
- 7.34 2.1 would be collectively voted for as a block to reduce any confusion.
- 7.35 Against – 2  
Abstain – 1  
For – All other attendees
- 7.36 The group voted for 2.2.1 as follows:
- Against – 0  
Abstain – 0  
For – All attendees
- 7.37 2.3 in its entirety was to be noted by all members of the group.
- 7.38 Any expressed interest in becoming a representative of the Task and Finish group was to be recorded in the message board within the meeting. There would be two groups that would require representation from the Schools Forum, but it was confirmed in the meeting by the Head of Education Business Effectiveness that the dates were proposed to the benefit of diary management for all and could now be held on one date. All submissions would be collated by the Director of Learning and Systems Leadership outside of the meeting.

### **8. Notional SEN budget**

- 8.1 This report sets out the changes to Notional SEN budgets in 2020-21 and proposes that a task and finish group is established to agree a Notional SEN policy for 2021-22 and future Local Funding Formulae. The Notional SEN budget is a notional portion of the Schools Block which is calculated using the Department of Education's Authority Pro-Forma Tool (APT) and is also advised to maintained schools as part of their Individual School Budget shares in February.
- 8.2 The Chair reiterated the importance of the group understanding they would be a part of the Task and Finish Group should it be agreed.
- 8.3 The group were to agree 2.1.1 the setting up a Task and Finish Group and the outcome was:
- Against – 0  
Abstain – 0  
For - All attendees

### **9. Split Sites funding**

9.1 This report sets out the changes for Split Sites (SS) criteria and proposes that two task and finish groups are established to agree on the best way to categorise schools with SS using in a more transparent and simplified method. SS funding is a premises element within the Schools Block with a budget of £745,000.

9.2 **Question:** Why are we splitting the meetings into two groups?

9.3 **Response:** That is a good question. The reason why is that for primary schools and secondary schools the way they are categorised are different and they receive different chunks of the split site funding. As you can see at the moment, secondary schools are receiving a higher proportion of the allocation funding due to the number of students in the school. So, we decided to have a separate meeting for primary and a separate one for secondary in order for them each to agree on what's the best possible way to allocate the split site funding and have a more simplified criteria for the future. At the moment, as you're about to see from Table 1, the criteria for split site funding is a bit over-complicated and we've done our research in regard to different local authorities and we found that they had more simplified criteria. For example, split site for another local authority state that a school would receive funding if its half a mile or three quarters of a mile from their second building, but our one is more complicated where we have sports sites etc. so two task and finish groups would be the best solution.

9.4 **Comment:** That makes sense and actually means that a more in-depth conversation that is specific to the groups will happen.

9.5 2.1.1 to set up two task and finish groups; primary and secondary

Against – 0  
Abstain – 0  
For – All attendees

## 10. Growth Fund

10.1 This report sets out some proposed changes to the Growth Fund and proposes that a task and finish group is established to agree on the best way to align with national practices. The Growth Fund is an element within the Schools Block with an allocation of £1,280,068 in 2020-21.

Against –  
Abstain –  
For – All Attendees

10.2 **Comment:** Officers will send out invites to all headteachers and SBMs following the vote, as we have all just agreed to set up this group. If you are in charge of any task and finish groups being set up please feedback the dates so we know, even if they don't go, but as a form of inclusion.

Date of Next Meetings:  
Wednesdays, 5:30pm

## On TEAMS

- 14 October 2020
- 11 November 2020
- 9 December 2020
- 13 January 2021
- 10 February 2021

**Meeting closed 19:42.**

DRAFT

## **Schools Forum 16 September 2020**

### **Summary of Decisions**

#### **Item 3a**      **Matters Arising from the Minutes of Schools Forum 15 January 2020**

##### **(1)**            **Schools Forum noted:**

The responses to questions regarding

1.      Further clarity regarding the use of reserves;
2.      Further increases to the hourly rate for 2YO FEEE places;
3.      The change in policy on part-time places at Whitefield;
4.      Transition arrangements and honouring commitments to existing full-time places;
5.      Whether we are we the only LA requesting/offering part-time FEEE nursery places; and
6.      Why panel were still referring full time places at Whitefield, allegedly.

##### **(2)**            **Schools Forum agreed:**

The summary of the views expressed by Schools Forum on the High Needs proposals at the January meeting to be included in the Cabinet report on these proposals.

#### **Item 4**            **Schools Forum Membership**

##### **2.1**            **Schools Forum agreed:**

- 2.1.1      That the current balance of school representation is appropriate to continue for the 2020-21 session.

#### **Item 5**            **Dedicated Schools Grant Outturn 2019-20**

##### **Schools Forum noted:**

- 2.1      The final settlement of DSG allocation to the Local Authority (LA) for 2019-20, after academy recoupment and including the July 2020 Early



Years Adjustment of a reduction of £0.153 million, was £159.090 million.

- 2.2 The cumulative brought forward DSG surplus balances from 2018-19 were £2.012 million and reduced to £0.574 million at the end of 2019-20.

The DSG is expected to move into a deficit position of £1.334 million by the end of 2020-21 as Early Years and School Block surpluses are utilised. The LA will have to report to the Department for Education (DfE) on its plan to manage the deficit position.

- 2.3 The High Needs (HN) overspend in 2019-20 was £2.796 million leading to a cumulative carry forward deficit on the HN block of £4.532 million. This were offset by in year surpluses in the Early Years and Schools Blocks.

#### **Item 6      Dedicated Schools Grant 2020-21 & update on School Funding Announcement for 2021-22**

##### **Schools Forum noted:**

- 2.1 The 2020-21 allocations for Schools, Central Services and Early Years blocks remain unchanged from those reported in February 2020.
- 2.2 The High Needs block allocation has increased by £0.138 million due to changes in the gross entitlement and a reduction in academy recoupment.
- 2.3 The total 2020-21 Gross DSG allocation before academy recoupment is £269.332 million.
- 2.4 The total 2020-21 Net DSG for the LA after academy recoupment of £105.418 million is £163.914 million.
- 2.5 The ESFA proposals for 2021-22:
- Excluding pay and pensions, School Block funding is expected to increase by 2% and High Needs block funding is expected to rise by 8%.
  - The Central Services block is expected to reduce by 3%

- Funding from the teachers' pay grant and the teachers' pension employer contribution grant, including the supplementary fund, has been added to the National Funding formulae from 2021-22
- The 2019 update to the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) has been incorporated so that deprivation funding allocated through the formulae is based on the latest data.

## **Item 7**      **Funding of PRU Places**

### **2.1**      **Schools Forum agreed in principle:**

- 2.1.1      An increase in top-up funding contributions for students attending Hawkswood so that the current £18,300 per place can rise to be £23,000 per place, similar to the London average range of £23,889 to £25,191
- 2.1.2      That the schools' top-up funding contributions are agreed for three year periods, with reviews undertaken every two years. This is to enable the Group of PRU schools to strengthen their strategic financial planning.

### **2.2**      **Schools Forum agreed:**

- 2.2.1      That a Task and Finish Group is held with school representatives, the Family Resilience Service and Hawkswood leadership to discuss costings and possible contribution levels and to report back to the Schools Forum in December 2020.

### **2.3**      **Schools Forum noted:**

- 2.3.1      That, unlike mainstream schools, PRU's only receives funding via commissioned places and the associated 'top-ups'. No school can be forced to contribute toward the 'top-up' for PRU places, however schools who choose not to opt-in at the start of the financial year to the schools contribution leave the PRU's financial sustainability - and the delivery of the agreed AP framework - vulnerable.

## **Item 8**      **Notional SEN**

### **2.1**      **Schools Forum agreed:**

- 2.1.1      That a task and finish group is established to agree a Notional SEN policy for 2021-22 and future Local Funding Formulae.

**Item 9**      **Split Sites**

**2.1**            **Schools Forum agreed:**

2.1.1            That two task and finish groups, one for primary and one for secondary, are established for schools that receive SS funding to agree on criteria for future funding.

2.1.2            The terms of reference in 5.3.

**Item 9**      **Growth Fund 2021-22**

**2.1**            **Schools Forum agreed:**

2.1.1            That a task and finish group is established to reach an agreement on whether to mirror the fund with DfE funding for growing schools and review the Leadership & Management criteria.

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>4</b>
Report Title	<b>Early Years Block: Early Years funding formula planning for free education payments for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds for 2021-22</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	<b>Eve McLoughlin, Head of Early Years, Childcare &amp; Business Development Service</b> <b>Tel: 020 8496 3576</b> <a href="mailto:eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk">eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>		
Appendices	<b>Appendix A:</b> E-Mail to early years providers regarding Early Years Task and Finish Group, 1 October 2020  <b>Appendix B:</b> Terms of Reference Early Years Task & Finish group - 2021-22		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report sets out the proposed plan for the development of the early years funding formula for free education payments for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds for 2021-22.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2.1 Schools Forum to note:

- 2.1.1 The proposed timeline set out in Table 1 should form the basis of development of the 2021-22 early years funding formula (EYFF).
- 2.1.2 That an Early Years Task and Finish Group (EYTFG) has been established as set out in Appendix A and B to review and make recommendations on:
- The 2021-22 Early Years Block funding;
  - The wider consultation with all FEEE providers regarding the 2021-22 Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF) for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds; and
  - The 2021-22 provider EYFF hourly payment rates for 2, 3 & 4 year-olds.
- 2.1.3 The DfE's EYNFF operational guidance states that at least 95% of the Early Years Block funding of the DSG in respect of three and four year olds MUST be passed through to providers.

### **3. REASON**

- 3.1 The LA is required to consult annually with Schools Forum on arrangements for Early Years provision.

### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The DfE/ESFA have not yet published Early Years Block budget allocations for 2021-22. Allocation are usually published around mid-December.
- 4.2 The normal process for determining funding allocations for local authorities for the early years entitlements is to take an annual census count of the number of hours taken up by children in each local authority in January. This is the mid-point of the academic year and so balances the relatively lower numbers eligible for the free entitlements in the autumn term and the higher numbers in the summer term. This means that local authorities would in normal circumstances be paid for the autumn term 2020 based on the January 2021 census data
- 4.3 The DfE recognise that the number of children attending childcare may not have returned to normal levels by early January, when we take the January 2021 census. In light of the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak, the final funding allocation to local authorities for the 2020 autumn term will therefore exceptionally be based on our January 2020 census count
- 4.4 The DfE expect to return to the normal early years funding process and use the January 2021 census count to drive funding allocations for the 2021 spring term. Therefore, the DfE also expect local authorities' funding to providers to return to the normal approach (that is, 'funding following the child') for all providers from 1 January 2021. However, the DfE will keep this under review and confirm the approach in further guidance in the autumn.
- 4.5 The LA will work on the basis that there will not be any changes for 2021-22 to the current Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) operational guidance and plan for 2021-22 accordingly.

## **5. PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2021-22 EYFF**

5.1 The proposed plan is outlined below in the table below:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
1 October 2020	Expressions of interest sought from all providers of free early education to become a member of the EYTFG. (Appendix A)
16 October 2020	Closing Date for expressions of interest for EYTFG
w/c 19 October 2020	EYTFG members emailed to confirm appointment to the EYTFG and announced in The Hub newsletter
4 November 2020	First meeting of the EYTFG
Mid-December 2020	Publication by DfE/ESFA of provisional 2020-21 Early Years DSG block allocations
16 December 2020	Second meeting of the EYTFG
15 January 2021	Report to Schools Forum on the indicative modelling for 2020-21 EYFF
11-19 January 2021	On line consultation with all FEEE providers on the proposed EYFF and group question and answer sessions run for providers
20-27 January 2021	Analysis of consultation responses
29 January 2021	Final meeting of the EYTFG
10 February 2021	Report to Schools Forum on the proposed EYFF 2020-21 for approval

## **6. CONSULTATION**

- 6.1 An online consultation is planned between 11 and 19 January 2021. Providers will be made aware of the consultation via the Early Years newsletter on the Hub website. In addition, e-mails will be sent to all Chairs of Governors, Headteachers and Ofsted registered PVI sector providers advising them of the consultation as well as a link to the online survey.
- 6.2 Q&A sessions will also be held during the consultation week which providers can attend should they wish to.
- 6.3 EYTFG members will also be required to make their respective sector aware of the consultation and encourage them to respond. A hard copy of the consultation questions will be made available to enable respondents to discuss and agree a collective response before submitting their answers online.



## APPENDIX A

**E-mail regarding Early Years Task and Finish Group, 2 October 2020**

**HAVE YOUR SAY ON EARLY YEARS FUNDING IN 2021/22**

**DEADLINE FOR RESPONSE FRIDAY 16 OCTOBER**

Schools FAO: Governors/Directors, Headteachers, Early Years Foundation Stage Leads and School Business Managers

PVIs FAO: Managing Directors / Chairs of Trustees / Sole Traders / Operation Managers and Finance Officers

Dear All,

In line with the LA's statutory duty and as notified to the Borough's Schools Forum, I will be setting up and chairing an Early Years Task and Finish Group with FEEE providers across all sectors.

The remit of this group will be to **review and make recommendations on:**

- The Early Years Block 2021-22 funding;
- The wider consultation with all FEEE providers regarding new 2021-22 Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) for 2, 3 & 4 year-olds;
- The 2021-22 Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) hourly payment rates for 2, 3 & 4 year-olds

In order to ensure the effectiveness of the group it is important that we have diverse membership across range of roles within schools/settings. We are hoping to achieve 10% representation from the sector currently delivering FEEE places, this equates to the following number of representatives from each sector:

- 3 Maintained Schools (including Maintained Nursery Schools)
- 2 Academies
- 3 to 4 PVI term time providers
- 3 to 4 PVI year-round / full day-care providers (open more than 38 weeks per year and open between 8am and 6pm as a minimum)
- 5 Childminders

Expressions of interest to be part of this group are invited from Senior Leaders from School and PVI sector providers who:

- Are fully up to date with their Headcount returns, in line with the FEEE Financial procedures; and
- Have a good working knowledge of early years funding.

Members will be expected to disseminate information from the Early Years Task and Finish group to their respective sector and to collate their views for presentation at the Early Years Task and Finish Group. The membership of this group will also include LBWF service managers and officers.

**We encourage those of you who provide free early education places to 2, 3 & 4 year-old children to become actively involved to ensure that your sector is truly represented and your opinions are heard.**

Representatives will be expected to be able to attend all meetings between October 2020 and February 2021, so please do not express an interest in becoming a part of this group if you are unable to commit to attendance during this period.

**Key dates:**

- 10am to 1pm Wednesday 4 November 2020
- 10am to 1pm Wednesday 16 December 2020
- 10am to 1pm Friday 29 January 2021

**All expressions of interest should be returned by email no later than midnight on FRIDAY 16 OCTOBER to [FEEEprovision@walthamforest.gov.uk](mailto:FEEEprovision@walthamforest.gov.uk)**

If we have more applicants than available places on the group, applicants will be asked to provide a pen portrait of no more than 200 words by Tuesday 20 October 2020 to be circulated to all FEEE providers to decide on electing a representative for that group. The vote will take place on 21 and 22 October. The final group members will be announced on Friday 23 October.

Kinds Regards,

Eve McLoughlin, Head of Early Years Childcare and Business Development



# **London Borough of Waltham Forest**

**Draft**

## **Terms of Reference**

**Early Years Task and Finish Group**

**2021/2022**

## **1. ESTABLISHMENT**

The Early Years Task & Finish Group (the Group) is established as a time limited sub group of Waltham Forest School's Forum. As such, all principles will closely align with those of the Schools Forum.

The Early Years Task & Finish Group and Waltham Forest School's Forum will work together as strategic partners to co-operate on matters falling within the aims and objectives of the group.

This Group will, wherever possible, try to achieve consensus between the key partners providing Free Early Education in the Borough in line with the relevant statutory guidance.

## **2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE GROUP**

The aim of the Group is to take make recommendations to Schools Forum, based on wider consultation with FEEE providers operating in the Borough, and in line with the Governments statutory guidance on matters regarding:

- The Early Years Block 21-22 funding;
- The wider consultation with all FEEE providers regarding new 2021-22 Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) for 2,3 & 4 year olds;
- The new 2021-22 Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) hourly payment rates for 2,3 & 4 year olds; and
- The impact/implications of any new statutory requirements

Decision Making Powers of the Group:-

- The Group do not have decision making powers
- The Schools Forum may refuse or approve the recommendations of the Group subject to modifications.

## **3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE GROUP**

It was aimed to achieve 10% representation from the sector currently delivering FEEE places. The final membership and composition of the Group is based on the number of operational FEEE providers that expressed an interest in becoming a member of the group in line with the published criteria before the deadline date of 16<sup>th</sup> October 2020. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the group it is important that we have diverse membership across range of roles within schools/settings.

Only Provider Representative Members have a vote. There must be at least 1 member from each sector for a vote to be held.

The final Provider Representative Membership is agreed as:

- 3 Maintained Schools (including Maintained Nursery Schools)
- 2 Academy School
- 4 PVI term time providers

- 4 PVI year round/full daycare providers (open more than 38 weeks per year and open between 8am and 6pm as a minimum)
- 1 Childminder (filled by a LA nominated Early Years Teaching & Learning Consultant)

Total = 14 Voting members

The Voting Members of the Group are:

**Voting Members:**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>School/Setting Name</b>
<b>Maintained Schools (including Maintained Nursery Schools*)</b>	Helen Currie	Church Hill & Low Hall Nursery Schools
	Tracey Griffiths	Barn Croft Primary School
	Shaesta Khan	Mission Grove Primary School
<b>Academies</b>	Maureen Okoye	Arbor Academy Trust
	Beth Billington	Lime Academy Hornbeam
<b>PVI term time providers</b>	Ruth Mattison	Handsworth Pre-school
	Hawa Hansa	Noor UI Islam Preschool
	Pam Chapman	Shernhall Pre-School
	Sue Ruff	St. Andrews Pre-school
<b>3 to 4 PVI year-round / full day-care providers</b>	Denise O'Sullivan	Little Diamonds Nursery
	Anuta Dunca	1 <sup>st</sup> Stepping Stones Nursery School
	Hannah McCarthy	Footsteps Day Nursery
	Sarah Kendrick	Redwood Pre School
<b>Childminders</b>	Donia Duffy	LBWF (Representing Childminders)

**Non-voting members - LBWF Officers:**

<b>LBWF staff</b>	Eve McLoughlin	Head of Early Years Childcare and Business Development (Chair)
	Mohammad Akhtar	Early Years Finance & Business Manager
	Elisha Brett	Early Years T&L Consultant – Schools

**Non-voting Advisors to the group to attend as and when required / invited:**

	Duncan James-Pike	Strategic Finance Advisor – Finance Team (High Needs Block & Early Years Block)
	Eva Gunkova	Assistant Director – SEND Service (Special Educational Needs & Disabilities)
	Carol Fredrick	Head of Early Help Delivery 0-18 (Children & Families Centres)

Clerk to the meeting is Temi Adeniji: [temilade.adeniji@walthamforest.gov.uk](mailto:temilade.adeniji@walthamforest.gov.uk)

Members are appointed to the Group for the period November 2020 to March 2021.

A member ceases to be a member of the Group if he or she resigns from the Group or no longer occupies / is a member of the office or body which he or she was nominated to represent.

Observers will be able to attend meetings to ask questions and contribute to the discussion but will not be able to vote. Voting members will be able to vote on their behalf.

Observers must provide details of their intention to attend the meeting to the clerk in advance of their attendance;

Officers employed by the Local Authority / Families Directorate who have a role in the strategic development of Early Years and associated services are non-voting members of the Group.

They will provide advice to the Group on professional issues, including reports before them, matters of procedure and advice and guidance on changes to Government guidance or policy and make recommendations on the EYNFF.

**4. MEETINGS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GROUP**

All meetings papers, agendas and minutes are will be made available to the group. Communication links will also be set up on The Hub to enable sector representative to share information with and receive feedback from their respective sector.

Meetings will be held at suitable venues in the Borough as may be considered appropriate in the circumstances. The decisions as to where to hold meetings shall ultimately lie with the Chair of the Group.



The Group shall meet no less than 3 times during the period November 20 and March 21.

The Group may establish and set terms of reference for subcommittees and working groups as required, subject to first obtaining the advice of the Chair of the Group as to the necessity for such arrangements.

Members who fail to attend two consecutive meetings without a satisfactory explanation will have their membership reviewed by the Group.

## **5. Agenda Planning / Despatch of Papers**

The responsibility for setting the agenda for the Group lies with the Chair. The Chair shall ensure that all matters falling within the remit of the Group are placed on an appropriate agenda for consideration by the Group in a timely manner.

In this regard meetings need to be scheduled at appropriate points in order to enable the Group to consider outcomes of local consultations and national announcements. The frequency and timing of meetings shall be agreed in advance of the next meeting.

Items for inclusion on the agenda for the Group (submitted by a member of the Group) must be submitted to the Chair of the Group not less than 10 working days before a scheduled meeting of the Group

Agendas and reports will generally be circulated by the Chair of the Group at least 5 working days before the meeting to which they relate.

## **6. Quorum**

The quorum for any Group meeting shall be at least 40% of the voting membership. At least one representative of each of the sectors must be present and voting.

## **7. Declaration of Interests**

Members of the Group will have regard to the Local Code of Conduct for Members.

Interests whether personal or pecuniary, should be declared at the outset of the meeting and before the item is discussed. A member with a pecuniary interest or disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) beyond or over and above those interests of the generality of the group they represent) shall declare that interest as soon as it becomes apparent. The member may be present for the introduction of the Item and presentation of a report by the presenting officer, make representations, answer questions and give evidence in response to that presentation before leaving the room. A member with a pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) may not take part in the Group's debate on the item, the decision and/or vote.

In considering whether or not to declare a pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest, a member of the Group should apply the following test: 'Would a member of the public, knowing the facts of the situation, reasonably think the member might

be influenced by the interest?' A pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest would include the situation whereby a proposal uniquely affects either a school/setting at which they are a head teacher / governor/Managing Director or Business owner or which their children attend / close family members are employed at.

If a member knows, or ought to know, that they will have a pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interest in any matter being discussed by the Group they are encouraged to send a substitute (nominated in accordance with the Constitution) to the meeting in their place.

## **8. Voting Procedures**

The Group shall always seek to operate on a consensus basis. If it is not possible to reach a consensus, members will be required to undertake a formal vote on the matter before them. Each member will have one vote. Votes cast will be carried on a simple majority basis which will be recorded. In the event of an equal number of votes for and against a proposal this will be recorded.

## **9. Clerk to the Group**

The Group will be clerked by an employee of the Council. The specific responsibilities of the Clerk will be to:

- convene meetings of the Group;
- arrange accommodation for meetings;
- co-ordinate and act as secretariat to meetings;
- copy, circulate and dispatch appropriate papers;
- publish papers on The Hub website;
- make and maintain a record of the Membership and all proceedings of the Group.

## **10.FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

Request for Information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) 2000 will be handled in accordance with the Council's published procedures for dealing with such requests. Any Member of the Group receiving a request under the FOIA will be required to pass that request to the Chair of the Group within 24 hours of receipt of that request in order that the Education Support Service may deal with the request on behalf of the Group within the 20 working day time limit.

## **11.COMPLAINTS / DISPUTES**

The Group is intended to be a collaborative, co-operative body and needs to ensure that no particular sector or member is unduly favoured. Problems and issues should normally be debated and resolved at the Group meetings.

However, if parties feel that these have not been resolved, the following process should be followed and minutes taken.

Stage 1: Complaints from member/s of the group or issues of non- compliance with the terms of reference will in the first instance, be referred in writing to the

Chair of the Group. The parties who are in dispute will meet with the Chair of the Group who will investigate and attempt to reach satisfactory resolution through discussion with the representative/s concerned.

Stage 2: In the event of satisfactory resolution not being reached, the matter will be referred to the Chair of Schools Forum for a final decision.

## **12. Local Code of Conduct for Members**

All Members must comply with the following standards when carrying out your official duties:

- a. To act solely in the public interest and never improperly attempt to or actually confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person or improperly act to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, friends or close associates.
- b. Not to place themselves under a financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.
- c. To make all decisions on merit when carrying out public duties, such as making public appointments or awarding contracts.
- d. To be accountable for their decisions to the public and to cooperate fully with whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.
- e. To be open about their decisions and actions and the decisions and actions of their authority and Members should be prepared to give reasons for those decisions and actions.
- f. When using or authorising the use by others of the resources of this authority, ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes) and members must have regard to any statutory guidance made under the Local Government Act 1986.
- g. To comply with the law (including the Council's Access to Information Rules) in respect of the disclosure and confidentiality of information held by the Council and to seek advice before disclosing personal or other confidential information.
- h. To treat others with respect and not to bully or harass any person.
- i. To promote and support high standards of conduct when serving in their office, particularly those set out in a. to h. above, by leadership and by example.

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>5</b>
Report Title	<b>Home Hospital Teaching Service</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Information		
Report Author/ Contact details	<b>Eve McLoughlin, Head of Early Years, Childcare &amp; Business Development Service</b> <b>Tel: 020 8496 3576</b> <a href="mailto:eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk">eve.mcloughlin@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>		

## **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report is to inform Schools Forum of arrangements by the LA to meet its statutory duty to provide education provision for children who cannot attend school due to illness.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **2.1 Schools Forum to note:**

- 2.1.1 The contents of this report.

## **3. REASON**

- 3.1 The LA has a statutory duty to arrange suitable full-time education (or as much education as the child's health condition allows), for children of compulsory school age, who because of physical or mental health issues, would otherwise not receive suitable education, and that this education should be provided as soon as it is clear that the child will be away from school for 15 days or more, whether consecutive or cumulative.
- 3.2 Funding is provided to the LA to deliver this statutory duty via the High Needs Block (HNB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The LA's budget allocation for home education is £395,960 for 2020/21 and £427,637 for 2021/22

## **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The provision of the Home and Hospital Teaching Service in Waltham Forest over the last few years has been the result of a contract between The Lime Academy (Hornbeam School) and the London Borough of Waltham Forest (LBWF). This contract began in September 2017 and expired in August of this year, leading up to this point there were discussions between the two parties, following which an agreement was reached to extend this service contract until the 31st December 2020. LBWF has commended Hornbeam School for

the service that it has provided as part of this contract to pupils on Acorn Ward at Whipps Cross Hospital and to those who have had to be educated in their homes due to their medical condition.

- 4.2 Following the cessation of the current contract, from 1 January 2021, LBWF will provide home/hospital teaching services 'in house' by creating a new SEND and Inclusion Teaching Service for children and young people (CYP) with SEND and health needs, which will have lead responsibility for meeting the LA's statutory duty to arrange suitable full-time education for children of compulsory school age who, because of physical or mental health issues, would otherwise not receive suitable education. This education should be provided as soon as it is clear that the child will be away from school for 15 days or more, whether consecutive or cumulative.
- 4.3 This in house service will form a part of the SEND Service under the management of the Assistant Director for SEND, and ensure that all Waltham Forest CYP who meet the criteria for home/hospital teaching, including those who are placed outside of the Borough, receive it. Responsibility for arranging home/hospital teaching to Waltham Forest CYP outside of the Borough would not have previously formed part of the remit of the contract with The Lime Academy. LBWF believe that moving forward we are in the best position to co-ordinate the delivery of a re-shaped service to meet our statutory duties and the needs of all the eligible pupils in the borough.
- 4.4 The size of the service team will remain the same when it transfers from the school to LBWF and it is proposed that the employees who currently deliver the frontline Home and Hospital Teaching Service are to transfer to LBWF by 1 January 2021, from which point the new service will start. A consultation is currently taking place with these staff and their Trade Unions to confirm details for the transfer. This should mean that, particularly for current service users, there would be no noticeable change in the service that they are presently receiving. Teaching will continue to be delivered on Acorn Ward at Whipps Cross, although partly due to LBWF prioritising meeting its statutory requirements, plus changes in the children's oncology service at the Hospital and also due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this may be at a reduced level.
- 4.5 The original annual contract sum was £327,000 per annum, which equated to the majority of the total HNB budget allocation for home education. (2017-18 £363,000, 2018-19 £364,815, 2019-20 £366,630). The annual contract sum was subsequently reduced to £300,000 for 2019/20.
- 4.6 The estimated annual cost of the current staffing establishment, up to 31 August 2020 is £282,500 per annum. This will need to be uplifted to include the pay increases that came into effect on the 1st September 2020. The annual DSG HNB budget allocation for financial year 2020/21 is £395,960.

- 4.7 In addition to the staffing costs, additional costs are incurred in relation to home teaching services provided to Waltham Forest residents who are in hospital or therapeutic units outside of the borough and receive hospital education from providers attached to the placement, for which we have to pay. For the financial year to date these charges equate to £47,000. If costs continue at the same rate for the remainder of the financial year this could equate to up to £80,000.
- 4.8 New processes and procedures need to be put in place for the agreement of these placements and the associated costs. The new SEND and Inclusion service will include responsibility for developing and implementing processes regarding this, to ensure budgets are managed and costs and placements are appropriate.
- 4.9 Schools are primarily responsible for ongoing education provision for all pupils who are unable to attend school due to illness. According to school attendance data held by the LA's data team, in 18/19 there were 1063 CYP people absent for 16 or more days due to illness. There were 27 pupils with 50+ days illness recorded, 6 primary aged children and 21 secondary aged.

It is anticipated that as the new SEND and Inclusion Teaching service will be amended slightly to include the following responsibilities:

- Ensuring that there are procedures and protocols in place to follow up with schools to establish what arrangements they have put in place for the ongoing education provision for all pupils who have been absent for more than 15 days for health reasons, and to ensure that home education is provided where the school are unable to make suitable arrangements themselves.
- Lead responsibility for meeting the LA's statutory duty to arrange suitable full-time education for children of compulsory school age who, because of physical or mental health issues, would otherwise not receive suitable education.
- Lead responsibility for meeting the LA's statutory duty to ensure that children and young people (CYP) have access to any specialist equipment that they may need to allow them to access or return to education provision.
- Lead on responsibility for meeting the LA's statutory duty with regards to CYP who are electively home educated or educated other than at school where an EHCP is in place to review of the suitability of the education provision to ensure it is suitable to the child's age, ability, aptitude and SEN and it continues to be appropriate.

## **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Consultation with stakeholders, to advise them of the change of service provider will include:

- Whipps Cross Hospital
- Parents/carers, children young people currently using the service
- Schools (including this advisory report to Schools Forum)
- The SEND Parents Forum Group
- The LA's BACME, SEND and Education Psychology Services

## LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM</b> <b>11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>6</b>
Report Title	<b>High Needs Block 2020-21 update</b>		
Decision/ Discussion/ Information	For Information		
Report Author/ Contact details	Raina Turner, Head of Education Finance <a href="mailto:raina.turner@walthamforest.gov.uk">raina.turner@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 0208 496 3520 Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor <a href="mailto:duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk">duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 0208 496 3502		
	Appendix A: 2020-21 Projection Summary Appendix B: 2020-21 Projection Details Appendix C: Behaviour & AP Strategy: Commissioning a wraparound support offer		

### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report updates School Forum on the High Needs block (HNB) forecast for 2020-2. High Needs expenditure has exceeded its funding allocations and has been in deficit since 2018-19 caused mainly by the increase in demand for Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) exceeding the funding from the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). At the end of 2019-20 the HNB closed with a cumulative deficit of **£4.5 million**.
- 1.2 For 2020-21 the LA received an increase in ESFA funding of £5.03 million. The LA has worked with schools and Schools Forum on several strategies including a review of contracts, an Alternative Provision strategy and the introduction of a new Resource Ladder to manage within its revised funding allocations.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Schools Forum to note:**



- 2.1 The 2020-21 gross allocations for the HNB is **£42.445 million**. The amount received by the LA after Academy and FE college placement recoupment is **£33.864 million**.
- 2.2 The total 2020-21 Funding for the HNB is increased to **£34.169 million** after adjusting for the inter block transfer from the Schools Block and sixth form funding.
- 2.3 The current Outturn Forecast for financial year 2020-21 is a breakeven position if the Judicial Review decision upholds the Council's decision
- 2.4 An in-year deficit position of **£0.700 million** could arise if the Judicial Review does not uphold the Council's decision.
- 2.5 Places have increased in Special schools (29) and SRP units (17) from this September.
- 2.6 ECHP Plans have increased by 133 (6%) since last September 2019

### 3. REASON

- 3.1 The LA provides Schools Forum with updates on the trajectory of HN spending due to the significant deficit balance. This informs the budget setting cycle for the next financial year. The LA needs to report to the DFE on its intentions to address the deficit balance.
- 3.2 The LA will prepare the 2021-22 HN budget between December and February. The time frame enables the LA to have the latest position for outturn and pressures in the current year. In addition, the ESFA makes its funding announcement in December. As part of the process Schools Forum will be consulted on the budget and plans to reduce the HN deficit.
- 3.3 This report summaries the forecast outturn for 2020-21. Summary level information is set out in **Appendix A**. Detailed information is reported in **Appendix B**.

### 4. 2021-22 OUTTURN FORECAST

- 4.1 The HN forecast is a **breakeven position**. This includes 10% reductions in top up payments to mainstream schools from this September for Bands E and F. This decision is currently subject to a Judicial Review. If the Judicial Review is found against the LA, the HNB is projected to move into a significant **in year deficit** of approximately **£0.700 million**.
- 4.2 **Appendix A** reports the spend for each of the main provider categories. Expenditure compared to last financial year has increased by 2% overall and the forecast spend is **£34.12 million**. The headline figure is being reported as breakeven as there is only a minor surplus of **£48,700** projected currently. There are four significant assumptions in this

projection: FE, Alternative Provision commissioning and Independent schools are all assumed to be spent to the allocated budget; and it is assumed that the Judicial Review will uphold the LA's decision.

- 4.3 The highest percentage increases are in: FE colleges: Home Hospital and Independent & Non maintained schools categories.
- 4.4 The figure for FE colleges top up payments have increased due to an increase in numbers and residential costs at FE colleges for 5 students now being met by the HNB. It is expected that growth in numbers should be managed within the allocation but a clearer position on student numbers will be known in November/December.
- 4.5 The reported increase in Home Hospital is due to better reporting of payments to other hospitals tuition that are educating the LA pupils. In 2019-20 only the contract costs with Hornbeam/Lime Trust had been reported under this heading, while the rest was shown against Independent schools.
- 4.6 The increase in Independent and Non-Maintained schools is due to increased numbers of pupils being placed in Out Borough schools.
- 4.7 Savings are expected in Alternative Provision (AP) in 2020-21 as the new AP model's school provisions will begin next financial year. **Appendix C** sets out the strategy for commissioning wrap around support for specialist intervention in schools and short term offsite AP for children at risk of exclusion.
- 4.8 The financial impact of the new Resource Ladder will not be known until early in the new year.

## 5. HN EHCP DATA

- 5.1 Expenditure forecast shows increases in place and top up payments for all settings. The EHCP data set out below shows the increase in demand since last year and the age of the cohort as of this August.

Current EHCP at 1st of the month



	Data 30 September 2019		Data 20 October 2020		Increase	
	E	F	E	F	E	F
Special Schools	90	413	80	427	-10	14
Mainstream	280	337	350	370	70	33
PRU	5	4	6	4	1	0
SRP	48	122	47	127	-1	5
	423	876	483	928	60	52

Age at 31/08/2020



**ITEM 6 HIGH NEEDS UPDATE APPENDIX A**

	2020-21 Projection £	2019-20 Outturn £
<b>INCOME</b>		
LA Allocation	33,467,851	28,815,340
Recoupment - Special Schools	7,150,000	7,105,833
Recoupment - Academy SRP	582,500	540,000
Recoupment - FE	848,334	947,800
Home Hospital Funding	395,960	
Sixth Form Grant	2,113	
Transfer from Schools Block	303,000	
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>42,749,758</b>	<b>37,408,973</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>		
Special Schools	17,715,539	17,228,400
SRPs	3,736,805	3,608,321
Mainstream	8,169,369	7,763,440
FE	3,484,434	2,498,985
AP and PRU	3,491,405	3,567,347
Independent & Other LAs	3,889,896	3,316,668
Home Hospital	396,000	311,125
Other Services	1,817,600	1,939,724
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>42,701,047</b>	<b>40,234,011</b>
<b>Deficit + or Surplus -</b>	<b>-48,711</b>	<b>2,825,038</b>
JR risk	730,000	
<b>Deficit or Surplus</b>	<b>681,289</b>	

ITEM 6 HIGH NEEDS UPDATE APPENDIX B: Month 6 Budget Monitoring Forecast

Description	Outturn Forecast based on		Notes
	Revised Allocations	Month 6 plus 10% reduction and new band	
<b>INCOME</b>			
LA Allocation	33,467,851	33,467,851	
Recoupment - Special Schools	7,150,000	7,150,000	
Recoupment - Academy SRP	582,500	582,500	
Recoupment - FE	848,334	848,334	
Home Hospital Funding	395,960	395,960	
6th Form Grant	72,667	2,113	
School Block Transfer	303,000	303,000	
<b>HIGH NEEDS BLOCK FUNDING TOTAL</b>	<b>42,820,312</b>	<b>42,749,758</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
<b>SPECIAL SCHOOLS</b>			
Place Funding maintained schools	570,000	570,000	
Place Funding academies	7,150,000	7,150,000	
Top-ups	9,490,000	9,573,872	includes 20 EHCPs pending and Nursery places
Spot Purchase of places Hornbeam Sept 2020		145,833	25 places
Spot Purchase of places Hornbeam Retropective		200,000	TBA
Spot Purchase Whitefield Sept 2020		75,833	13 places
Spot Purchases intial Budget	290,000	0	Used against above lines
Predictive Growth initial budget	350,000	0	Used against above lines
<b>TOTAL SPECIAL SCHOOLS</b>	<b>17,850,000</b>	<b>17,715,539</b>	
<b>SPECIAL RESOURCE PROVISION £6k per place</b>			
Place Funding Maintained schools	552,000	552,000	
Place Funding Academies	582,500	582,500	
Top up funding	2,500,000	2,486,971	Includes 5 more known EHCPs pending
Spot Purchase Davies Lane FY		23,000	
Spot Purchase Hillyfield FY		40,833	
Spot Purchase Chingford Sept 2020		24,500	
Spot Purchase Chingford Retropective		27,000	
Spot Purchases	20,000	0	
<b>TOTAL SPECIAL RESOURCE PROVISION</b>	<b>3,654,500</b>	<b>3,736,805</b>	
<b>MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS</b>			
Predictive Growth12%	948,000	173,165	expecting 55 New EHCPs
Top-up : Mainstream schools	7,400,000	7,996,203	10% Reduction applied on band E and F from 1 Sept 2020
<b>TOTAL MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS</b>	<b>8,348,000</b>	<b>8,169,369</b>	
<b>FURTHER EDUCATION - POST 16 PROVISION</b>			
Top up fees for further education providers	1,700,000	1,700,000	awaiting details from September intake
Place funding	848,334	848,334	
Transfer of costs from social care Transitions		322,100	5 x Post 16 students in residential colleges (40% assumed to HNB)
Spot Purchase	160,000	160,000	awaiting details from September intake
Predictive Growth 12%	204,000	454,000	should cover increases. top up average between £2k to £6k per pupil
<b>TOTAL FURTHER EDUCATION - POST 16 PROVISION</b>	<b>2,912,334</b>	<b>3,484,434</b>	Based on AY 20/21 SUBJECT TO REVISIONS
<b>ALTERNATIVE PROVISION AND PRU</b>			
Place Funding Hawkswood Primary, Secondary and Therapeutic PRUs	860,000	860,000	
14 SEND Places Hawkswood	140,000	130,000	Start in Sept but 11 Pupils in there from April
Top up Funding Hawkswood Primary, Secondary and Therapeutic PRUs	159,000	141,205	
Forest Pathways	500,000	208,300	April to August
AP College placements staff		112,000	
Accelerated Learning Academy		267,000	From August
Alternative Provision (College placements) Hawkswood	1,000,000	416,700	April to August
Alternative Provision (College Placements) LA		334,000	from September
Out of Mainstream support		78,000	
CAMHS supoport		21,000	
Family Resilience Centre commissioning	400,000	400,000	Intervention work for 150 pupils plan to use
Belmont Park Assessment places	300,000	258,000	30 places , 10 extra from Sept
New School-based Provisions	360,000	50,000	1 unit Heathcote opening; all to open FY 21-22
Contingency	200,000	122,000	Intervention work for 150 pupils less the CAMHS in above
EP services at Wood Street		24,000	
Virtual School		69,200	One-off for AY 20/21
<b>TOTAL ALTERNATIVE PROVISION AND PRU</b>	<b>3,919,000</b>	<b>3,491,405</b>	

ITEM 6 HIGH NEEDS UPDATE APPENDIX B: Month 6 Budget Monitoring Forecast

Description	Outturn Forecast based on		Notes
	Revised Allocations	Month 6 plus 10% reduction and new band	
<b>INDEPENDENT &amp; OTHER</b>			
Independent & NMSS (2862)	1,500,000	1,412,596	
Placements in OLA schools (3339)	1,200,000	1,200,000	assumes £200k accrual will be used
Alternative Education (3341)	690,000	618,000	Not Top up Home schooling NTAS
Preventative Education	24,300	24,300	
LAC Education		435,000	
Predictive Growth 12%	406,800	200,000	may need for Covid growth
<b>TOTAL INDEPENDENT &amp; OTHER</b>	<b>3,821,100</b>	<b>3,889,896</b>	
<b>TOTAL HOME HOSPITAL</b>			
Home Hospital Contract	300,000	300,000	
Other schools		96,000	Whittingham,Rhodes Wood, Ellen Mede Hospital
<b>TOTAL HOME HOSPITAL</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>396,000</b>	
<b>OTHER SERVICES</b>			
£300k HI/VI support to children,young people and professionals £317k CPD			
SEND SUCCESS (Outreach)	700,000	700,000	for professionals YR1 upwards, £83k CPD for professionals Early years
Speech and Language Therapy Service	140,000	140,000	Expected to stay with budget
SEND Team	441,000	441,000	Expected to stay with budget
EY SEND Home Visitors (under 5's with high level/ complex & life limiting SEND who are not in a EY setting)	108,000	108,000	
BACME (Social Inclusion) reduction of £27k from previous years	297,000	297,000	Expected to stay with budget
FAP Payments to schools for admitting excluded pupils	71,600	71,600	Expected to stay with budget
HN Finance		60,000	
<b>TOTAL OTHER SERVICES</b>	<b>1,757,600</b>	<b>1,817,600</b>	
<b>HIGH NEEDS TOTAL PROJECTED SPEND</b>	<b>42,562,534</b>	<b>42,701,047</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE OVER (+) OR UNDER (-) FUNDING ALLOCATION</b>		<b>-48,711</b>	
<b>JUDICIAL REVIEW RISK</b>		<b>730,000</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE OVER (+) OR UNDER (-) FUNDING ALLOCATION INCLUDING JR RISK</b>		<b>681,289</b>	

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>7</b>
Report Title	<b>Local Funding Formula 2021-22</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Information and Decision		
Report Author/ Contact details	Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor <a href="mailto:duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk">duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 020 8496 3502  Sergio Dimech, Principal Accountant Education Finance <a href="mailto:sergio.dimech@walthamforest.gov.uk">sergio.dimech@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>		
Appendices	Appendix A: IDACI Comparison Appendix B: MFG Comparison Appendix C: 2021-22 NFF Factors Appendix D: LFF & MFG Work through		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report and its appendices set out illustrations of changes to the Local Funding Formula (LFF) using the initial 2021-22 APT. This report also includes appendices that illustrate the use of National Formula Funding (NFF) factors and the impact on Waltham Forest Schools. It uses 2019 census data.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2.1 Schools Forum to note:

- 2.1.1 The contents of this report

### 2.2 Schools Forum to agree:

- 2.2.1 That the LFF will continue to use NFF Funding factors.

- 2.3 A preference for the Minimum Funding Guarantee to be set at either:

a. **+2% (recommended)**

b. +1% **or**

c. +0.5% **or**

d. Another rate between +0.5% and +2%.

- 2.4 Schools Forum to agree a preference through which factor(s) to allocate any additional funding through after running the formula.

a. AWPU

b. Any other funding factor(s)

## 3. REASON

- 3.1 In December 2019 Schools Forum agreed to adopt the National Funding Formula for the 2020-21 Financial Year
  - 3.2 Officers need to consult with schools to agree whether to continue this, at what level the MFG should be set and through which factor(s) any remaining funding should be allocated so that a revised LFF can be implemented once the APT has been received in mid-December.
  - 3.3 Schools Forum has adopted four decision-making principles: fairness; stability; transparency; and protecting vulnerable pupils; and needs to consider the balance between them in its decision making on funding.
- 4. CHANGES FROM 2020-21**
- 4.1 Waltham Forest's provisional Schools Block allocation for 2021-22 excluding Growth Fund is £214.34m representing an increase of 2.00% in per pupil funding on the previous year.
  - 4.2 As the £0.3m High Needs block transfer will not be sought by officers for 2021-22 this in effect allocates a further 0.14% for distribution amongst schools, giving a total increase of 2.14%.
  - 4.3 There have been a number of changes to the Schools block from 2020-21:
    - MFG must be set between +0.5% & +2%
    - The Teachers Pay Grant & Teacher Pension Grant have both been added to schools' baseline funding figures for 2020-21 when used for calculating their allocation for 2021-22.
    - The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) has been updated to include 2019 data rather than 2015 data which had been used up to and including 2020-21. It is a measure of the likelihood that a child is in a household experiencing relative socio-economic deprivation. On average Waltham Forest households have become less deprived compared to 2015 with total funding going through these factors falling by 30%, and the impact on schools between the 2015 and 2019 datasets is shown in **Appendix A**.
  - 4.4 **Appendix B** shows the impact on school budgets with the MFG set at +0.5%, +1% and +2%. In these models:
    - 2019 pupil numbers are used, so figures will change depending on 2020 Census actuals
    - In all examples any additional funding has been passed through the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) factor, equally for all three year-group variants. The actual factor through which remaining funding will be allocated is to be decided for School Forum.



- 4.5 The 2021-22 National Funding Factors are shown in **Appendix C**. A step by step work through of the funding formula and MFG for a selection of 10 schools is shown in **Appendix D**.
- 4.6 The table below shows how many of the 68 schools receive their full NFF allocation and how many are benefiting from the MFG at the various MFG levels.

**Table 1**

MFG Level	NFF Schools	MFG Schools	Minimum Gain	Maximum Gain
+2.00%	13	55	1.61%	5.45%
+1.00%	38	30	0.85%	6.49%
+0.50%	46	22	0.42%	6.70%

- 4.7 As the value of the MFG is reduced, less funding is diverted from the operation of the formula so the number of schools that move to the NFF increases. If a faster transition to the NFF is desired using a lower MFG increases the pace of transition, however, the higher the MFG, the more evenly the extra funding is distributed.
- 4.8 Please note that the MFG applies only to Pupil-led factors in the funding formula, excluding premises factors. In the illustrative models this means that the year on year funding, which includes premises factors, is slightly lower than the MFG level used.
- 4.9 Schools Forum has adopted four decision-making principles: fairness; stability; transparency; and protecting vulnerable pupils. There is always a balance to be struck between the principles. Having a lower MFG of say +0.5% arguably protects vulnerable pupils more due to the NFF's higher weighting to IDACI and Low Prior Attainment and lower weighting to Basic Entitlement (AWPU) but a higher MFG promotes fairness and stability by spreading benefits most equitably. Officers **recommend** an MFG of 2% as this ensures that no school receives an increase of less than 1.61%, whilst still allowing those schools with particularly high LPA and IDACI to gain up to 5.45%.
- 4.10 The lower the MFG value chosen the greater the amount of surplus budget to allocate through other factors as less is being used to pay for the MFG. The increase to other factors required to bring the total Schools Block budget back to our allocation of £214.339 million is shown in the table below:

Table 2: Extra funds to be applied when using lower MFG rates:

MFG Level	Post MFG Budget (£m)	To be Allocated (£m)
+2.00%	213.911	0.429
+1.00%	211.931	2.408
+0.50%	210.948	3.391

- 4.11 For modelling purposes officers have allocated all additional funding through increasing AWPUP equally in both phases (4.1% at +2.0% MFG, 5.76% at +1.0% MFG and 6.10% at +0.50% MFG). Additional funding could be allocated through any factor.
- 4.12 Officers **recommend** allocating additional funding through AWPUP as this spreads the additional funding equitably to the greatest number of schools.

APPENDIX A - IDACI COMPARISON BETWEEN 2015 DATASET AND 2019 DATASET WITH SAME CENSUS DATA

LAESTAB	School Name	2020-21 IDACI	2021-22 IDACI	Year on Year Change	Percentage Change
		<b>£11,699,359</b>	<b>£8,216,451</b>	<b>-£3,482,907.57</b>	-30%
3202001	Chase Lane Primary School	£161,403.00	£101,571.84	<b>-£59,831.16</b>	-37%
3202006	Whitehall Primary School	£115,145.00	£81,860.56	<b>-£33,284.44</b>	-29%
3202017	Downsell Primary School	£155,695.00	£118,197.31	<b>-£37,497.69</b>	-24%
3202023	Newport School	£102,812.00	£19,814.14	<b>-£82,997.86</b>	-81%
3202028	Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	£54,204.00	£27,057.67	<b>-£27,146.33</b>	-50%
3202030	Edinburgh Primary School	£118,887.00	£100,564.89	<b>-£18,322.11</b>	-15%
3202031	Greenleaf Primary School	£111,065.00	£44,311.13	<b>-£66,753.87</b>	-60%
3202045	Handsworth Primary School	£50,821.00	£48,804.51	<b>-£2,016.49</b>	-4%
3202049	Thorpe Hall Primary School	£89,330.00	£77,946.45	<b>-£11,383.55</b>	-13%
3202050	The Winns Primary School	£218,576.00	£110,926.71	<b>-£107,649.29</b>	-49%
3202062	Oakhill Primary School	£31,533.00	£31,919.18	<b>£386.18</b>	1%
3202064	Henry Maynard Primary School	£140,920.00	£102,438.03	<b>-£38,481.97</b>	-27%
3202066	South Grove Primary School	£132,733.00	£102,649.17	<b>-£30,083.83</b>	-23%
3202067	Dawlish Primary School	£38,982.00	£9,739.25	<b>-£29,242.75</b>	-75%
3202069	Gwyn Jones Primary School	£42,411.00	£22,201.58	<b>-£20,209.42</b>	-48%
3202072	George Tomlinson Primary School	£70,796.00	£40,245.45	<b>-£30,550.55</b>	-43%
3202074	Mission Grove Primary School	£200,771.00	£151,020.58	<b>-£49,750.42</b>	-25%
3202075	Coppermill Primary School	£62,048.00	£24,821.81	<b>-£37,226.19</b>	-60%
3202076	Stoneydown Park School	£116,075.00	£74,346.34	<b>-£41,728.66</b>	-36%
3202078	Parkside Primary School	£156,371.00	£122,966.78	<b>-£33,404.22</b>	-21%
3202079	The Jenny Hammond Primary School	£85,534.00	£57,758.77	<b>-£27,775.23</b>	-32%
3202082	Ainslie Wood Primary School	£98,184.00	£53,698.49	<b>-£44,485.51</b>	-45%
3202083	Barn Croft Primary School	£47,494.00	£17,340.08	<b>-£30,153.92</b>	-63%
3203001	Chingford CofE Primary School	£54,045.00	£40,288.76	<b>-£13,756.24</b>	-25%
3203300	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£27,705.00	£21,860.52	<b>-£5,844.48</b>	-21%
3203301	St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	£56,321.00	£37,506.11	<b>-£18,814.89</b>	-33%
3203305	St Joseph's Catholic Infant School	£31,442.00	£17,821.90	<b>-£13,620.10</b>	-43%
3203311	Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	£104,608.00	£79,695.08	<b>-£24,912.92</b>	-24%
3205200	St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	£122,707.00	£83,322.26	<b>-£39,384.74</b>	-32%
3204060	Frederick Bremer School	£355,375.00	£249,225.09	<b>-£106,149.91</b>	-30%
3204063	Heathcote School & Science College	£398,465.00	£292,020.39	<b>-£106,444.61</b>	-27%
3204066	Willowfield School	£394,092.00	£258,834.41	<b>-£135,257.59</b>	-34%
3204069	Leytonstone School	£223,901.00	£170,493.65	<b>-£53,407.35</b>	-24%
3204072	Walthamstow School for Girls	£340,723.00	£238,798.31	<b>-£101,924.69</b>	-30%
3204075	Kelmscott School	£349,216.00	£240,915.06	<b>-£108,300.94</b>	-31%
3204603	Holy Family Catholic School	£427,114.00	£311,986.12	<b>-£115,127.88</b>	-27%
3204000	Buxton School	£512,649.00	£369,658.26	<b>-£142,990.74</b>	-28%
3202005	Lime Academy Larkwood	£148,995.00	£111,034.99	<b>-£37,960.01</b>	-25%
3202007	Yardley Primary School	£107,448.29	£97,155.02	<b>-£10,293.27</b>	-10%
3202015	Davies Lane Primary School	£172,816.53	£123,561.94	<b>-£49,254.58</b>	-29%
3202018	Hillyfield Primary Academy	£398,663.96	£229,519.36	<b>-£169,144.59</b>	-42%
3202019	Emmanuel Community School	£52,471.00	£34,008.86	<b>-£18,462.14</b>	-35%
3202029	Willow Brook Primary School Academy	£152,724.00	£104,771.34	<b>-£47,952.66</b>	-31%
3202033	The Woodside Primary Academy	£319,964.08	£251,837.30	<b>-£68,126.78</b>	-21%
3202034	Chapel End Junior Academy	£78,154.00	£37,874.25	<b>-£40,279.75</b>	-52%
3202035	Riverley Primary School	£126,759.00	£95,676.32	<b>-£31,082.68</b>	-25%
3202036	Sybourn Primary School	£150,483.00	£85,200.81	<b>-£65,282.19</b>	-43%
3202037	Thomas Gamuel Primary School	£90,186.00	£75,364.12	<b>-£14,821.88</b>	-16%
3202038	Walthamstow Primary Academy	£52,667.24	£30,920.89	<b>-£21,746.35</b>	-41%
3202040	Roger Ascham Primary School	£165,904.00	£102,421.79	<b>-£63,482.21</b>	-38%
3202043	Longshaw Primary School	£91,969.00	£64,623.34	<b>-£27,345.66</b>	-30%
3202047	Salisbury Manor Primary School	£93,822.00	£73,615.49	<b>-£20,206.51</b>	-22%
3202061	Woodford Green Primary School	£35,174.00	£25,016.71	<b>-£10,157.29</b>	-29%
3202081	Whittingham Primary Academy	£154,439.00	£106,460.41	<b>-£47,978.59</b>	-31%
3202084	Mayville Primary School	£109,348.00	£80,198.55	<b>-£29,149.45</b>	-27%
3203304	St Saviour's Church of England Primary School	£99,173.44	£67,665.79	<b>-£31,507.65</b>	-32%
3203307	St Mary's CofE Primary School	£125,394.15	£95,666.39	<b>-£29,727.76</b>	-24%
3203308	Barclay Primary School	£238,132.00	£203,062.47	<b>-£35,069.53</b>	-15%
3203310	Selwyn Primary School	£117,661.26	£113,477.92	<b>-£4,183.34</b>	-4%
3204001	South Chingford Foundation School	£226,712.16	£159,672.61	<b>-£67,039.55</b>	-30%
3204002	Eden Girls' School Waltham Forest	£274,852.00	£206,884.55	<b>-£67,967.45</b>	-25%
3204061	Connaught School for Girls	£179,694.00	£108,885.75	<b>-£70,808.25</b>	-39%
3204064	Norlington School and 6th Form	£205,529.00	£126,951.27	<b>-£78,577.73</b>	-38%
3204076	Lammas School and Sixth Form	£314,418.00	£230,704.83	<b>-£83,713.17</b>	-27%
3205400	Highams Park School	£325,236.78	£261,366.72	<b>-£63,870.06</b>	-20%
3205401	Chingford Foundation School	£436,426.00	£352,724.21	<b>-£83,701.79</b>	-19%
3206905	Walthamstow Academy	£503,540.00	£332,569.00	<b>-£170,971.00</b>	-34%
3204062	George Mitchell School	£350,449.00	£272,931.69	<b>-£77,517.31</b>	-22%

APPENDIX B - COMPARISON OF MFG LEVELS

School Name	2020-21		0.50%			1.00%			2.00%		
	20-21 MFG Adjustment	20-21 Post MFG Budget	21-22 MFG Adjustment	21-22 Post MFG Budget	Year on year % Change	21-22 MFG Adjustment	21-22 Post MFG Budget	Year on year % Change	21-22 MFG Adjustment	21-22 Post MFG Budget	Year on year % Change
Dawlish Primary School	£35,972.85	£947,387.39	£5,525.30	£988,582.80	0.42%	£11,865.33	£992,759.69	0.85%	£30,659.19	£1,001,113.46	1.70%
Coppermill Primary School	£46,514.25	£1,106,342.36	£13,243.54	£1,156,216.79	0.43%	£20,806.91	£1,161,154.31	0.86%	£43,355.19	£1,171,029.34	1.72%
St Saviour's Church of England Primary School	£91,577.95	£1,522,045.74	£35,149.29	£1,606,428.23	0.46%	£46,263.12	£1,613,736.32	0.91%	£79,247.14	£1,628,352.50	1.83%
George Tomlinson Primary School	£123,932.15	£2,076,456.70	£18,879.11	£2,174,052.25	0.46%	£33,902.84	£2,183,951.53	0.91%	£78,433.77	£2,203,750.07	1.83%
Gwyn Jones Primary School	£150,320.22	£1,785,664.90	£49,728.12	£1,873,609.49	0.46%	£62,929.37	£1,882,172.12	0.92%	£102,442.18	£1,899,297.38	1.84%
Mayville Primary School	£88,664.50	£1,706,948.14	£7,879.92	£1,785,998.06	0.46%	£20,201.36	£1,794,178.30	0.92%	£56,548.73	£1,810,538.78	1.84%
Greenleaf Primary School	£97,480.89	£1,879,066.11	£43,988.77	£1,974,488.42	0.46%	£57,815.55	£1,983,537.76	0.92%	£98,971.73	£2,001,636.45	1.84%
Chapel End Junior Academy	£40,083.07	£1,543,581.71	£130,214.97	£1,768,262.89	0.46%	£142,133.18	£1,776,375.34	0.92%	£176,725.92	£1,792,600.24	1.84%
Whittingham Primary Academy	£93,119.80	£1,772,512.38	£27,407.68	£1,855,282.07	0.46%	£40,280.24	£1,863,816.77	0.92%	£78,285.61	£1,880,886.16	1.85%
Stoneydown Park School	£124,247.79	£2,389,530.46	£11,369.59	£2,501,870.03	0.46%	£28,835.43	£2,513,447.96	0.93%	£80,408.40	£2,536,603.81	1.86%
The Winns Primary School	£149,543.92	£2,918,369.50	£68,669.79	£3,056,380.95	0.47%	£90,186.00	£3,070,667.40	0.94%	£153,652.21	£3,099,240.30	1.88%
Mission Grove Primary School	£179,862.55	£3,267,226.87	£16,674.81	£3,424,240.75	0.47%	£40,977.32	£3,440,307.11	0.94%	£112,860.50	£3,472,439.82	1.89%
Henry Maynard Primary School	£234,715.27	£3,572,787.68	£35,996.01	£3,754,967.55	0.47%	£63,013.23	£3,772,591.85	0.94%	£143,595.23	£3,807,840.46	1.89%
Willow Brook Primary School Academy	£118,912.06	£2,387,908.74	£13,695.39	£2,498,230.43	0.47%	£31,193.68	£2,509,968.05	0.94%	£82,471.90	£2,533,443.27	1.89%
St Mary's CofE Primary School	£152,415.86	£2,386,825.44	£15,040.67	£2,511,460.96	0.47%	£33,409.99	£2,523,271.44	0.94%	£88,686.16	£2,546,892.39	1.89%
Newport School	£268,268.79	£3,404,685.48	£121,786.29	£3,573,006.81	0.47%	£147,517.45	£3,589,888.75	0.95%	£223,990.74	£3,623,652.62	1.90%
Selwyn Primary School	£190,889.57	£2,768,754.90	£10,558.65	£2,903,626.34	0.47%	£31,357.95	£2,917,346.26	0.95%	£92,965.33	£2,944,786.10	1.90%
Davies Lane Primary School	£298,950.15	£3,559,172.35	£107,404.21	£3,738,820.06	0.48%	£134,769.35	£3,756,734.45	0.96%	£216,210.68	£3,792,563.24	1.93%
Norlington School and 6th Form	£286,761.93	£3,954,317.05	£99,571.17	£4,151,428.31	0.48%	£129,907.50	£4,171,368.37	0.97%	£219,963.57	£4,211,248.48	1.93%
The Woodside Primary Academy	£305,478.49	£4,875,569.54	£63,943.59	£5,102,517.66	0.49%	£100,398.70	£5,127,150.67	0.97%	£206,722.26	£5,176,416.67	1.94%
Barclay Primary School	£362,230.11	£5,280,691.13	£49,914.74	£5,535,889.33	0.49%	£90,016.14	£5,562,641.69	0.97%	£207,947.87	£5,616,146.41	1.94%
Hillyfield Primary Academy	£305,717.13	£5,845,467.34	£106,365.35	£6,121,820.88	0.49%	£150,474.00	£6,151,516.26	0.97%	£279,428.07	£6,210,907.03	1.95%
Edinburgh Primary School	£119,901.63	£2,248,586.95	£0.00	£2,354,412.38	0.59%	£12,531.14	£2,361,564.57	0.89%	£59,417.98	£2,382,490.79	1.79%
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	£79,057.41	£1,827,128.26	£0.00	£1,917,568.15	0.61%	£10,654.58	£1,923,618.82	0.93%	£50,577.12	£1,941,321.29	1.86%
Parkside Primary School	£132,197.21	£2,622,925.09	£0.00	£2,750,182.87	0.62%	£15,047.04	£2,758,786.74	0.94%	£71,741.89	£2,784,384.67	1.87%
Woodford Green Primary School	£48,883.34	£919,407.35	£0.00	£966,003.42	0.73%	£3,583.41	£967,273.31	0.86%	£23,023.22	£975,547.26	1.73%
Sydborn Primary School	£81,996.78	£2,363,686.46	£0.00	£2,482,482.97	0.78%	£9,863.94	£2,486,528.39	0.94%	£61,214.13	£2,509,796.45	1.89%
South Grove Primary School	£86,301.47	£2,236,854.59	£0.00	£2,339,798.80	0.88%	£5,390.30	£2,340,365.39	0.90%	£49,632.60	£2,361,326.87	1.81%
Chase Lane Primary School	£104,915.02	£3,180,786.82	£0.00	£3,338,657.30	1.09%	£1,670.38	£3,333,213.60	0.93%	£66,686.77	£3,363,894.97	1.86%
Handsworth Primary School	£111,081.79	£1,802,330.28	£0.00	£1,906,766.24	1.14%	£712.45	£1,902,631.86	0.92%	£41,461.27	£1,919,988.20	1.84%
St Joseph's Catholic Infant School	£19,499.67	£648,991.69	£0.00	£680,790.57	1.29%	£0.00	£679,437.16	1.08%	£10,053.83	£682,958.96	1.61%
Roger Ascham Primary School	£29,212.02	£1,911,316.19	£0.00	£2,030,760.80	1.42%	£0.00	£2,026,133.75	1.19%	£35,884.11	£2,039,686.14	1.86%
Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	£33,576.00	£1,235,098.54	£0.00	£1,299,633.19	1.45%	£0.00	£1,296,949.50	1.24%	£18,408.84	£1,302,405.95	1.67%
Ainslie Wood Primary School	£61,452.22	£1,909,646.23	£0.00	£2,020,485.70	1.47%	£0.00	£2,015,719.84	1.23%	£34,607.96	£2,027,326.13	1.81%
Longshaw Primary School	£58,718.91	£1,547,816.66	£0.00	£1,637,824.17	1.48%	£0.00	£1,633,960.58	1.24%	£28,131.50	£1,643,445.09	1.83%
Frederick Bremer School	£195,956.16	£6,070,611.51	£0.00	£6,428,174.58	1.69%	£0.00	£6,413,431.77	1.45%	£98,352.38	£6,440,630.36	1.88%
The Jenny Hammond Primary School	£52,752.46	£1,554,736.92	£0.00	£1,649,647.98	1.69%	£0.00	£1,645,795.96	1.46%	£24,037.79	£1,651,242.59	1.79%
Riverley Primary School	£62,320.65	£2,129,569.13	£0.00	£2,253,625.56	1.92%	£0.00	£2,248,859.70	1.71%	£26,673.97	£2,252,532.00	1.87%
Barn Croft Primary School	£14,545.18	£962,369.17	£0.00	£1,019,538.21	1.96%	£0.00	£1,017,363.49	1.74%	£9,946.85	£1,016,814.44	1.69%
Lime Academy Larkwood	£95,103.43	£2,925,546.73	£0.00	£3,106,184.84	2.01%	£0.00	£3,099,197.99	1.78%	£37,554.96	£3,103,032.06	1.90%
George Mitchell School	£184,756.93	£5,225,517.15	£0.00	£5,574,093.65	2.15%	£0.00	£5,560,581.58	1.91%	£67,010.98	£5,562,378.68	1.94%
Lammas School and Sixth Form	£114,482.76	£5,103,496.70	£0.00	£5,432,371.29	2.17%	£0.00	£5,420,636.14	1.95%	£55,813.20	£5,419,811.49	1.94%
Walthamstow Academy	£119,540.44	£5,634,770.44	£0.00	£6,021,687.68	2.18%	£0.00	£6,006,499.79	1.93%	£74,128.46	£6,007,326.34	1.94%
Thorp Hall Primary School	£78,223.29	£1,918,947.76	£0.00	£2,043,530.82	2.21%	£0.00	£2,038,834.36	1.98%	£19,391.48	£2,035,559.14	1.81%
Leytonstone School	£219,934.75	£5,282,934.96	£0.00	£5,659,458.17	2.30%	£0.00	£5,644,860.86	2.04%	£62,853.40	£5,637,262.69	1.90%
Yardley Primary School	£77,833.14	£1,795,708.00	£0.00	£1,923,306.31	2.41%	£0.00	£1,918,494.18	2.15%	£17,617.02	£1,912,886.21	1.85%
Chingford CofE Primary School	£74,334.47	£1,830,927.86	£0.00	£1,961,035.79	2.47%	£0.00	£1,956,200.52	2.22%	£16,396.75	£1,949,260.62	1.86%
Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	£55,535.95	£1,789,049.07	£0.00	£1,912,747.27	2.50%	£0.00	£1,908,247.46	2.26%	£14,146.64	£1,900,676.51	1.86%
Thomas Gamuel Primary School	£53,830.64	£1,607,120.62	£0.00	£1,714,412.25	2.52%	£0.00	£1,710,606.50	2.29%	£10,730.88	£1,702,969.54	1.84%
Walthamstow School for Girls	£156,399.05	£5,558,155.49	£0.00	£5,978,308.46	2.54%	£0.00	£5,962,953.31	2.28%	£50,756.73	£5,939,600.85	1.88%
Downsell Primary School	£57,667.49	£2,799,957.34	£0.00	£2,974,854.62	2.56%	£0.00	£2,968,978.27	2.36%	£13,711.66	£2,954,328.64	1.86%
Salisbury Manor Primary School	£37,081.33	£1,388,339.73	£0.00	£1,481,563.84	2.60%	£0.00	£1,478,313.34	2.38%	£7,502.95	£1,470,128.25	1.81%
Connaught School for Girls	£113,697.52	£3,818,861.13	£0.00	£4,114,070.45	2.77%	£0.00	£4,103,243.33	2.50%	£29,258.26	£4,080,246.26	1.93%
Whitehall Primary School	£46,286.29	£1,924,783.07	£0.00	£2,063,799.89	2.82%	£0.00	£2,058,987.76	2.58%	£7,747.73	£2,043,510.50	1.81%
Eden Girls' School Waltham Forest	£74,908.08	£3,628,646.10	£0.00	£3,916,522.70	3.27%	£0.00	£3,906,945.13	3.02%	£3,784.52	£3,864,505.02	1.90%
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£30,285.55	£947,932.28	£0.00	£1,023,970.83	3.44%	£0.00	£1,021,518.50	3.19%	£0.00	£1,009,682.68	2.00%
Emmanuel Community School	£8,900.74	£920,242.42	£0.00	£992,549.01	3.55%	£0.00	£990,420.57	3.33%	£0.00	£980,147.97	2.26%
Willowfield School	£64,300.61	£5,661,284.50	£0.00	£6,137,101.79	3.69%	£0.00	£6,121,964.91	3.44%	£0.00	£6,048,909.18	2.20%
Holy Family Catholic School	£102,340.44	£5,952,351.79	£0.00	£6,472,969.64	3.80%	£0.00	£6,456,352.48	3.53%	£0.00	£6,376,152.35	2.24%
Heathcote School & Science College	£75,087.56	£6,248,609.49	£0.00	£6,766,447.98	3.85%	£0.00	£6,750,779.26	3.61%	£0.00	£6,675,156.66	2.45%
Kelmscott School	£72,356.39	£5,421,121.27	£0.00	£5,883,286.05	3.87%	£0.00	£5,868,983.68	3.62%	£0.00	£5,799,955.59	2.40%
Highams Park School	£179,487.56	£6,816,009.10	£0.00	£7,464,646.55	4.25%	£0.00	£7,444,412.52	3.97%	£0.00	£7,346,756.18	2.61%
Buxton School	£46,121.42	£7,285,308.66	£0.00	£7,967,092.25	4.63%	£0.00	£7,947,837.78	4.38%	£0.00	£7,854,909.17	3.16%
Chingford Foundation School	£141,638.30	£7,444,820.76	£0.00	£8,177,323.44	4.66%	£0.00	£8,155,697.96	4.39%	£0.00	£8,051,325.98	3.05%
South Chingford Foundation School	£15,147.01	£3,281,555.99	£0.00	£3,592,076.84	4.75%	£0.00	£3,583,404.74	4.49%	£0.00	£3,541,550.21	3.27%
Oakhill Primary School	£19,644.46	£926,063.91	£0.00	£1,012,701.39	4.89%	£0.00	£1,010,399.43	4.65%	£0.00	£999,289.40	3.50%
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	£0.00	£994,929.36	£0.00	£1,087,893.86	5.00%	£0.00	£1,085,487.80	4.77%	£0.00	£1,073,875.30	3.65%
Walthamstow Primary Academy	£2,678.05	£770,630.21	£0.00	£749,784.38	6.70%	£0.00	£748,269.02	6.49%	£0.00	£740,955.38	5.45%
	£7,355,631	£201,026,796	£1,053,007	£214,339,326		£1,567,708	£214,339,326		£4,051,830	£214,339,326	

APPENDIX C - 2021-22 NFF FUNDING FACTORS

NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA 2020-21

ACA  
1.08204

PUPIL-LED FACTORS			
		PRIMARY PER PUPIL	SECONDARY PER PUPIL
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	£3,091	
	KS3		£4,348
	KS4		£4,935
DEPRIVATION	FSM	£487	£487
	FSM Ever 6	£606	£882
	IDACI F	£227	£325
	IDACI E	£271	£438
	IDACI D	£406	£579
	IDACI C	£438	£628
	IDACI B	£471	£676
	IDACI A	£649	£909
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	£1,152	£1,742
	EAL	£579	£1,558
	MOBILITY	£947	£1,353

SCHOOL-LED FACTORS	
LUMP SUM (Each school)	£123,785
RATES	Actual Costs
PFI	Actual Costs

NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA FACTORS 2021-22

ACA  
1.08274

PUPIL-LED FACTORS			
		PRIMARY PER PUPIL	SECONDARY PER PUPIL
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	£3,381	
	KS3		£4,768
	KS4		£5,374
DEPRIVATION	FSM	£498	£498
	FSM Ever 6	£623	£910
	IDACI F	£233	£336
	IDACI E	£282	£449
	IDACI D	£444	£628
	IDACI C	£482	£682
	IDACI B	£514	£736
	IDACI A	£671	£937
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	£1,186	£1,797
	EAL	£596	£1,608
	MOBILITY	£974	£1,397

SCHOOL-LED FACTORS	
LUMP SUM (Each school)	£127,547
RATES	Actual Costs
PFI	Actual Costs

DIFFERENCE NNF FACTORS 2020-21 TO 2021-22

		PRIMARY PER PUPIL	SECONDARY PER PUPIL
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	£290	
	KS3		£421
	KS4		£438
DEPRIVATION	FSM	£11	£11
	FSM Ever 6	£17	£28
	IDACI F	£6	£11
	IDACI E	£11	£11
	IDACI D	£38	£49
	IDACI C	£44	£55
	IDACI B	£44	£60
	IDACI A	£22	£28
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	£33	£55
	EAL	£17	£50
	MOBILITY	£28	£44

SCHOOL-LED FACTORS	
LUMP SUM (Each school)	£3,761
RATES	
PFI	

APPENDIX D - 2% MFG 2021-22

		Frederick Bremer	Norlington	Highams Park	Heathcote	Woodford Green	Selwyn	Handsworth	Davies Lane	Hillyfield	Woodside
A	NOR	861	608	1,181	917	200	612	419	817	1,246	1,022
	Basic Entitlement	£4,486,735.15	£3,163,938.45	£6,157,902.46	£4,768,524.38	£704,084.16	£2,154,497.52	£1,475,056.31	£2,876,183.79	£4,386,444.31	£3,597,870.05
	FSM	£83,674.15	£56,280.83	£93,137.29	£97,619.84	£7,968.97	£88,654.75	£18,428.23	£46,319.62	£93,137.29	£118,538.38
	FSM6	£303,548.59	£201,082.54	£295,360.45	£328,045.10	£19,354.68	£145,780.11	£41,287.06	£90,896.02	£185,390.39	£228,455.75
	IDACI	£249,225.09	£126,951.27	£261,366.72	£292,020.39	£25,016.71	£113,477.92	£48,804.51	£123,561.94	£229,519.36	£251,837.30
	EAL	£65,922.62	£22,510.16	£35,463.20	£35,373.12	£14,011.93	£71,883.69	£33,361.66	£111,246.91	£115,591.69	£155,723.68
	Low Attainment	£378,025.68	£187,045.30	£326,199.29	£359,342.54	£50,483.63	£126,392.64	£111,947.39	£148,127.16	£417,955.91	£402,828.82
	Mobility	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£5,212.17	£0.00	£1,990.35	£0.00	£23,156.48
	PFI	£379,812.32	£0.00	£0.00	£413,854.52	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£310,390.89	£0.00
	Split Sites	£30,000.00	£90,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£40,000.00	£40,000.00	£40,000.00
B	Subtotal MFG budget	£5,976,943.61	£3,847,808.54	£7,169,429.41	£6,294,779.88	£820,920.07	£2,705,898.80	£1,728,885.16	£3,438,325.79	£5,778,429.85	£4,818,410.45
	Lump Sum	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77	£127,546.77
	Rates	£237,787.60	£15,929.60	£49,780.00	£252,830.00	£4,057.20	£18,375.20	£22,095.00	£10,480.00	£25,502.34	£23,737.20
C	Total Allocation	£6,342,277.98	£3,991,284.91	£7,346,756.18	£6,675,156.66	£952,524.04	£2,851,820.77	£1,878,526.93	£3,576,352.56	£5,931,478.96	£4,969,694.42
D=B/A	20-21 unit value	£6,941.86	£6,328.63	£6,070.64	£6,864.54	£4,104.60	£4,421.40	£4,126.22	£4,208.48	£4,637.58	£4,714.69
E	19-20 unit value	£6,917.74	£6,559.23	£5,912.64	£6,690.78	£4,136.98	£4,483.63	£4,142.32	£4,385.41	£4,766.51	£4,820.55
D-E	Change in £	£24.12	-£230.60	£158.00	£173.76	-£32.38	-£62.23	-£16.11	-£176.93	-£128.93	-£105.86
D-E	Change %	0.35%	-3.52%	2.67%	2.60%	-0.78%	-1.39%	-0.39%	-4.03%	-2.70%	-2.20%
F	Adjustment %	1.65%	5.52%	0.00%	0.00%	2.78%	3.39%	2.39%	6.03%	4.70%	4.20%
G =(A*E)*F	Adjustment £	£98,352.38	£219,963.57	£0.00	£0.00	£23,023.22	£92,965.33	£41,461.27	£216,210.68	£279,428.07	£206,722.26
H = C+G	POST MFG Budget	£6,440,630.36	£4,211,248.48	£7,346,756.18	£6,675,156.66	£975,547.26	£2,944,786.10	£1,919,988.20	£3,792,563.24	£6,210,907.03	£5,176,416.67
J =(H/A)	Per PUPIL	£7,480.41	£6,926.40	£6,220.79	£7,279.34	£4,877.74	£4,811.74	£4,582.31	£4,642.06	£4,984.68	£5,064.99

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>8</b>
Report Title	<b>Notional SEN</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Hiran Perera, Senior Accountant Education Finance <a href="mailto:hiran.perera@walthamforest.gov.uk">hiran.perera@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 020 8496 6805  Harun Guleid, Senior Accountant Education Finance <a href="mailto:harun.guleid@walthamforest.gov.uk">harun.guleid@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 020 8496 4177		
Appendices	Appendix A: Notional SEN Averages Appendix B: Notional SEN Models 2021-22 Appendix C: Notional SEN Allocations 2019-20 & 20-21 Appendix D: Options		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report summarises the conclusions of the Task & Finish group held on 12 October 2020 and sets out the proposed changes to Notional SEN budgets in 2021-22.
- 1.2 The Notional SEN budget is a notional portion of the Schools Block which is calculated using the Department of Education's Authority Pro-Forma Tool (APT) and is also advised to maintained schools as part of their Individual School Budget shares in February.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2.1 Schools Forum to agree:

- 2.1.1 That the 2021-22 Notional SEN budgets are set by officers at:
  - c) National Averages **Recommended**
  - a) 2020-21 Factors
  - b) 2019-20 Phase Split

## 3 NOTIONAL SEN

- 3.1 School Funding regulations require that the Notional SEN budget comes from the Schools Block, comprising proportions of funding from factors such as the



basic per-pupil entitlement, deprivation and prior attainment. It is from this notional budget that mainstream schools are expected to:

- Meet the needs of pupils with low cost, frequently occurring SEND (e.g. learning and cognition.)
- Contribute, up to at least the first £6,000 to the costs of provision for pupils with additional needs (most pupils with SEND will not require this full amount of funding).

3.2 A schools Notional SEN budget is not ringfenced.

3.3 Historically in LBWF the Notional SEN budget has been around 10% of the total Schools Block allocation.

3.4 For 2020-21 significant alterations were made to the Local Funding Formula to align it with the National Funding Formula which resulted in less funding going through AWPU and considerably more going through other factors such as Low Prior Attainment.

3.5 To maintain the overall level of Notional SEN at 10% of total Schools Block funding most of the factor percentages were reduced as shown in **Table 1** below:

**Table 1: Notional SEN Factors & Percentages**

Factor	2019-20		2020-21	
	%	£	%	£
AWPU	2%	£3,077,188	2%	£2,173,336
FSM	50%	£0	32%	£1,018,673
FSM6	50%	£5,595,444	32%	£2,561,481
IDACI(A- F)	50%	£3,142,614	32%	£3,695,281
EAL	20%	£1,210,215	16%	£735,537
Mobility	20%	£68,100	16%	£39,055
LPA	100%	£6,439,994	79%	£9,879,316
<b>Notional SEN</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>£19,533,555</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>£20,102,679</b>
<b>Schools Block</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>£198,694,151</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>£201,026,796</b>

- 3.6 See **Appendix C** for school level Notional SEN allocations for 2019-20 & 2020-21. This shows that almost all primary schools Notional SEN increased, and all secondary schools had a reduction in Notional SEN.
- 3.7 A task and Finish Group meeting was held on Monday 12 October 2020 where all members were invited to attend and share their views on how the Notional SEN budget should be set for 2021-22.
- 3.8 At the meeting the need for stability to school Notional SEN budgets was emphasised, as well as the need to direct funding where it was needed, at high incidence low need pupils. It was agreed that it was difficult to isolate one or more specific factors in the LFF that perfectly related to this.
- 3.9 Firstly it was agreed that as Waltham Forest's Notional SEN as a percentage of Schools block was very close to the average across the country, we should aim to continue this trend going forward. It was agreed to recommend that our Notional SEN % across the borough should mirror the Greater London average. In 2020-21 the Greater London average was 10.2% and Waltham Forest's was 10.1%. The calculations for this are shown in **Appendix A**.
- 3.10 Three proposals were presented and it was agreed to bring them all to School Forum to choose the most appropriate model. The sums allocated by all three models are shown in Appendix B and the percentages applied to each funding factor are shown in Appendix D. They are:
- 3.10.1 A – Continue with 2020-21 factors
- This model continues with the factors from the current year to provide stability in Notional SEN budgets from the current year to the next.
- 3.10.2 B – Revert to 2019-20 budgets
- This would reverse changes in Notional SEN budgets for the current year and attempt to return to the Primary/Secondary phases that was present in 2019-20 budgets.
- 3.10.3 C – Use National Averages
- This would use the factors most commonly used nationally and at the average percentages they are used.
- 3.11 The table below shows the Primary Secondary phase split for the three models described above, as well as the split for the current year.

	2020-21		Model A - As Is		Model B - Revert		Model C - Nat Ave	
Primary	£11,566,873	58%	£12,128,800	58%	£11,254,213	53%	£11,803,769	56%
Secondary	£8,373,658	42%	£8,759,261	42%	£9,692,729	46%	£9,107,796	43%

- 3.12 Officers recommend Option C, using national averages. This option concedes the difficulty in finding appropriate factors linked to High Incidence, Low Need SEN and instead uses the 'Wisdom of the Crowd' to allocate funding through the most commonly used factors nationally.

Local authority Code	Local authority name	Total Funding for Schools Block Formula	Total Funding for Schools Block Formula Notional SEN	Notional SEN %
304	Brent	£231,267,145	£37,714,629	16.3%
307	Ealing	£248,585,620	£34,645,131	13.9%
308	Enfield	£266,232,710	£35,021,282	13.2%
313	Hounslow	£199,505,268	£25,606,311	12.8%
306	Croydon	£261,176,811	£33,216,339	12.7%
319	Sutton	£161,158,614	£19,452,220	12.1%
305	Bromley	£217,253,180	£25,389,945	11.7%
318	Richmond upon Thames	£121,043,618	£12,524,126	10.3%
317	Redbridge	£239,041,524	£24,423,147	10.2% AVERAGE
320	Waltham Forest	£201,026,796	£20,102,679	10.0% AVERAGE
315	Merton	£128,726,233	£12,789,014	9.9%
303	Bexley	£186,330,570	£18,202,219	9.8%
301	Barking and Dagenham	£224,099,350	£21,615,829	9.6%
310	Harrow	£170,068,838	£15,334,216	9.0%
302	Barnet	£263,087,577	£22,039,675	8.4%
314	Kingston upon Thames	£109,548,393	£8,640,945	7.9%
316	Newham	£348,391,784	£26,194,748	7.5%
309	Haringey	£199,037,485	£12,903,991	6.5%
311	Havering	£178,228,538	£8,965,251	5.0%
312	Hillingdon	£229,627,815	£11,528,880	5.0%
Average				10.1%

## APPENDIX B - NOTIONAL SEN MODELS

School Name	Notional SEN Budget 2020-21	A - CONTINUE WITH 2020-21 FACTORS			B - REVERT TO 2019-20 PHASE SPLIT			C - NATIONAL AVERAGES		
		As Is	%	£ Change	Reverse	%	£ Change	National Average	%	£ Change
<b>Total</b>	<b>£20,102,679</b>	<b>£21,060,728</b>			<b>£21,103,481</b>			<b>£21,060,726</b>		
Chase Lane Primary School	£319,127.50	£332,629.32	4.2%	£13,502	£305,889.36	-4.1%	£-13,238	£318,756.54	-0.1%	£-371
Whitehall Primary School	£211,264.88	£222,262.30	5.2%	£10,997	£204,394.71	-3.3%	£-6,870	£217,572.20	3.0%	£6,307
Downsell Primary School	£296,691.95	£315,046.70	6.2%	£18,355	£289,720.21	-2.3%	£-6,972	£289,770.18	-2.3%	£-6,922
Newport School	£344,798.91	£354,243.51	2.7%	£9,445	£325,766.00	-5.5%	£-19,033	£347,909.26	0.9%	£3,110
Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Centre	£128,866.79	£133,345.60	3.5%	£4,479	£122,626.00	-4.8%	£-6,241	£119,079.27	-7.6%	£-9,788
Edinburgh Primary School	£229,489.66	£247,633.59	7.9%	£18,144	£227,726.42	-0.8%	£-1,763	£242,292.58	5.6%	£12,803
Greenleaf Primary School	£154,185.66	£147,906.61	-4.1%	£-6,279	£136,016.45	-11.8%	£-18,169	£143,252.86	-7.1%	£-10,933
Handsworth Primary School	£145,905.15	£161,363.17	10.6%	£15,458	£148,391.24	1.7%	£2,486	£166,950.98	14.4%	£21,046
Thorpe Hall Primary School	£203,020.61	£220,800.37	8.8%	£17,780	£203,050.31	0.0%	£30	£212,095.68	4.5%	£9,075
The Winns Primary School	£319,232.27	£315,989.80	-1.0%	£-3,242	£290,587.50	-9.0%	£-28,645	£307,374.29	-3.7%	£-11,858
Oakhill Primary School	£84,515.32	£93,821.74	11.0%	£9,306	£86,279.45	2.1%	£1,764	£93,736.34	10.9%	£9,221
Henry Maynard Primary School	£313,831.25	£334,840.44	6.7%	£21,009	£307,922.74	-1.9%	£-5,909	£342,136.33	9.0%	£28,305
South Grove Primary School	£192,752.82	£202,720.12	5.2%	£9,967	£186,423.52	-3.3%	£-6,329	£193,760.47	0.5%	£1,008
Dawlish Primary School	£96,630.20	£97,050.48	0.4%	£420	£89,248.63	-7.6%	£-7,382	£91,036.37	-5.8%	£-5,594
Gwyn Jones Primary School	£137,870.70	£146,342.33	6.1%	£8,472	£134,577.93	-2.4%	£-3,293	£147,450.63	6.9%	£9,580
George Tomlinson Primary School	£216,587.66	£229,625.72	6.0%	£13,038	£211,166.19	-2.5%	£-5,421	£193,760.47	1.1%	£2,338
Mission Grove Primary School	£285,841.37	£299,098.55	4.6%	£13,257	£275,054.12	-3.8%	£-10,787	£286,120.99	0.1%	£280
Coppermill Primary School	£94,146.83	£91,505.96	-2.8%	£-2,641	£84,149.83	-10.6%	£-9,997	£89,283.96	-5.2%	£-4,863
Stoneydown Park School	£256,136.83	£269,302.28	5.1%	£13,165	£247,653.16	-3.3%	£-8,484	£262,336.95	2.4%	£6,200
Parkside Primary School	£306,441.54	£327,394.52	6.8%	£20,953	£301,075.39	-1.8%	£-5,366	£315,504.53	3.0%	£9,063
The Jenny Hammond Primary School	£164,822.33	£172,884.66	4.9%	£8,062	£158,986.52	-3.5%	£-5,836	£171,193.89	3.9%	£6,372
Ainslie Wood Primary School	£210,293.90	£217,586.71	3.5%	£7,293	£200,094.99	-4.8%	£-10,199	£211,424.97	0.5%	£1,131
Barn Croft Primary School	£114,557.07	£116,466.57	1.7%	£1,909	£107,103.86	-6.5%	£-7,453	£110,554.62	-3.5%	£-4,002
Chingford CofE Primary School	£183,293.06	£198,645.94	8.4%	£15,353	£182,676.86	-0.3%	£-616	£199,728.76	9.0%	£16,436
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£90,455.88	£98,381.69	8.8%	£7,926	£90,472.82	0.0%	£17	£101,300.89	12.0%	£10,845
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	£121,927.69	£128,406.63	5.3%	£6,479	£118,084.07	-3.2%	£-3,844	£125,297.08	2.8%	£3,369
St Joseph's Catholic Infant School	£58,287.19	£59,824.85	2.6%	£1,538	£55,015.55	-5.6%	£-3,272	£52,179.49	-10.5%	£-6,108
Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary School	£188,191.83	£199,647.30	6.1%	£11,455	£183,597.73	-2.4%	£-4,594	£196,971.90	4.7%	£8,780
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	£194,750.62	£201,850.41	3.6%	£7,100	£185,623.73	-4.7%	£-9,127	£198,715.65	2.0%	£3,965
Frederick Bremer School	£592,709.31	£620,468.30	4.7%	£27,759	£690,518.45	16.5%	£97,809	£638,387.52	7.7%	£45,678
Heathcote School & Science College	£603,057.23	£631,585.48	4.7%	£28,528	£702,890.74	16.6%	£99,834	£658,379.84	9.2%	£55,323
Willowfield School	£574,444.34	£590,012.60	2.7%	£15,568	£656,624.34	14.3%	£82,180	£608,743.28	6.0%	£34,299
Leytonstone School	£468,443.90	£502,150.06	7.2%	£33,706	£558,842.22	19.3%	£90,398	£527,990.70	12.7%	£59,547
Walthamstow School for Girls	£456,550.64	£471,453.69	3.3%	£14,903	£524,680.27	14.9%	£68,130	£514,203.44	12.6%	£57,653
Kelmscott School	£585,737.06	£611,981.44	4.5%	£26,244	£681,073.44	16.3%	£95,336	£611,319.92	4.4%	£25,583
Holy Family Catholic School	£574,565.31	£597,119.79	3.9%	£22,554	£664,533.92	15.7%	£89,969	£636,236.67	10.7%	£61,671
Buxton School	£917,004.87	£965,800.21	5.3%	£48,795	£1,003,594.65	9.4%	£86,590	£936,709.54	2.1%	£19,705
Lime Academy Larkwood	£244,483.58	£257,613.84	5.4%	£13,130	£236,904.35	-3.1%	£-7,579	£254,016.83	3.9%	£9,533
Yardley Primary School	£153,068.25	£165,867.91	8.4%	£12,800	£152,533.85	-0.3%	£-534	£173,822.66	13.6%	£20,754
Davies Lane Primary School	£267,755.96	£280,013.05	4.6%	£12,257	£257,502.90	-3.8%	£-10,253	£286,499.25	7.0%	£18,743
Hillyfield Primary Academy	£610,932.22	£617,566.88	1.1%	£6,635	£567,920.90	-7.0%	£-43,011	£615,974.89	0.8%	£5,043
Emmanuel Community School	£99,127.44	£103,284.94	4.2%	£4,158	£94,981.90	-4.2%	£-4,146	£96,014.41	-3.1%	£-3,113
Willow Brook Primary School Academy	£280,535.67	£293,671.51	4.7%	£13,136	£270,063.36	-3.7%	£-10,472	£281,899.73	0.5%	£1,364
The Woodside Primary Academy	£594,334.89	£633,414.41	6.6%	£39,080	£582,494.45	-2.0%	£-11,840	£602,582.33	1.4%	£8,247
Chapel End Junior Academy	£181,010.90	£186,537.59	3.1%	£5,527	£171,541.90	-5.2%	£-9,469	£177,361.08	-2.0%	£-3,650
Riverley Primary School	£210,958.04	£222,541.72	5.5%	£11,584	£204,651.67	-3.0%	£-6,306	£212,278.97	0.6%	£1,321
Sybourn Primary School	£288,824.52	£297,009.66	2.8%	£8,185	£273,133.16	-5.4%	£-15,691	£275,980.81	-4.4%	£-12,844
Thomas Gamuel Primary School	£193,742.73	£209,111.70	7.9%	£15,369	£192,301.28	-0.7%	£-1,441	£192,414.35	-0.7%	£-1,328
Walthamstow Primary Academy	£71,552.87	£64,388.54	-10.0%	£-7,164	£59,212.37	-17.2%	£-12,340	£58,975.76	-17.6%	£-12,577
Roger Ascham Primary School	£250,438.99	£254,732.03	1.7%	£4,293	£234,254.21	-6.5%	£-16,185	£245,011.30	-2.2%	£-5,428
Longshaw Primary School	£154,549.87	£161,589.41	4.6%	£7,040	£148,599.30	-3.9%	£-5,951	£155,548.89	0.6%	£999
Salisbury Manor Primary School	£168,178.87	£178,866.46	6.4%	£10,688	£164,487.45	-2.2%	£-3,691	£168,584.89	0.2%	£406
Woodford Green Primary School	£70,169.78	£74,379.99	6.0%	£4,210	£68,400.61	-2.5%	£-1,769	£77,967.13	11.1%	£7,797
Whittingham Primary Academy	£170,572.83	£171,826.49	0.7%	£1,254	£158,013.42	-7.4%	£-12,559	£171,100.04	0.3%	£527
Mayville Primary School	£164,626.54	£172,019.66	4.5%	£7,393	£158,191.06	-3.9%	£-6,435	£164,348.77	-0.2%	£-278
St Saviour's Church of England Primary School	£139,881.43	£143,942.26	2.9%	£4,061	£132,370.79	-5.4%	£-7,511	£147,253.49	5.3%	£7,372
St Mary's CofE Primary School	£194,473.76	£205,389.64	5.6%	£10,916	£188,878.44	-2.9%	£-5,595	£220,489.35	13.4%	£26,016
Barclay Primary School	£555,489.10	£602,959.35	8.5%	£47,470	£554,487.67	-0.2%	£-1,001	£568,090.52	2.3%	£12,601
Selwyn Primary School	£248,050.79	£273,255.15	10.2%	£25,204	£251,288.27	1.3%	£3,237	£262,079.60	5.7%	£14,029
South Chingford Foundation School	£381,655.54	£399,763.12	4.7%	£18,108	£444,895.91	16.6%	£63,240	£394,650.82	3.4%	£12,995
Eden Girls' School Waltham Forest	£370,260.13	£386,507.87	4.4%	£16,248	£430,144.16	16.2%	£59,884	£396,592.18	7.1%	£26,332
Connaught School for Girls	£293,341.38	£301,796.15	2.9%	£8,455	£335,868.59	14.5%	£42,527	£325,852.35	11.1%	£32,511
Norlington School and 6th Form	£334,375.10	£344,193.71	2.9%	£9,819	£383,052.78	14.6%	£48,678	£366,174.34	9.5%	£31,799
Lammas School and Sixth Form	£479,550.87	£502,367.74	4.8%	£22,817	£559,084.48	16.6%	£79,534	£512,462.83	6.9%	£32,912
Highams Park School	£562,467.52	£603,135.25	7.2%	£40,668	£671,228.52	19.3%	£108,761	£655,010.56	16.5%	£92,543
Chingford Foundation School	£736,134.88	£787,953.33	7.0%	£51,818	£876,912.34	19.1%	£140,777	£842,750.96	14.5%	£106,616
Walthamstow Academy	£608,021.13	£613,906.89	1.0%	£5,886	£683,216.26	12.4%	£75,195	£647,118.86	6.4%	£39,098
George Mitchell School	£587,683.38	£623,931.87	6.2%	£36,248	£654,731.29	11.4%	£67,048	£607,133.33	3.3%	£19,450

School Name	Notional SEN Budget 2019-20	Notional SEN Budget 2020-21	£ Change on Previous Year	% Change on Previous Year
	<b>£19,533,555</b>	<b>£20,102,679</b>	<b>£569,124</b>	<b>3%</b>
Chase Lane Primary School	£282,522.74	£319,127.50	£36,604.76	12.96%
Whitehall Primary School	£182,201.28	£211,264.88	£29,063.61	15.95%
Downsell Primary School	£268,867.96	£296,691.95	£27,823.99	10.35%
Newport School	£314,555.39	£344,798.91	£30,243.52	9.61%
Chapel End Infant School and Early Years Ce	£101,699.82	£128,866.79	£27,166.97	26.71%
Edinburgh Primary School	£226,066.91	£229,489.66	£3,422.75	1.51%
Greenleaf Primary School	£134,832.18	£154,185.66	£19,353.48	14.35%
Handsworth Primary School	£118,433.98	£145,905.15	£27,471.17	23.20%
Thorpe Hall Primary School	£189,220.41	£203,020.61	£13,800.21	7.29%
The Winns Primary School	£330,632.69	£319,232.27	-£11,400.41	-3.45%
Oakhill Primary School	£76,630.66	£84,515.32	£7,884.66	10.29%
Henry Maynard Primary School	£280,168.61	£313,831.25	£33,662.64	12.02%
South Grove Primary School	£164,934.22	£192,752.82	£27,818.60	16.87%
Dawlish Primary School	£85,796.26	£96,630.20	£10,833.94	12.63%
Gwyn Jones Primary School	£130,661.57	£137,870.70	£7,209.13	5.52%
George Tomlinson Primary School	£188,767.42	£216,587.66	£27,820.24	14.74%
Mission Grove Primary School	£253,845.93	£285,841.37	£31,995.44	12.60%
Coppermill Primary School	£98,012.64	£94,146.83	-£3,865.81	-3.94%
Stoneydown Park School	£213,871.17	£256,136.83	£42,265.66	19.76%
Parkside Primary School	£255,510.13	£306,441.54	£50,931.41	19.93%
The Jenny Hammond Primary School	£128,071.43	£164,822.33	£36,750.89	28.70%
Ainslie Wood Primary School	£163,492.78	£210,293.90	£46,801.13	28.63%
Barn Croft Primary School	£96,045.36	£114,557.07	£18,511.71	19.27%
Chingford CofE Primary School	£145,852.14	£183,293.06	£37,440.91	25.67%
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	£68,549.72	£90,455.88	£21,906.16	31.96%
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	£97,740.32	£121,927.69	£24,187.37	24.75%
St Joseph's Catholic Infant School	£67,008.43	£58,287.19	-£8,721.24	-13.02%
Our Lady and St George's Catholic Primary S	£160,694.78	£188,191.83	£27,497.05	17.11%
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	£173,106.05	£194,750.62	£21,644.56	12.50%
Frederick Bremer School	£657,819.66	£592,709.31	-£65,110.34	-9.90%
Heathcote School & Science College	£643,344.83	£603,057.23	-£40,287.60	-6.26%
Willowfield School	£614,299.14	£574,444.34	-£39,854.80	-6.49%
Leytonstone School	£522,181.09	£468,443.90	-£53,737.18	-10.29%
Walthamstow School for Girls	£507,081.43	£456,550.64	-£50,530.79	-9.97%
Kelmscott School	£649,944.65	£585,737.06	-£64,207.58	-9.88%
Holy Family Catholic School	£596,910.26	£574,565.31	-£22,344.95	-3.74%
Buxton School	£922,111.51	£917,004.87	-£5,106.65	-0.55%
Lime Academy Larkwood	£212,543.76	£244,483.58	£31,939.81	15.03%
Yardley Primary School	£137,370.23	£153,068.25	£15,698.02	11.43%
Davies Lane Primary School	£247,695.45	£267,755.96	£20,060.51	8.10%
Hillyfield Primary Academy	£520,198.89	£610,932.22	£90,733.33	17.44%
Emmanuel Community School	£86,990.78	£99,127.44	£12,136.66	13.95%
Willow Brook Primary School Academy	£271,044.95	£280,535.67	£9,490.72	3.50%
The Woodside Primary Academy	£519,608.00	£594,334.89	£74,726.89	14.38%
Chapel End Junior Academy	£169,033.00	£181,010.90	£11,977.91	7.09%
Riverley Primary School	£174,560.24	£210,958.04	£36,397.81	20.85%
Sybourn Primary School	£248,957.67	£288,824.52	£39,866.85	16.01%
Thomas Gamuel Primary School	£176,335.87	£193,742.73	£17,406.85	9.87%
Walthamstow Primary Academy	£46,772.16	£71,552.87	£24,780.71	52.98%
Roger Ascham Primary School	£234,507.57	£250,438.99	£15,931.42	6.79%
Longshaw Primary School	£127,429.53	£154,549.87	£27,120.35	21.28%
Salisbury Manor Primary School	£170,709.54	£168,178.87	-£2,530.67	-1.48%
Woodford Green Primary School	£60,158.89	£70,169.78	£10,010.88	16.64%
Whittingham Primary Academy	£171,370.93	£170,572.83	-£798.10	-0.47%
Mayville Primary School	£153,943.67	£164,626.54	£10,682.87	6.94%
St Saviour's Church of England Primary Scho	£128,895.38	£139,881.43	£10,986.05	8.52%
St Mary's CofE Primary School	£170,889.94	£194,473.76	£23,583.82	13.80%
Barclay Primary School	£483,527.40	£555,489.10	£71,961.69	14.88%
Selwyn Primary School	£218,121.00	£248,050.79	£29,929.79	13.72%
South Chingford Foundation School	£419,135.42	£381,655.54	-£37,479.88	-8.94%
Eden Girls' School Waltham Forest	£392,944.00	£370,260.13	-£22,683.87	-5.77%
Connaught School for Girls	£327,898.11	£293,341.38	-£34,556.73	-10.54%
Norlington School and 6th Form	£374,085.14	£334,375.10	-£39,710.04	-10.62%
Lammas School and Sixth Form	£545,604.34	£479,550.87	-£66,053.47	-12.11%
Highams Park School	£608,527.85	£562,467.52	-£46,060.32	-7.57%
Chingford Foundation School	£749,213.44	£736,134.88	-£13,078.56	-1.75%
Walthamstow Academy	£668,522.60	£608,021.13	-£60,501.46	-9.05%
George Mitchell School	£605,473.35	£587,683.38	-£17,789.97	-2.94%

## OPTION A: AS IS

		PRIMARY	SECONDARY
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	1.70%	
	KS3		1.70%
	KS4		1.70%
DEPRIVATION	FSM	33.91%	33.91%
	FSM Ever 6	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI F	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI E	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI D	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI C	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI B	33.91%	33.91%
	IDACI A	33.91%	33.91%
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	84.77%	84.77%
	EAL	16.95%	16.95%
	MOBILITY	16.95%	16.95%

## OPTION B: REVERT TO 2019-20

		PRIMARY	SECONDARY
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	1.56%	
	KS3		1.89%
	KS4		1.89%
DEPRIVATION	FSM	31.18%	37.73%
	FSM Ever 6	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI F	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI E	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI D	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI C	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI B	31.18%	37.73%
	IDACI A	31.18%	37.73%
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	77.95%	94.34%
	EAL	15.59%	18.87%
	MOBILITY	15.59%	18.87%

## OPTION C: NATIONAL AVERAGE

		PRIMARY	SECONDARY
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	KS1&2	3.39%	
	KS3		3.39%
	KS4		3.39%
DEPRIVATION	FSM	0.00%	0.00%
	FSM Ever 6	35.64%	35.64%
	IDACI F	38.19%	38.19%
	IDACI E	38.19%	38.19%
	IDACI D	38.19%	38.19%
	IDACI C	38.19%	38.19%
	IDACI B	38.19%	38.19%
	IDACI A	38.19%	38.19%
ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS	LPA	76.38%	76.38%
	EAL		
	MOBILITY		



Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>9</b>
Report Title	<b>Growth Fund 2021-22</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Discussion and Decision by all		
Report Author/ Contact details	Jerome Francis, Principal Accountant Education Finance <a href="mailto:jerome.francis@walthamforest.gov.uk">jerome.francis@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 020 8496 6805  Harun Guleid, Senior Accountant Education Finance, <a href="mailto:harun.guleid@walthamforest.gov.uk">harun.guleid@walthamforest.gov.uk</a> 020 8496 4177		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report sets out the proposed changes to the Growth Fund agreed in the task and finish group in order align with national practices.
- 1.2 The Growth Fund is an element within the Schools Block with an allocation of £1,280,068 in 2020-21.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 2.1 Schools Forum to agree:

- 2.1.1 Growth Fund scheme for 2021-22 is agreed with the following amendments:
- 2.1.2 Leadership & Management amended criteria is agreed.
- 2.1.3 First Year Funding Guarantee is for 30 pupils
- 2.1.4 To apply 2.1.3 to Bulge and Permanent Expansions classes for the September 2020 intake.

## 3. REASON

- 3.1 New and growing schools are funded via the Authority Pro-Forma Tool with a flat estimate of 30 pupils per additional form for 7/12 of the following Financial Year. In the interest of consistency, equality and simplicity we intend to amend our growth fund to mirror this.
- 3.2 Leadership & Management allowance payments are currently triggered once permanent expansion classes are added to a growing school. However, the standard policy for growing schools in the borough has changed to a model of two initial years of bulge classes to gauge demand for additional places

before permanent expansion is agreed, which has resulted in Leadership & Management allowances being due several years after the additional costs are incurred.

#### 4. Background

- 4.1 Schools budgets for a given Financial Year are determined by the pupil count in the preceding October's school census. The purpose of the Growth Fund is to fund growing schools the period of September to March those additional pupils will not be funded through the formula.
- 4.2 Starting with the 2018-19 financial year the ESFA allocated some funding for Growth Fund – this was based on historical spend. However, from that year on our allocation has been reducing substantially each year. **See Table 1**

**Table 1: Growth Fund Income**

	From Top Slice £	From Reserves £	From ESFA Allocation £	Total Available £
2014-15	2,750,000	1,000,000		3,750,000
2015-16	2,500,000	1,250,000		3,750,000
2016-17	2,500,000	750,000		3,250,000
2017-18	2,771,000			2,771,000
2018-19	400,000		2,800,000	3,200,000
2019-20			2,285,615	2,285,615
2020-21			1,280,068	1,280,068

- 4.3 The ESFA are in effect unwinding the growth fund: for 2019-20 and 2020-21 they have protected the drop in funding, with the drop in growth fund allocation being no greater than 0.5% of our schools block allocation for the year.
- 4.4 At the beginning of the current financial year 2020-21 there were growth fund reserves of £1.135m.
- 4.5 Table 2 below illustrates the forecast income and expenditure of the Growth Fund through to 2022-23. Please note that for the 2022-23 growth fund income our indicative allocation for 2021-22 was used assuming that this is the best estimate.

**Table 2. Growth Fund Forecast**

	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
	£	£	£	£
Opening Balance	414,072	1,312,815	943,859	1,114,527
Total Growth Fund	1,386,873	1,649,624	1,218,340	924,706
Growth Fund Income	2,285,616	1,280,668	1,389,008	1,389,008
Closing Balance	<b>1,312,815</b>	<b>943,859</b>	<b>1,114,527</b>	<b>1,578,828</b>

### **Leadership & Management Allowance**

- 4.6 The Leadership & Management Allowance is an element of the growth fund that is designed to compensate schools for the additional revenue costs when a school is growing. This typically includes the demand on Senior Leadership Team time when capital works are being undertaken.
- 4.7 The current criteria from the Growth Fund are set out in **Appendix A** also showing proposed amendments.
- 4.8 Where there is a planned expansion of a school by at least 1FE, the local authority will provide additional leadership and management funding worth a maximum of £150,000 in recognition of the increase in management costs associated with expansion.
- 4.9 This shall be released in staged payments. If at any stage the proposal to expand is cancelled the staged payments shall only be paid up to the end of the stage at which the project is stopped.
- 4.10 These criteria were established during a period of high growth in the Primary sector when schools typically grew through an initial permanent expansion.

### **Proposal**

- 5.1 In the Task & Finish Group meeting held 21 October 2020, the LA proposed making the Leadership & Management criteria the same for both primary and secondary phases. The proposal will mean the schools will receive their first allowance prior to the first bulge class. The rationale being that the schools would have incurred costs prior to the first bulge class being implemented such as Senior Leadership members receiving additional workload.
- 5.2 Amendment made to the Growth Fund will see schools receive first year funding guarantee for 30 pupils rather than the current 25 pupils for bulge and permanent expansion classes.

- 5.3 Where the school takes in more than 30 additional students, funding will then be provided for any subsequent pupils up to the NOR.
- 5.4 If less than 30 students appear, there will be no claw back. Please see the proposal in **Appendix B**.
- 5.5 Task and Finish Group members requested that the Growth Fund minimum funding guarantee for the first year be applied to the September 2020 intake.

## **Growth Fund Scheme 2021-22**

In this document “school” means any maintained school, academy or free school

### **Permanent Expansions**

When a school admits an additional form of entry as part of a permanent expansion planned by the LA it will be eligible for support from the Growth Fund.

#### **First year funding guarantee**

Each new form of entry will receive a first year funding guarantee: a minimum of 7/12 x 2530 x average pupil-led funding rate for the school, i.e. for a minimum of 2530 places for seven months (September to March).

If more than 2530 pupils appear on the following October census for Reception / Year 7, additional average pupil-led funding will be allocated. There will be no claw-back if less than 2530 pupils appear.

#### **Second and subsequent entry years of expansion**

- 1.4 Ordinarily, the first year funding guarantee will apply in the second and subsequent years to each new form entry until the fully expanded PAN has been reached.
- 1.5 Where more than one form of entry has been implemented, and more than 30 additional pupils appear on the following October census, the first year funding guarantee will apply for the first form of entry up to 30, then for any subsequent forms up to the NOR.

#### **Years after admission**

- 1.6 Funding for the year group for the financial year following admission will reflect the actual NOR in the October census, in line with all other year groups.

#### **Permanent expansion when a bulge class is in its final year**

- 1.7 When a permanent expansion occurs in the same year as a maturing bulge class, an adjustment is necessary as the school would benefit from the bulge class final year protection but does not require assistance with a contraction in resources. The bulge class final year protection will be deducted from the permanent expansion’s first year funding guarantee to avoid double-funding

## Leadership and Management Allowance

- 1.8 Where there is a planned expansion of a school by at least 1FE, the local authority will provide additional leadership and management funding worth a maximum of £150,000 in recognition of the increase in management costs associated with expansion.
- 1.9 This shall be released in staged payments. If at any stage the proposal to expand is cancelled the staged payments shall only be paid up to the end of the stage at which the project is stopped.

This table is intended for permanent expansions or

Leadership And Management Allowance		Primary
Stage 1	At point of the second bulge class intake	£20,000
Stage 2	At point of approval of the permanent expansion of PAN by Cabinet/Secretary of State.	£30,000
Stage 3	September of the first form entry of the permanent expansion.	£75,000
Stage 4	April preceding the September entry of the second year of expansion.	£25,000

Leadership And Management Allowance		Secondary
Stage 1	At point of approval of the permanent expansion of PAN by Cabinet/Secretary of State.	£50,000
Stage 2	September of the first form entry of the permanent expansion.	£50,000
Stage 3	April preceding the September entry of the second year of expansion.	£50,000

Leadership And Management Allowance		Payment
Stage 1	During Summer Term of academic year prior to first bulge class. Conditional on the intention for further bulges	£50,000
Stage 2	During Summer Term of academic year prior to second bulge class (contingent on the first bulge filling and the second planned bulge being implemented).	£50,000

Stage 3	During Summer Term of academic year prior to permanent expansion (contingent on agreement and approval of permanent expansion)	£50,000
---------	--	---------

## Second sites

- 1.10 Commitments made to schools which have expanded onto second sites in agreement with the local authority will be honoured, but further expansions onto second sites will not receive additional funding.

Capacity	Year of expansion	Planned number of pupils on site	Shortfall	Funding at £150 per pupil
420	1	60	360	£54,000
420	2	120	300	£45,000
420	3	180	240	£36,000
420	4	240	180	£27,000
420	5	300	120	£18,000

## Resources

- 1.11 An additional £5,000 will be paid for each new FE towards the cost of additional resources when the first-year funding guarantee is applicable.

## **2 Temporary (Bulge Class) Expansions**

- 2.1 When a school admits an additional form of entry as a temporary expansion (bulge class) planned by the LA it will be eligible for support from the Growth Fund.

### **First year funding guarantee**

- 2.2 Each new bulge class will receive a first year funding guarantee: a minimum of  $7/12 \times 25$  **30** x average pupil-led funding rate for the school, i.e. for a minimum of 25 places for seven months (September to March).
- 2.3 Where more than one bulge class has been implemented for the same year group in an academic year, and more than 30 additional pupils appear on the following October census, the first year funding guarantee will apply for the first bulge class up to 30, then for any subsequent classes up to the NOR.
- 2.4 ~~If more than 25 pupils appear on the following October census for Reception / Year 7, additional average pupil-led funding will be allocated.~~ There will be no claw-back if less than 25 **30** pupils appear.

### **Years after admission: minimum class size guarantee (see Table below)**

- 2.5 The Local Authority will give a minimum class size guarantee of AWPU funding for 25 pupils per bulge class until the final year the bulge class is in the school unless the numbers in the bulge class fall to zero, when the class size guarantee will cease.
- 2.6 Class size protection for bulge classes is capped at 15 AWPU.
- 2.7 In the final year the class size protection will be reduced to 5/12 of AWPU to reflect that the bulge class matures after five months.

### **Final year protection**

- 2.8 The final year of a bulge class gives protection to the school. When a bulge class matures, the seven months (September to March) funding generated by the bulge class pupils is retained by the school to assist with the contraction in resources.

### **Resources**

- 2.9 An additional £5,000 will be paid for each new FE towards the cost of additional resources when the first year funding guarantee is applicable



### 3 Reception and Key Stage 1 classes

- 3.1 Where as a result of an appeal or the Local Authority asks a school to take a pupil which takes the number in the reception or Key Stage 1 class to over 30, the Local Authority will meet the cost of an additional teaching assistant to keep the class size at 30 or below. Payments will be made termly in arrears based on submitted evidence of costs incurred by the school.

Table: Minimum Class Size Guarantee

MINIMUM CLASS SIZE GUARANTEE - SECONDARY				MINIMUM CLASS SIZE GUARANTEE - PRIMARY			
			£4,776				£3,482
over PAN	top up places	places funded	secondary AWPU	over PAN	top up places	places funded	primary AWPU
25 or more	0	0	£0	25 or more	0	0	£0
24	1	25	£4,776	24	1	25	£3,482
23	2	25	£9,552	23	2	25	£6,964
22	3	25	£14,328	22	3	25	£10,446
21	4	25	£19,104	21	4	25	£13,928
<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£23,880</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£17,410</b>
19	6	25	£28,656	19	6	25	£20,892
18	7	25	£33,432	18	7	25	£24,374
17	8	25	£38,208	17	8	25	£27,856
16	9	25	£42,984	16	9	25	£31,338
<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£47,760</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£34,820</b>
14	11	25	£52,536	14	11	25	£38,302
13	12	25	£57,312	13	12	25	£41,784
12	13	25	£62,088	12	13	25	£45,266
11	14	25	£66,864	11	14	25	£48,748
<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£71,640</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£52,230</b>
9	15	24	£71,640	9	15	24	£52,230
8	15	23	£71,640	8	15	23	£52,230
7	15	22	£71,640	7	15	22	£52,230
6	15	21	£71,640	6	15	21	£52,230
<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>£71,640</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>£52,230</b>
4	15	19	£71,640	4	15	19	£52,230
3	15	18	£71,640	3	15	18	£52,230
2	15	17	£71,640	2	15	17	£52,230
1	15	16	£71,640	1	15	16	£52,230
0	0	0	£0	0	0	0	£0

## **Growth Fund Scheme 2021-22**

In this document “school” means any maintained school, academy or free school

### **Permanent Expansions**

When a school admits an additional form of entry as part of a permanent expansion planned by the LA it will be eligible for support from the Growth Fund.

#### **First year funding guarantee**

Each new form of entry will receive a first year funding guarantee: a minimum of 7/12 x 30 x average pupil-led funding rate for the school, i.e. for a minimum of 30 places for seven months (September to March).

If more than 30 pupils appear on the following October census for Reception / Year 7, additional average pupil-led funding will be allocated. There will be no claw-back if less than 30 pupils appear.

#### **Second and subsequent entry years of expansion**

- 1.4 Ordinarily, the first year funding guarantee will apply in the second and subsequent years to each new form entry until the fully expanded PAN has been reached.
- 1.5 Where more than one form of entry has been implemented, and more than 30 additional pupils appear on the following October census, the first year funding guarantee will apply for the first form of entry up to 30, then for any subsequent forms up to the NOR.

#### **Years after admission**

- 1.6 Funding for the year group for the financial year following admission will reflect the actual NOR in the October census, in line with all other year groups.

#### **Permanent expansion when a bulge class is in its final year**

- 1.7 When a permanent expansion occurs in the same year as a maturing bulge class, an adjustment is necessary as the school would benefit from the bulge class final year protection but does not require assistance with a contraction in resources. The bulge class final year protection will be deducted from the permanent expansion's first year funding guarantee to avoid double-funding

## Leadership and Management Allowance

- 1.8 Where there is a planned expansion of a school by at least 1FE, the local authority will provide additional leadership and management funding worth a maximum of £150,000 in recognition of the increase in management costs associated with expansion.
- 1.9 This shall be released in staged payments. If at any stage the proposal to expand is cancelled the staged payments shall only be paid up to the end of the stage at which the project is stopped.

This table is intended for permanent expansions or

Leadership And Management Allowance		Payment
Stage 1	During Summer Term of academic year prior to first bulge class. Conditional on the intention for further bulges	£50,000
Stage 2	During Summer Term of academic year prior to second bulge class (contingent on the first bulge filling and the second planned bulge being implemented).	£50,000
Stage 3	During Summer Term of academic year prior to permanent expansion (contingent on agreement and approval of permanent expansion)	£50,000

## Second sites

- 1.10 Commitments made to schools which have expanded onto second sites in agreement with the local authority will be honoured, but further expansions onto second sites will not receive additional funding.

Capacity	Year of expansion	Planned number of pupils on site	Shortfall	Funding at £150 per pupil
420	1	60	360	£54,000
420	2	120	300	£45,000
420	3	180	240	£36,000
420	4	240	180	£27,000
420	5	300	120	£18,000

## Resources

- 1.11 An additional £5,000 will be paid for each new FE towards the cost of additional resources when the first-year funding guarantee is applicable.

## **2 Temporary (Bulge Class) Expansions**

- 2.1 When a school admits an additional form of entry as a temporary expansion (bulge class) planned by the LA it will be eligible for support from the Growth Fund.

### **First year funding guarantee**

- 2.2 Each new bulge class will receive a first year funding guarantee: a minimum of  $7/12 \times 30 \times$  average pupil-led funding rate for the school, i.e. for a minimum of ~~25~~ places for seven months (September to March).
- 2.3 Where more than one bulge class has been implemented for the same year group in an academic year, and more than 30 additional pupils appear on the following October census, the first year funding guarantee will apply for the first bulge class up to 30, then for any subsequent classes up to the NOR.
- 2.4 There will be no claw-back if less than 30 pupils appear.

### **Years after admission: minimum class size guarantee (see Table below)**

- 2.5 The Local Authority will give a minimum class size guarantee of AWPU funding for 25 pupils per bulge class until the final year the bulge class is in the school unless the numbers in the bulge class fall to zero, when the class size guarantee will cease.
- 2.6 Class size protection for bulge classes is capped at 15 AWPU.
- 2.7 In the final year the class size protection will be reduced to  $5/12$  of AWPU to reflect that the bulge class matures after five months.

### **Final year protection**

- 2.8 The final year of a bulge class gives protection to the school. When a bulge class matures, the seven months (September to March) funding generated by the bulge class pupils is retained by the school to assist with the contraction in resources.

### **Resources**

- 2.9 An additional £5,000 will be paid for each new FE towards the cost of additional resources when the first year funding guarantee is applicable

## **3 Reception and Key Stage 1 classes**

- 3.1 Where as a result of an appeal or the Local Authority asks a school to take a pupil which takes the number in the reception or Key Stage 1 class to over 30, the Local Authority will meet the cost of an additional teaching assistant to keep the class size at 30 or below. Payments will be made termly in arrears based on submitted evidence of costs incurred by the school.

Table: Minimum Class Size Guarantee

MINIMUM CLASS SIZE GUARANTEE - SECONDARY				MINIMUM CLASS SIZE GUARANTEE - PRIMARY			
			£4,776				£3,482
over PAN	top up places	places funded	secondary AWPU	over PAN	top up places	places funded	primary AWPU
25 or more	0	0	£0	25 or more	0	0	£0
24	1	25	£4,776	24	1	25	£3,482
23	2	25	£9,552	23	2	25	£6,964
22	3	25	£14,328	22	3	25	£10,446
21	4	25	£19,104	21	4	25	£13,928
<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£23,880</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£17,410</b>
19	6	25	£28,656	19	6	25	£20,892
18	7	25	£33,432	18	7	25	£24,374
17	8	25	£38,208	17	8	25	£27,856
16	9	25	£42,984	16	9	25	£31,338
<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£47,760</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£34,820</b>
14	11	25	£52,536	14	11	25	£38,302
13	12	25	£57,312	13	12	25	£41,784
12	13	25	£62,088	12	13	25	£45,266
11	14	25	£66,864	11	14	25	£48,748
<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£71,640</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>£52,230</b>
9	15	24	£71,640	9	15	24	£52,230
8	15	23	£71,640	8	15	23	£52,230
7	15	22	£71,640	7	15	22	£52,230
6	15	21	£71,640	6	15	21	£52,230
<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>£71,640</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>£52,230</b>
4	15	19	£71,640	4	15	19	£52,230
3	15	18	£71,640	3	15	18	£52,230
2	15	17	£71,640	2	15	17	£52,230
1	15	16	£71,640	1	15	16	£52,230
0	0	0	£0	0	0	0	£0

Meeting / Date	<b>SCHOOLS FORUM 11 November 2020</b>	Agenda Item	<b>10</b>
Report Title	<b>Funding relating to excluded pupils</b>		
Decision/Discussion/ Information	For Information		
Report Author/ Contact details	<b>Duncan James-Pike, Strategic Finance Advisor</b> <b>020 8496 3502</b> <a href="mailto:duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk">duncan.james-pike@walthamforest.gov.uk</a>		

## **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report sets out the regulations applying to the funding for excluded pupils and pupils who leave a mainstream school for reasons other than permanent exclusion and are receiving education funded by the local authority other than at a school.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **2.1 Schools Forum to note:**

- 2.1.1 The regulations applying to the to the funding for excluded pupils and pupils who leave a mainstream school for reasons other than permanent exclusion and are receiving education funded by the local authority other than at a school.
- 2.1.2 The LA will be compliant with these regulations from 1 April 2021.

## **3. REASON**

- 3.1 Some years ago there was a period when there were no excluded pupils in Waltham Forest and the claw-back and reallocation of funding for excluded pupils fell into disuse. Since schools resumed excluding pupils, the LA has not been compliant with the Schools Funding Regulations but will be compliant from 1 April 2021.

## **4. BACKGROUND: SCHOOLS REVENUE FUNDING 2021 to 2022 OPERATIONAL GUIDE, paragraphs 193 to 212.**

### **Redetermination of budgets where pupils have been excluded**

- 193 Where pupils are excluded, funding should flow in-year from the school that has excluded the pupil to the provision that takes responsibility for the pupil. If a school subsequently admits a pupil who has been permanently excluded during that financial year, it should then receive additional funding.

- 194 The provisions here also apply to pupils who leave a mainstream school for reasons other than permanent exclusion, and are receiving education funded by the local authority other than at a school.
- 195 The provisions also act independently of whether a particular pupil has been on the census in the first place, and whether the school has received funding for them.

### **Deductions from the excluding school's budget**

- 196 The finance regulations apply specifically to mainstream maintained schools.
- 197 When a pupil is excluded from a mainstream maintained school, the local authority must deduct from the school's budget in-year the amount within the formula relating to the age and personal circumstances of that pupil, pro rata to the number of complete weeks remaining in the financial year from the 'relevant date'.
- 198 This means the deduction should cover not just the basic entitlement but also the relevant amounts for pupil-led factors, such as free school meals or English as an additional language, where the pupil would attract funding through those criteria.
- 199 Where the pupil is funded according to the post-16 formula, the amount attributable to the pupil is £4,188 base rate. Therefore, £4,188 per pupil can be deducted from the excluding school's budget. The finance regulations, however, only apply to mainstream maintained schools. The local authority can have an agreement with a 14 to 16 provider to pass funding from an excluded pupil to a new provider. The 'relevant date' is the sixth school day following the date of permanent exclusion.
- 200 The following worked example demonstrates how the deduction from the excluding school's budget should be calculated, where the 'relevant date' is 1 October, with 26 weeks remaining in the financial year.

<b>Funding formula factor</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Basic entitlement	£4,000
Free school meals	£500
English as an additional language	£300
Sub-total	£4,800
Pro-rata total for 26 weeks	£2,400
<b>Deduction from excluding school's budget</b>	<b>£2,400</b>

- 201 The only exception to using the number of weeks remaining in the financial year is where the exclusion takes place after 1 April, in a school year where the pupil would normally have left at the end of that school year. In that case, the calculation is based just on the number of weeks left until the end of the school year.
- 202 Where the excluded pupil is eligible for the pupil premium, the pupil premium itself cannot be recovered from the school from which a pupil is excluded, but the budget share must be adjusted for the pupil premium on the same basis as the calculations above
- 203 The deduction should also include the amount of a financial adjustment order as made under regulation 25(5)(b) of the School Discipline (Pupil Exclusions and Reviews) (England) Regulations 2012, where this is relevant.
- 204 The adjustment for a particular exclusion relates only to the current financial year and cannot be applied to subsequent years. Under regulation 22 of the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2020, any deductions or increases relating to pupil exclusions are not included in the MFG. A deduction can be made even if it reduces the budget share below the MFG and an increase will be in addition to the MFG.

#### **Additions to the admitting school's budget**

- 205 Where a mainstream maintained school admits a pupil who has previously been permanently excluded, the local authority must increase the school's budget in-year.
- 206 The increase must be at least the amount of the deduction taken off the excluding school, multiplied by the number of complete weeks remaining in the financial year, and divided by the number of complete weeks remaining in the financial year from the 'relevant date'.
- 207 In the example above, if a school then admitted the pupil from 1 January, this is with 13 weeks of the financial year remaining. As this is half the 26 weeks originally remaining, the admitting school should have its budget increased by at least £1,200.
- 208 Where the pupil is eligible for the pupil premium, the same principles apply as set out above. The principles also apply where the school's governing body subsequently reinstates a permanently excluded pupil. The increase can also include an amount up to the amount of the financial adjustment order where this was applied to the excluding school.

#### **Academies**



209 Most academies have provisions in their funding agreement that require the same adjustments to their budgets if requested to do so by their local authority. The wording in model funding agreements states:

“If asked to by a local authority, the academy trust must enter into an agreement with that local authority that has the effect that where:

- the academy admits a pupil who has been permanently excluded from a maintained school, the academy itself, or another academy with which the local authority has a similar agreement; or
- the academy trust permanently excludes a pupil from the academy

the arrangements for payment will be the same as if the academy were a maintained school, under regulations made under section 47 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.”

210 The adjustments should also relate to the local authority financial year; local authorities can change this to the academy financial year, by local agreement.

211 The schools forum may also agree to make adjustments in line with the school or academy’s funding period, with academy adjustments being made on an academic year and maintained school’s adjustments being made on a financial year, and these amounts are no greater than those specified in the operational guide, this would constitute a local agreement and would need to be agreed with individual academies.

212 Some of the oldest academies do not have any provisions in their funding agreement. In these situations, any adjustments would have to be by agreement between the local authority and academy.