

Members of the Schools Forum are asked to attend a meeting to be held on

Wednesday 16th October 2018

18:00pm – 20.00pm

@

**Hitherfield Primary School
Leigham Vale,
Streatham,
SW16 2JQ**

for the transaction of the business set out below.

Agenda

Time*	Item	
18.00	1. Apologies & welcome	
18:05	2. Membership and Register of Interests and Declaration of New Interests	Verbal and Paper
18:10	3. Minutes from the Schools Forum meeting held 13th June 2018 and matters arising	Paper
18:20	4. Information about schools funding NFF and DSG settlement for 2019/2020	Verbal
18:30	5. High Needs Block spend update and request to transfer funding from Schools Block	Paper attached
18:45	6. Early Years Funding Formula	Paper attached
18:55	7. Cost pressures to schools	Paper attached
19:00	8. Falling Rolls Fund	Paper attached
19:10	9. Growth Fund update	Paper attached
19:20	10. Vulnerable Schools Fund	Paper to follow
19:30	11. Forward Plan	Verbal
19:35	12. Agree date of next meeting, location and likely agenda items: meeting dates 4th of December 2018 and 15th of January 2019	
19:40	13. Any Other business (AOB)	

Agenda Item 2

Title: Review of School Governance and Schools' Forum Representation

Date: 3rd October 2018

Report to: Schools Forum October 2018

Report for: Information Decision X Consultation Action X

Author: Chris Ashely- Jones - Chair Lambeth Schools Forum

1. Current Schools Build up

1.1 It has been identified that there has been some changes to the build-up of Lambeth schools and the percentages of representation on the schools forum.

1.2 The table below shows the different governance structures of Lambeth schools.

All Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Primary	60	66
Secondary Schools	16	18
Special Schools	5	5
Nursery Schools	5	5
All Through Schools	2	2
Other Schools	3	3
Primary Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Community	29	47
Academy	7	12
Voluntary Aided	20	33
Foundation	4	7
Secondary Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Community	2	13
Academy	9	56
Voluntary Aided	4	25
UTC	1	6
Special Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Community	4	80
Foundation	1	20
Nursery Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Community	5	100
All Through Schools		

Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Community	1	50
Academy	1	50
Other Schools		
Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Academy	1	50
Independent FE	1	50

Type	Number	Percentage of Total
Primary	10	45
Secondary Schools	5	23
Special Schools	1	5
Nursery Schools	1	5
All Through Schools	0	0
Other Schools	1	5
Other Providers	3	14
Faith Body	1	5

1.3 This shows that the overall non- LA representation at Schools’ Forum by school type is in Lambeth with the overall school percentages except for All-Through schools, though they have traditionally been represented in either the secondary or primary school group.

This is broken down in terms of governance as:

Primary Schools - 5 Headteachers and 5 Governors, of which: Community = 7 (70%) Voluntary Aided = 3 (30%)
Secondary Schools – 3 x Headteacher/Principal and 2 Governors of which: Academy = 2 (40%) Voluntary Aided = 3 (60%)
Special Schools – 1 Headteacher – Community
Nursery Schools – 1 Headteacher – Community
Other Providers (currently and wrongly called Non-Schools as it includes Other Schools) – 5, Governance not specified

2. Recommendations – to be discussed And Actions

The following changes to be made to representation

- Primary School Membership should change from 7 Community and 3 Voluntary Aided to 5 Community, 3 Voluntary Aided, 1 Academy and 1 Foundation.
- Secondary Schools Membership should change from 2 Academy and 3 Voluntary Aided to 2 Academy, 2 Voluntary Aided and 1 Community.
- Special School should remain as 1 Community.
- Nursery Schools should remain as 1 Community.

- Non-Schools should be renamed Other Providers.
- That we do not make these changes immediately, but that we make them as and when vacancies arise.
- **New nomination to consider: Sarah Keane**

LAMBETH SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERSHIP										
	TYPE OF MEMBER	GROUP	SUB GROUP	SUB SUB GROUP	NAME	SCHOOL	MEMBERSHIP START DATE	MEMBERSHIP EXPIRY DATE	POSITION OCCUPIED	Term of service
1	School	Primary	C	Headteacher	Alexandra Hardy	Henry Cavendish	03 November 2010	03 November 2018	1	2
2	School	Primary	C	Headteacher	Chris Ashley-Jones (Chair)	Hitherfield Primary	14 May 2014	14 May 2018	1	1
3	School	Primary	VA	Headteacher	Humaira Saleem	Iqra Primary School	10 January 2018	10 January 2022	1	
4	School	Primary	C	Headteacher	Chris Toye	Wyvern Federation	10 January 2018	10 January 2022	1	
5	School	Primary	VA	Headteacher	Jayne Mitchel	St Andrews CE	13 June 2018	13 June 2022	1	1
6	School	Primary	C	Governor	Carena King	Immanuel and St Andrews CoE P.	16 October 2018	16 October 2022	1	1
7	School	Primary	C	Governor	Matthew Green	Telferscot	06 December 2011	06 December 2019	1	2
8	School	Primary	VA	Governor	Michale Holland	Sunnyhill Primary School	16 October 2018	16 October 2022	1	1
9	School	Primary	C	Governor	Charles Asher	Gipsy Hill Federation	10 January 2018	10 January 2022	1	
10	School	Primary	C	Governor	Tony Andrews	Wyvern Federation	13 July 2016	13 July 2020	1	1
11	School	Secondary	VA / VC	Headteacher	Nick Butler	St Gabriel's College	13 June 2018	13 June 2022	1	1
12	School	Secondary	A	Principal	David Boyle	Dunraven School	29 September 2015	29 September 2019	1	1
13	School	Secondary	VA	Governor	Roger Bowdery	Bishop Thomas Grant	29 September 2015	29 September 2019	1	1
14	School	Secondary	VA/C	Governor	Vacant	Vacant				1
15	School	Secondary	A	Principal	Kate Atkins	Great North Wood Education Trust	10 January 2018	10 January 2022	1	1
16	School	Special	C	Headteacher					1	1
17	School	Nursery	C	Headteacher	Glenda King	Ethelred	12 January 2016	12 January 2020	1	1
18	Non School	PRU		Principal	Mark Jordan	Parallel Learning Trust	06 March 2018	05 March 2022	1	1
19	Non School	PVI		Manager	Raymond Smith	Pre-School Learning Alliance	13 June 2018	13 June 2022	1	1
20	Non School	PVI			Vacant	Vacant				
21	Non School	16-19 Partnership		Vice Principal	Paul Cox	Lambeth College	29 September 2015	29 September 2019	1	1
22	Non School	Faith Body		Governor	Maksud Gangat	Orchard School	12 November 2014	16 October 2022	1	1
								TOTAL	20	
LAMBETH SCHOOLS MEMBER SUBSTITUTES POOL MEMBERSHIP										
	TYPE OF MEMBER	GROUP	SUB GROUP	SUB SUB GROUP	NAME	SCHOOL	MEMBERSHIP START DATE	MEMBERSHIP EXPIRY DATE	POSITION OCCUPIED	
	School Sub									
	Non School Sub	PVI								
								TOTAL		



Pro-Forma Register of Business Interests 2018-19

Name of Schools Forum Member: _____

Name of Business	Nature of Business	Nature of Interest	Date of Appointment or Acquisition	Date of Cessation of Interest	Date of Entry

I certify that I have declared all beneficial interests, which I or any person closely connected with me, have with businesses or other organisations which may have dealings with the Lambeth Schools Forum.

If any member has a direct personal financial interest (or other interest) in any item under discussion they should declare this at the beginning of the meeting and withdraw from the discussion of that item.

Signed Date

Responsible Officer Checklist and Record Log: Maria Gabrielczyk

For the year beginning 1 April 2018

Agenda Item 3**LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH****SCHOOLS FORUM**

Draft minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum held at Hitherfield Primary School, Leigham Vale, Streatham, London SW16 2JQ on Wednesday 13th June 2018 at 18:00pm – 20.00pm

School Forum Members:

<u>Schools:</u>	Present, Apologies, Absent	<u>Governors:</u>	Present, Apologies, Absent
Chris Ashley–Jones (CAJ) Hitherfield	Present	Roger Bowdery (RB) BTG	Apologies
Nick Butler (NB) St. Gabriel's College	Present	Ray Smith (RS) Pre-School Alliance	Present
Alexandra Hardy (AH) Henry Cavendish	Present	Maksud Gangat (MG) Orchard Primary	Apologies
Glenda King (GK) Ethelred	Apologies	Matthew Green (MG) Telferscot Primary	Apologies
David Boyle (DB) Dunraven School	Present	Charles Asher (CA) GHF	Apologies
Mark Jordan (MJ) (PCA)	Present		
Humaira Saleem (HS) Iqra	Present		
Chris Toye (CT) Wyvern Federation	Present		
Jayne Mitchell (JM) St. Andrew's Primary	Present		
Kate Atkins (KA) Great North Wood Education Trust	Present		
<u>Officers:</u>	Present, Apologies, Absent	<u>Observers:</u>	Present, Apologies, Absent
Cathy Twist (CTw) Director - ELS	Present	Sarah Tomlinson (ST) NUT/NEU	Present
Kathryn Shaw (KS) School Quality Improvement Lead	Present	Christine Golding (CG) GMB Union	Present
Bunmi Idowu (BI) Early Years	Present	Vinay Gupta (VG) St. Gabriel's College	Present
Tim Gibson (TG) Interim Assistant Director Childrens Finance	Present	Cllr Ben Kind	Present
Dominique Franklin-Johnson (DFJ) Finance Group Manager	Present	Cllr Jenny Brathwaite	Present
Annie Hudson (AH) Strategic Director	Apologies		
Hamant Baharadia (HB) Assistant Director Strategic Finance	Absent		

1. **Welcome & Apologies**

CA-J welcomed everyone to the meeting. CA-J extended a warm welcome to the new Councillors Ben Kind and Jenny Brathwaite and introductions were made.

Apologies were received and accepted from: Annie Hudson; Maksud Gangat, Matthew Green, Charles Asher; Roger Bowdery, Glenda King,

2. **Draft minutes from the Schools Forum meeting held on 6th March 2018**

The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting and signed off by the Chair.

3. **Matters arising**

- Page 2 Item 2 – This item is outstanding on how the education money is spent. **ACTION: Finance Team.**
- The Growth Fund – this action is being addressed at the meeting.
- Page 2 Item 4 – Membership. Marcia Hosain no longer wants to be on the SF and Carol Hayes has offered to replace her. Monica Box is not in a position to join the SF and Dan Cundy will join in her place. This was accepted by all SF members. CAJ will review the membership to reflect the current makeup. This will be done at the next meeting in the new academic year. **ACTION: CAJ**
- Page 4 Item 7 – EY Funding – TG informed that there is no need to change the rate, therefore £6.03 remains.

4. **Membership**

The following vacancies were discussed:

1 x Primary Community Governor/Representative;

1 x Secondary Community Governor/Representative;

1 x Special School Governor/Representative (Lambeth Forum);

1 x Non-School PVI Governor/Representative;

The names put forward were Carena King and Michael Holland, (Sunnyhill Primary School) who are both primary community governors. They were happy to accept.

Jeremy Baker (Chair of Governors – Rosendale Primary School) is a reserve, as there are no vacancies at the moment.

CAJ will keep trying to recruit members for the Special School and the Non-School PVI.

CAJ informed of membership expiring for JM – who agreed to stay on, NB – who agreed to stay on, RS – who agreed to stay on, AH – who did not agree to stay on as she is retiring, MG – CAJ to speak to him. **ACTION: CAJ.**

5. Register of Interests and Declaration of New Interests

Members were asked to complete and sign Declarations of Interests. These will be kept with the SF Clerk.

6. Early Years Service Update - Kathryn Shaw

KS informed about the take up of 30hours free childcare for working parents. Data has been received and the take up is steadily improving with the number of children taking up the offer in the borough, in school settings, PVI's and with childminders.

Funding has been received from the DfE to build on the delivery of the 30hrs. The seconded post holder will be looking at supporting childminders. Work is being done with a film company to promote childminding as a whole and this will also assist with the 30hr take-up.

Parents are more aware and more parents are coming forward. Providers are also helping them with regard to eligibility. The challenges will remain the same with the huge admin task, work needed to get payments through, to get codes and eligibility.

AH thanked BI for the support she had provided for the school.

Q. Does EY have access to a list of childminders who do 30hrs?

A. It would be useful to have such a list, so that EY would know who they could refer parents to.

KS stated that GDPR will need to be looked at and the next step will be more partnership working and talking to childminders so that they can come back to RS. It identified that children's centres are the main hub for them to work with. Also 2yr olds have been targeted and parents are being made aware of the 30hr places of funded childcare.

KS clarified issues with codes and informed of the importance of being issued with a code rather than validating the code. The DfE could be contacted for further assistance.

Q. Is there data for the demographics of the people who have taken up the spaces, so that those that need the places are targeted?

A. This information is not available as parent apply directly with a code. The information can only be broken down into wards. EY will look at getting together case studies.

Q. How far away is Lambeth from meeting the anticipated DfE target?

A. The DfE were unaware that Lambeth have a downturn in 3 and 4 year olds.

Q. How does Lambeth compare with other boroughs eg. Croydon or Lewisham?

A. The data was taken from the statistical analysis done by the DfE and shows Lambeth is doing well.

KS informed that RS emailed her about available funding, which is LA led and bids have to go through the LA, however this was not discussed further. KS was asked to look into this for the next meeting. **ACTION: KS.**

CAJ thanked KS for her work.

7. DSG Outturn - Tim Gibson

TG presented a paper on the amount of income and spending from the DSG.

After all the deductions, Lambeth received £214.491m for the academic year 2017/18. There was an overspend by the Council of £1.743m in 2017/18 and this meant that the unspent DSG c/f decreased from £6.638m to £4.895m.

TG pointed out that the pressure area is in the HN block where the spending is not sustainable as more was spent than received. The EY estimated amount of funding is still not the final amount and it will come through in June and this has delayed the time adjustments.

Q. What is the plan for the c/f? What is the money for?

A. Approx £1m is needed to address timing differences in the EY's Block and the remainder will be used to cover overspends and cost pressures in the HNB. By the end of the year there is expected to be little or no c/f. Actions are needed to bring the costs down for the HNB. In 2018/19 there will be at least £4m more spent on the HNB than is likely to be received, unless the costs can be reduced. The situation cannot be sustained.

8. SEND High Needs Block Budget – Cathy Twist & Tim Gibson

CTw gave a SEND update on Local Area Strategy, inspection preparation and funding.

- The Children and Families Action 2014 have increased the EHCP eligibility from 3-19 to 0-25.
- The local area inspection assess partnership working to commission and provide services for children and families.
- An inspection will be carried out by Ofsted and CQC.
- In terms of outcomes - Lambeth do well for outcomes for children. Lambeth is clear on its strengths and areas for development with an action plan in place. This is monitored by the SEND strategic board.
- Lambeth DSG for 2017/18 totalled £268m. It allocated £22.8m to EY, £206m to schools and £38.5m on HN. £41m (20%) is identified as the notional SEN budget and schools are notified of the amounts in their individual budgets.
- Lambeth need to find £55m savings over the 3yr period 2017/18 to 2019/20.
- There is no system in place to do a review of the EHCP.

Q. Are ECHP being granted for a certain amount of years with an end date?

A. No. They will be regularly reviewed. SEN have set targets and are slowing down or reducing their allocation of EHCPs, as the resource grant can be allocated for a set period of time. It was suggested that a pilot project be done as it has been in Medway.

- SEN is projected to overspend by £4.8m for 2017/18. The SF has agreed an additional £1.58m for schools with higher numbers of EHCPs.
- SEN Travel Assistance – the total spend is projected to be £4.5m. The bus contract has been retendered with the aim of reducing the budget to £3.5m for 2018/19.
- A savings proposals plan to reduce the overspend on the HN budget for 2018/19 by £3m was suggested.

- A national survey was done recently and 85 LA responded saying they had budget pressures with 68 LA reporting an overspend.

Q. What is the DfE's response to this?

A. That there is no more money available.

A discussion took place around the accurate diagnosis of EHCPs and the role of Health, especially SEMH as an increasing number of pupils were getting EHCPs for MH, due to the lack of MH support for schools and CAMHS taking a long time and are a variable provision. Health have provided initiatives and their willingness, however there isn't the financial support. There was a discussion on the exploration of the Inclusion Fund and the possibility of repurposing that.

9. Growth Fund 2017-18 and 2018-19 – Tim Gibson

TG gave an update on the Growth Fund, on what the money was spent on.

Due to the adjustment of pupil numbers, if a school is permanently expanding the APT method would be used, but if the school is taking bulge classes then the Growth Fund would be used.

Three main strands are considered in pupil funding, - a) those pupils not on the census; b) start-up costs – of a new class coming in; c) diseconomies of scale – where there are new schools with the same costs as established schools.

TG produced figures of what was set aside, what was spent and what was c/f. He informed that there was an issue with the diseconomies of scale both in primary and secondary schools.

Q. What is the APT?

A. It is the Authority Proforma Tool that needs to be filled in by a deadline and returned to the DfE in January.

A discussion arose on whether there should be a reduction in the PAN for expanding schools if the demand in school places is falling. The need for accurate pupil planning and the longer term risk if numbers are reduced. The expansion of some schools may lead to the possible closure of others. The reduction of PAN with primaries so they don't close.

Q. Is there a demand for places in the primary sector or should they be looking at reducing their PAN?

A. There is still a need in the south of the borough.

Q. Is there a risk register?

A. It is part of the Education Advisory Board.

10. Forward Plan

Disproportionate SEN funding and HNB will be viewed at the next meeting in October.

ACTION: CTw.

£250K was agreed from the vulnerable schools fund and feedback from the LSP was requested on how it was spend and whether it was a success. **ACTION: TG.**

A review of the Growth Fund is needed. The growth criteria will be reviewed in the Forward Plan.

The paper on EY Funding Formula will be reviewed to see whether the formula should be kept as is or tweaked to reflect deprivation.

Also the In-Year forecast income and spend of the DSG will be reported at future meeting/s. **ACTION: TG.**

11. AOB

It was noted that the Council has been allocated £350K in the first year of the sugar tax. This is for reducing childhood obesity and improving health.

Rosendale Primary School have been running research into reducing childhood obesity and are working with a Finnish company, who make trackers to monitor the amount of exercise pupils are getting. KA to send CTw information and contact details. **ACTION: KA.**

12. Future Meeting Dates

16th October 2018 @ Hitherfield School 6-8pm

There being no further business to discuss, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.50pm

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Chris Ashley-Jones
Chair of the School Forum

Agenda Item 4 - Information about schools funding NFF and DSG settlement for 2019/2020
Verbal Update Tim Gibson

Agenda Item 5

Title: SEND Strategy Update and High Needs Block Budget Constraints

Date: 16th October 2018

Report to: Schools Forum October 2018

Report for: Information Decision X Consultation Action

Author: Claire Kirwan, SEND Transformation Officer, Special Education Needs, Education Learning and Skills, 0207 926 6678, ckirwan@lambeth.gov.uk

1. Report Summary

- 1.1 This report provides an update to the Schools Forum on the SEND Strategy, and the SEND budget constraints.
- 1.2 The Children and Families Act 2014 brought in a range of changes for assessment, provision and support for children and young people with SEND and their families including increasing the age range eligible for Education, Health and Care Plans from 3-19 to 0-25 and including health and care provision where appropriate. Lambeth created their Local Area Strategy 2017-2020 in the Autumn of 2017 in consultation with partners, providers, parent and carers and children and young people. This sets out the Local Area's vision for children and young people with Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission (CQC) are now inspecting local areas on how well the partnership of the Council, schools and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) work together to commission and provide services for children and families.
- 1.3 Lambeth's SEND Strategic Board has overseen a comprehensive implementation of the Children and Families Act and has completed a self-evaluation allowing the board to oversee the strengths and areas for improvement, so that they can ensure the best outcomes for children and young people and continues to monitor the Local Area's outcomes for children and young people with SEND.
- 1.4 In 2018/19 the Schools Forum agreed to transfer 0.5% of the Schools Block funding into the High Needs Block. As the cost pressures that underpinned that decision are continuing and increasing, this report asks for the Schools Forum's agreement to a transfer on the same basis in 2019/20, i.e. 0.5%.

2. Finance summary

- 2.1 Support for children with Special Educational needs and Disabilities is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for education, from the health services budget for health and from Council revenue grant for social care elements.
- 2.2 The DSG (High Needs Block) is the greatest contributor to these costs and is currently overspent by £4.2 million. Even with the savings options that are described in this report there will continue to be a significant structural shortfall in the High Needs Block and thus this report

recommends that 0.5% be transferred from the Schools Block into the High Needs Block which will partly alleviate this pressure.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 To note the progress of implementation of Children and Families Act 2014 and the ongoing improvements and activities.
- 3.2 To note the progress with implementation of Local Area Strategy for Children and young people with SEND.
- 3.3 To make the Schools Forum aware of budget constraints within Special Educational Needs Service and proposals to reduce spend.
- 3.4 The Schools Forum is asked to agree to the transfer of 0.5% from the schools block of the DSG to the high needs block.

4. Context

- 4.1 The Children and Families Act 2014 brought in a range of changes for assessment, provision and support for Children and Young People with SEND and their families. The age range went from 3-19 to 0-25 for those children and young people supported by Statements/Education Health Care Plans (EHCP) and included Health and Care provision where appropriate within Education Health Care Plans. It put the children and young people and their parents and carers voice at the heart of the Education Health Care Plan.
- 4.2 Lambeth has a SEND Strategic Board which oversees the implementation of the Children and Families Act and developed a Local Area Strategy 2017-2020 alongside the Children and Young Peoples Plan.
- 4.3 The Board have developed a Self-Evaluation Form (SEF) which enables them to have a clear understanding of strengths and areas for development in relation to the Children and Families Act. This has then informed our Local Area Strategy. This is monitored via the Board which has representation from elected members, Education, SEND, Social Care, Health, Commissioners and parents and carers.
- 4.4 This report alongside our Local Area Strategy sets out our shared vision, principles and priorities to ensure partners are working together to effectively identify and meet the needs of Lambeth's children and young people with Special educational needs and / or Disabilities. This directly the supports the three priorities within our Borough Plan 2016-2021; partners working together, increasing in provision within Lambeth so children and young people remain part of their communities, and reducing inequality for Children and Young People with SEN or disabilities.
- 4.5 The local Area inspection will focus on three key questions. These are the way we self-evaluate our provision
 - a) How effectively does the local area identify children and young people who have SEN and/or disabilities
 - b) How effective does the local area assess and meeting the needs of children and young people who have SEN and/or disabilities

- c) How effectively does the local area improve outcomes for children and young people who have SEN and/or disabilities

4.6 **Key Strengths – Identifying Needs**

These have been identified as follows:

- The Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA) was refreshed in 2018 and is informing commissioning priorities across education, health and care, there is also a specific Children With Disabilities (CWD) JSNA.
- All health visitors receive regular training in early identification of additional needs and disabilities.
- Proactive promotion of the Disability Register (Lambeth Liberty Card). Since it was taken in-house in 2016 numbers registered have greatly increased and positive feedback from parents and carers about the Liberty card has been received.
- School census data is analysed to identify anomalies in the way schools may be identifying needs and appropriate support, advice and challenge is provided by school improvement advisors.
- New models of short breaks commissioning will give us a wealth of data around children's needs in the borough.

4.7 **Key Strengths: Assessing and Meeting Needs**

These have been identified as follows:

- All children with complex developmental needs identified at birth or emerging in the first five years of life are assessed as soon as they are identified and the Disabilities Team around the Child (DTAC) ensures that relevant health, education and care support and provision is actioned.
- New EHCPs are co-produced. EHCP co-ordinators organise 'outcomes' meetings with parents and children and young people to identify aspirations.
- The majority of Education and Health provision is judged 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted or CQC.
- We have reviewed our outreach services and bought these back in-house, to ensure schools can easily access the assessment support they need from professionals.
- Schools are also commissioning directly which allows for greater flexibility in schools obtaining the assessments they need in a timely way.
- Training and support for SENCOs is comprehensive, effective and valued.
- The Early Years SEND Team is effectively supporting parents of children with complex needs evidenced by overwhelmingly positive feedback from parents.

- A 'SEND Support' plan template used by EY providers and schools to encourage a consistent approach across all settings to bringing together information to help plan support that makes a difference to a child/young person's learning development.
- Parents are positive about the Lambeth Independent Advice and Support Service (LIASS).
- There is successful, ongoing implementation of Independent Travel Training for young people.

4.8 **Key Strengths: Improving Outcomes**

These have been identified as follows:

- SEND Leaders and the SEND Strategic Partnership Board consider the SEND data dashboard and analysis and undertake 'deep dives' into any data anomalies e.g. a closer look at identification of Speech Language and Communication Needs (SLCN).
- The Children and Young Peoples Plan and Local Area Strategy are outcomes focused and informed by data and feedback from parents and young people
- All new Service Level Agreements and Contracts with providers are outcomes focused.
- Lambeth pupils with SEN and SEN Support generally achieve above or in line with the statistical neighbour average.

4.9 **Our Challenges**

These have been identified as follows:

- The demand for new EHCPs has been high with a 25% increase since 2014. This rise has put huge pressures on the service which has meant that some statutory timescales have been difficult to meet. However, more recently we are performing highly in this area.
- Health commissioned services do not go up to the age of 25 and clearer pathways between children's and adults' disability services are being developed, alongside a greater focus on supporting young adults with disabilities into work.
- Support for children with SEMH needs is still too fragmented. Our Children and Young People's Plan and new co-ordinated commissioning arrangements are helping to address this along with new Resource Bases
- Preparation for Adulthood pathways are being better developed in the borough.
- 'SEN Support' in schools is not always consistent and there are variations on what each school offers.
- Parents are not always clear on the support available prior to an EHCP being put in place. We are currently agreeing a borough moderation process to address this.

- Commissioning and engagement with parents and carers can be too fragmented, there is a good relationship with Parents Forum and forums overall are well attended by both professionals and parents and carers. We are working on a commissioning and engagement plan so parents are clear about the commissioning cycle and when they can get involved.
- Engagement with children and young people with SEND and their families at a strategic level is not yet fully established, though parent reps are on our Board, and every EHCP has the child's voice contained within it.
- Lambeth Council needs to find £55m savings over the three year period 2017/18 to 2019/20, in order to manage the cut in core funding from Government and inflation in a period of increasing demand and complexity of needs.
- Lambeth is allocated a lower % of Dedicated Schools Grant than the London average for High Needs (14.8% compared to 16.3%). We have agreed with Schools Forum to transfer 0.5% and have implemented a banding model for Special Schools to tackle top-up spending for 2017/2018.
- We are currently focused on reducing the numbers of pupils in independent and non-maintained schools by continuing our programme to increase local specialist provision.

5. Next Steps

- We will continue to further refresh our Self Evaluation Form (SEF) and 'position statement' making changes and modifications to services to ensure they are as efficient as possible.
- We have rebranded the Lambeth Local Offer and implemented an advertising timetable around the borough, so that we can raise awareness of the Local offer Website.
- Within Children's and Adults Social Care work is underway to develop a 0-25 team so that children and young people with disabilities have fewer transitions within their lives.
- We are opening and commissioning a range of new provision for those with Social Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) needs which will reduce costs and improve outcomes for those children and young people who have SEMH needs.
- We are expanding our independent travel training programme after a successful first year to encourage more young people with SEND to travel independently. We will review our SEN Transport policy to ensure we encourage supported independence as far as is possible.
- Lambeth has contracted an organisation called SEND 4 Change who have independently reviewed our SEF and set out areas for improvement. We will continuously act on feedback.

6. SEND Budget

- 6.1 Special Educational Needs provision (Special schools, education plans for individual pupils and specialist school placements, etc.) is funded though part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

‘High Needs Budget’. The Children and Families Act 2014 put significant additional burdens on the DSG High Needs budget for SEN. In Lambeth, EHCPs have increased by 25%, above the London average of 14%. The High Needs Budget has only increased by 2%. Lambeth is allocated a lower % of DSG than the London average for high needs (14.8% compared to 16.3%)

6.2 SEN is projected to overspend for 2018/19 by £4.2 million. Costs of EHCPs are increasing nationally and out of borough placements are also increasing. There are a number of reasons that the numbers of EHCPs have risen:

- Introduction of the extended age range (0-25) in the Children and Families Act 2014. This has led to a sharp rise in the number of requests for assessment for an EHCP (particularly 19-25 year olds), and the increased expectation that an EHCP will remain in place until age 25.
- The 2014 reforms have raised parental awareness and expectations, making some parents more proactive in pursuing an EHCP for their child.
- The financial pressures faced by schools leading them to encourage parents or young people to apply for EHCPs more readily than previously.
- Reduction in early prevention services (in local authorities, schools, and CAMHS) due to funding pressures.
- There has been an increase in the number of young people presenting with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and Social Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) needs in particular.
- There has been an increase in accuracy of diagnosis and earlier identification of SEND.
- Advances in paediatric care for babies and children with complex conditions means more children are presenting with needs.

6.3 For 2017/2018 Lambeth SEN reduced overspend by £1.9 million:

Area	Savings
Retendering of transport contract reducing costs	£1.2m
Phase 1; review and re commissioning of outreach services: sensory, ASD, high needs, PRU	£400k
Freezing recruitment in SEN team	£300k
Special schools budgets allocation changed to new fixed banding arrangements – saving any additional top-ups over future years	
	£1.9m

- 6.4 For 2018/19 SEN is projected to overspend by £4.2 million: a proposal for savings is listed below.

1.	Phase 2: Outreach Service reductions	£315k
2.	Line by line budget analysis reduction (including legal services, equipment, agency staff)	£370k
3.	SEN Management – Restructure of Service	£300k
4.	Agree repurposing of SEN disproportionate EHC Plan budget	£500k. (There will be then remain £500 for disproportionate and £500 for 5-14 Inclusion fund post moderation)
5.	Reduce number of out of borough placements by increasing capacity in borough Elm Green SEMH RB PLT – SEMH RB Vanguard ASD free school	£500k
6.	Post 16/19 reduction in costs	£500k
7.	Reduce Early Years EHC Plans – with use of Early Years Inclusion fund	£250k
	Total	£3,235m

- 6.5 Each of these areas is currently being explored in detail and are the subject of discussion and consultation and risk mitigation planning.

Further detailed plans and an update on progress will be brought to the December Schools Forum.

Agenda Item 6

Title:	Early Years Funding Formula – Deprivation Element			
Date:	1st October 2018			
Report to:	Schools Forum October 2018			
Report for:	Information X	Decision X	Consultation	Action
Author:	Dominique Johnston-Franklin – Group Manager Education			

1. Background

- 1.1 The DfE published its Early Years National Funding Formula Guidance (EYNFF) in December 2016. The EYNFF determined the hourly rate to be paid to each setting for providing early years education.
- 1.2 The Lambeth Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF) has an hourly rate and a two supplements: quality and deprivation. In the existing formula each child receives funding based on the Income Deprivation Affecting Child Index (IDACI) rating of the child's home address (deprivation).
- 1.4 Meeting the needs of deprived children is a key part of the Government's priority of narrowing the attainment gap between children from different socio-economic backgrounds and thus it is a mandatory requirement that there be a deprivation supplement included in the Early Years Funding Formula.
- 1.5 Funding for deprivation is allocated to early years providers based on the (IDACI) score of the children at the setting as at January. The IDACI score of each child is determined by their household postcode as recorded on the January pupil census.
- 1.6 The Indices of Deprivation 2015 provide a set of relative measures of deprivation for small areas (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) across England, based on seven different domains of deprivation:
- Income Deprivation
 - Employment Deprivation
 - Education, Skills and Training Deprivation
 - Health Deprivation and Disability
 - Crime
 - Barriers to Housing and Services
 - Living Environment Deprivation
- 1.6 The disadvantage (deprivation) supplement has been included in the funding formula for many years in Lambeth and settings can also access funding for disadvantaged pupils through the Early Years Pupil Premium. It is priority for the council is to ensure there is sufficient high quality early years education provision. This includes ensuring that the current EYNFF is targeting pupils who are disadvantaged.

2. Current Formula 2018-19

- 2.1 The total deprivation funding is determined by taking the average IDACI score for the setting, multiplying it by the number of free-entitlement hours provided by the setting per week (as per the January census), multiplying this by the maximum funded weeks and then by deprivation unit value:

Example- Deprivation 2018-19	
IDACI score average [A]	0.3457
Free Entitlement hours / and Extended Entitlement hours [B]	990
Maximum funded weeks [C]	38
Deprivation unit [D]	£1.10
$E = A*B*C*D$	
Total Deprivation [E]	£14,306

- 2.2 This principle formula means that every child deprivation score generates a level of funding for the provider, therefore deprivation rates will not be fixed for each setting but based on the individual postcodes of the children who attend the setting and therefore are variable.
- 2.3 The current amount of funding distributed in deprivation funding through Lambeth EYNFF is £1.18m.
- 2.4 The existing formula for deprivation is not compliant with the current guidance and thus this paper gives options on how it can be modified in order to comply.

3. Proposal for Change in formula 2019-20

- 3.1 Within the National Funding Formula (NFF) for schools there is a deprivation element that can be distributed. The LA has the choice to use IDACI, Free School Meals (FSM) or FSM Ever 6. Lambeth currently use FSM Ever 6 in the schools block formula but are proposing to move towards the same methodology recommended for schools funding in IDACI to the EYNFF for Lambeth.
- 3.2 As mentioned above every child within Lambeth EYFF generates an element of deprivation funding but moving forward the proposal is to mirror the IDACI bands that are used in the National Funding Formula which are set out in the table below:

IDACI Score	IDACI band
$x < 0.2$	G
$0.2 \leq x < 0.25$	F
$0.25 \leq x < 0.3$	E
$0.3 \leq x < 0.35$	D
$0.35 \leq x < 0.4$	C
$0.4 \leq x < 0.5$	B
$0.5 \leq x \leq 1$	A

Note that only pupils with an IDACI score above 0.2 band G, can be assigned deprivation funding through this factor, meaning there are six bands which can be used to allocate deprivation funding.

- 3.3 In addition to the use of the IDACI bands it is for Lambeth Schools Forum to consider if they want to restrict the funding within the EYNFF to be allocated to the top 4 bands only therefore targeting the top 57%, or the top 3 bands targeting children in most deprived 43% areas in the borough. Models have been prepared that illustrate the differences between these two options.
- 3.4 In the change to the EYFF, Lambeth removed the factor to provide vulnerable full time places to parents who could not access the extended 30 hours entitlement, due to not meeting criteria. Some Lambeth early years provider have chosen to still offer full time places under the old criteria which Lambeth used to fund via the early years block. By targeting the IDACI deprivation funding it could allow providers to have the flexibility to support some vulnerable parents identified.

4. Deprivation Formula Change Options

- 4.1 In order to model the potential implications of moving towards the IDACI bands Appendix 1 shows the detailed analysis on a provider basis. The changes between each model are below:-

Model 1 - Removal of Band G – as per NFF

- In removing the band G this will give an overall increase to the deprivation pot.
- The reason for this is that most providers average IDACI score will increase as we have removed the lower scores which reduce the average.
- The individual movement per provider is demonstrated in ***appendix 1 Schools forum paper REF (1)***

Model 2 - Band A-D 57% deprivation scores

- In only targeting the top 4 deprived bands the deprivation rate could increase to £1.46 per hour from the current £1.10 per hour.
- The individual movement per provider is demonstrated in ***appendix 1 Schools forum paper REF (2)***

Model 3 - Band A-C 43% deprivation scores

- As with Model 2 In only targeting the top 3 deprived bands the overall amount distributed will decrease if the rate stays at £1.10 per hour
- To ensure the pot is not decreasing in total by the retargeting of IDACI bands the deprivation rate could increase in Model 3 to £1.79 per hour from the current £1.10 per hour.
- The individual movement per provider is demonstrated in appendix 1 Schools forum paper REF (2)
- The individual movement per provider is demonstrated in ***appendix 1 Schools forum paper REF (3)***

In Summary of the key points for each band movement potential are:

Model 1 –does not necessarily target the settings with the most deprived children in Lambeth

Model 2 – Keeps the overall pot the same if there is an increased rate and targets 57% of the children in Lambeth.

Model 3 - Keeps the overall pot the same if there is an increased rate and targets 43% of the children in Lambeth.

5. Actions

- 5.1 Schools forum members to review the 3 models of deprivation funding that is accessed through the EYNFF and agree which model should be applied to the 19-20 EYNFF funding.
- 5.2 Schools forum will be presented EYNFF including all factors paper for Dec-18 Forum for decision. We will also review payments to child-minders for supplement factors.

Agenda Item 7

Title: Teachers Pay Grant / Teacher Pensions

Date: 26th September 2018

Report to: Schools Forum October 2018

Report for: Information X Decision Consultation Action

Author: Dominique Johnston-Franklin – Group Manager Education

1. Background

- 1.1 The Education Secretary confirmed in July a government investment of £508 million to fully fund the pay deal which means the main pay range for classroom teachers will increase by 3.5 per cent.
- 1.2 Schools will continue to determine how their staff are paid but the increases above will be funded by government with a new teachers' pay grant – worth £187 million in 2018/19 and £321 million in 2019/20 from the existing Department for Education (DfE) budget – paid to all schools on top of their core budgets from the National Funding Formula.
- 1.3 In cash terms, teachers could receive a boost of between £1,184 and £1,366 to their salary, while salaries for new teachers will increase by between £802 and £1003.

2. Teacher Pay Grant Methodology

- 2.1 The following guidelines have been published but the DfE to help schools to understand how the Teachers Pay Grant will help support the current pay deal for teachers.
- 2.2 The Grant will be paid to schools based on the number of pupils ages 2 to 19 in:
 - maintained nursery schools
 - primary and secondary maintained schools
 - primary and secondary academies and free schools
 - all through maintained schools and academies
 - 16 to 19 maintained schools
 - 16 to 19 academies
- 2.3 The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) will pay the funding for maintained school to local authorities, who will need to pass the funding directly on to the schools at the rates published. They will pay the funding for academies directly to the academy. The LA will also be allocated allocate funding to distribute to institutions who provide for children with high needs. This will be based on places in:
 - maintained special schools
 - special academies and free schools
 - pupil referral units
 - alternative provision academies and free schools
 - hospital schools
- 2.4 In order to determine the rates, the ESFA have taken the overall annual pay bill for teachers, including additional costs such as pensions and national insurance, and applied the average percentage uplift of the announced 2018 to 2019 pay award. They have then subtracted 1% that all schools should have been planning for in line with the previous public pay sector scale.

- 2.5 The funding has been divided between primary (including early years), secondary (including school sixth forms) and special schools. This has been done based on the size of the teacher wage bill for each sector. This is to take into account, for example, that special schools generally spend more on staff per pupil.

An Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) has then been applied, which takes into account higher teacher wages in London. For inner London the rates are demonstrated below:

Sector	2018 to 2019 (£)	2019 to 2020 (£)
Primary schools	19.51	33.65
Secondary schools (with same rate for all 11-19 year olds)	31.57	54.20
Rates for special and alternative provision schools	78.1	134.97

The assumptions have been made that all mainstream schools have at least 100 pupils and all high needs institutions have at least 40 places.

3. Allocations

- 3.1 The ESFA will provide further detailed guidance and information in October. This will include school level allocations for mainstream schools, and local authority level allocations for high needs.
- 3.2 Schools Finance team have created below tables to illustrate possible final amount for schools to incorporate in their forecast planning. These will be confirmed once final allocations are announced by ESFA.

School Name	Phase	NOR	NOR Primary	NOR Secondary	TPG Total Allocation for 18/19 £
Ashmole Primary School	Primary	201.00	201.00	0.00	3,921.51
Clapham Manor Primary School	Primary	417.00	417.00	0.00	8,135.67
Granton Primary School	Primary	557.00	557.00	0.00	10,867.07
Heathbrook Primary School	Primary	341.00	341.00	0.00	6,652.91
Henry Cavendish Primary School	Primary	819.00	819.00	0.00	15,978.69
Jessop Primary School	Primary	355.00	355.00	0.00	6,926.05
Kingswood Primary School	Primary	807.00	807.00	0.00	15,744.57
Lark Hall Primary School	Primary	359.00	359.00	0.00	7,004.09
Paxton Primary School	Primary	342.00	342.00	0.00	6,672.42
Richard Atkins Primary School	Primary	330.00	330.00	0.00	6,438.30
Sudbourne Primary School	Primary	310.00	310.00	0.00	6,048.10
Sunnyhill Primary School	Primary	525.00	525.00	0.00	10,242.75
Telferscot Primary School	Primary	410.00	410.00	0.00	7,999.10
Vauxhall Primary School	Primary	202.00	202.00	0.00	3,941.02
Walnut Tree Walk Primary School	Primary	224.00	224.00	0.00	4,370.24
Wyvil Primary School	Primary	472.00	472.00	0.00	9,208.72
Crown Lane Primary School	Primary	400.00	400.00	0.00	7,804.00
Fenstanton Primary School	Primary	534.00	534.00	0.00	10,418.34
Elm Wood School	Primary	374.00	374.00	0.00	7,296.74
Allen Edwards Primary School	Primary	359.00	359.00	0.00	7,004.09
Glenbrook Primary School	Primary	260.00	260.00	0.00	5,072.60
Herbert Morrison Primary School	Primary	185.00	185.00	0.00	3,609.35
Streatham Wells Primary School	Primary	209.00	209.00	0.00	4,077.59

Note – this will be confirmed and published by DFE in Oct-18 so there may be some changes

School Name	Phase	NOR	NOR Primary	NOR Secondary	TPG Total Allocation for 18/19 £
Bonneville Primary School	Primary	352.00	352.00	0.00	6,867.52
Hill Mead Primary School	Primary	420.00	420.00	0.00	8,194.20
Hitherfield Primary School	Primary	614.00	614.00	0.00	11,979.14
Henry Fawcett Primary School	Primary	331.00	331.00	0.00	6,457.81
Stockwell Primary School	Primary	544.00	544.00	0.00	10,613.44
Kings Avenue School	Primary	363.00	363.00	0.00	7,082.13
Loughborough Primary School	Primary	376.00	376.00	0.00	7,335.76
Jubilee Primary School	Primary	376.00	376.00	0.00	7,335.76
Archbishop Sumner Church of England Primary School	Primary	358.00	358.00	0.00	6,984.58
Christ Church Primary SW9	Primary	173.00	173.00	0.00	3,375.23
Christ Church , Streatham Church of England Primary School	Primary	200.00	200.00	0.00	3,902.00
Macaulay Church of England Primary School	Primary	192.00	192.00	0.00	3,745.92
St Andrew's Church of England Primary School	Primary	194.00	194.00	0.00	3,784.94
St John the Divine Church of England Primary School	Primary	163.00	163.00	0.00	3,180.13
St John's Angell Town Church of England Primary School	Primary	191.00	191.00	0.00	3,726.41
St Jude's Church of England Primary School	Primary	198.00	198.00	0.00	3,862.98
St Leonard's Church of England Primary School	Primary	253.00	253.00	0.00	4,936.03
St Luke's Church of England Primary School	Primary	199.00	199.00	0.00	3,882.49
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	Primary	190.00	190.00	0.00	3,706.90
St Saviour's Church of England Primary School	Primary	192.00	192.00	0.00	3,745.92
St Stephen's Church of England Primary School	Primary	189.00	189.00	0.00	3,687.39
Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School	Primary	345.00	345.00	0.00	6,730.95
St Helen's Catholic School	Primary	267.00	267.00	0.00	5,209.17
The Orchard School	Primary	195.00	195.00	0.00	3,804.45
Iqra Primary School	Primary	208.00	208.00	0.00	4,058.08
St Bernadette Catholic Junior School	Primary	236.00	236.00	0.00	4,604.36
St Anne's Catholic Primary School	Primary	391.00	391.00	0.00	7,628.41
St Bede's Catholic Infant School	Primary	170.00	170.00	0.00	3,316.70
St Andrew's Catholic Primary School	Primary	440.00	440.00	0.00	8,584.40
Immanuel and St Andrew Church of England Primary School	Primary	392.00	392.00	0.00	7,647.92
Reay Primary School	Primary	208.00	208.00	0.00	4,058.08
St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School	Primary	312.00	312.00	0.00	6,087.12
Julian's School	Primary	830.00	830.00	0.00	16,193.30
Norwood School	Secondary	757.00	0.00	757.00	23,898.49
Lilian Baylis Technology School	Secondary	627.00	0.00	627.00	19,794.39
Saint Gabriel's College	Secondary	494.00	0.00	494.00	15,595.58
La Retraite Roman Catholic Girls' School	Secondary	779.00	0.00	779.00	24,593.03
Bishop Thomas Grant Catholic Secondary School	Secondary	902.00	0.00	902.00	28,476.14
Archbishop Tenison's School	Secondary	380.00	0.00	380.00	11,996.60
London Nautical School	Secondary	542.00	0.00	542.00	17,110.94
Woodmansterne School	All-through	711.00	620.00	91.00	14,969.07
Oasis Academy Johanna	Primary	208.00	208.00	0.00	4,058.08
Rosendale Primary School	Primary	627.00	627.00	0.00	12,232.77
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School	Primary	398.00	398.00	0.00	7,764.98
Oasis Academy South Bank	Secondary	608.00	0.00	608.00	19,194.56
Trinity Academy	Secondary	267.00	0.00	267.00	8,429.19
South Bank Engineering UTC	Secondary	86.00	0.00	86.00	2,715.02
Platanos College	Secondary	1,011.00	0.00	1,011.00	31,917.27
The Elmgreen School	Secondary	896.00	0.00	896.00	28,286.72
St Martin in the Fields High School for Girls	Secondary	473.00	0.00	473.00	14,932.61
Lambeth Academy	Secondary	781.00	0.00	781.00	24,656.17
Ark Evelyn Grace Academy	Secondary	703.00	0.00	703.00	22,193.71
City Heights E-ACT Academy	Secondary	761.00	0.00	761.00	24,024.77
Durand Academy	All-through	783.00	726.00	57.00	15,963.75
Dunraven School	All-through	1,359.00	288.00	1,071.00	39,430.35
Effra Nursery	NMS	133.00			2,594.83
Ethelred Nursery	NMS	54.00			1,053.54
Holmewood Nursery	NMS	138.00			2,692.38
Maytree Nursery	NMS	99.00			1,931.49
Triangle Nursery	NMS	131.00			2,555.81
ElmCourt School	Special	100.00			7,810.00
Lansdowne School	Special	100.00			7,810.00
The Livy School	Special	97.00			7,575.70
The Michael Tippett School	Special	70.00			5,467.00
Turney School	Special	120.00			9,372.00

4. Teachers' Pension Contributions Increases 2019

- 4.1 HM Treasury has published a written Ministerial Statement about the valuation of public sector pension schemes, including the Teacher Pension Scheme.

The valuations will result in much higher costs for employers, including colleges. Some of the reasons for this is that the original Teachers Pension Scheme (TPS) was designed to protect employers from increases in the future has not kept in line with the cost cap and the following concerns have been identified:-

- Falling longevity and lower than forecast pay means pensions are worth less to members in the scheme
- This is resulted in a cost cap floor breach - essentially a breach in the valuations process when the scheme was set up
- Scheme Advisory Board has 6 months to make proposals to DfE.
- DfE plans to improve the scheme by April 2019
- This means employers paying higher bills from September
- The way in which the scheme rules are written into law means that it prevents evasive action to cut scheme costs. Which means the fund needs to be topped up.

- 4.2 The (badly-designed) cost cap mechanism of the teacher pension scheme requires the DfE to improve TPS benefits. These improvements will be paid for by 'teaching employers' using money they would otherwise spend on staff pay within the sector

- 4.3 The DfE have promised to compensate state-funded schools and colleges funding only until March 2020 (7 months) but this is yet to be seen in written legislation and may only cover some teaching costs (eg those related to 16-18 education)

- 4.4 Since 2015, employers have paid 16.48% towards the TPS while employees have paid an average of 9.6% (contributions vary with pay rates so that higher paid teachers, including principals, pay more).

- 4.5 The recent announcements could mean an increase in the employer contributions to more than 23% - i.e. a 40% increase in costs. Because the Government Actuary's valuation is provisional, the final rate is not yet confirmed.

- 4.5 The DfE's funding to cover the exceptional increase is likely to be time-limited and probably will not meet the full increase in employer contribution. This will leave the education system in the 2020's with a TPS which is unaffordable on current funding levels. Increasing funding would obviously be preferable, but with the ongoing changes to the National Funding Formula (NNF) and ongoing pressures within schools budget it will create higher financial risks to schools.

Agenda Item 8

Title:	Falling Rolls Fund			
Date:	1st October 2018			
Report to:	Schools Forum October 2018			
Report for:	Information X	Decision X	Consultation	Action
Author:	Dominique Johnston-Franklin – Group Manager Education			

1. Background

- 1.1 The ability for Local Authorities to set criteria for a falling rolls fund was introduced by the Department for Education (DfE) in 2014 to protect schools from financial instability. The key aim of the fund is to protect schools from financial turbulence which may have been caused by external factors and which likely to be short term in nature.
- 1.2 Schools experience fluctuations in rolls for a variety of reasons, including new schools being set up locally, school rebuilding programmes, dislocations through regeneration programmes resulting in the movement of local housing estates etc. However set against the background of increase pupil places required especially in London, the decision on the viability of schools should not be on the inflexibility of the national funding formula but on the need to retain school places in local communities.
- 1.3 Lambeth Schools forum recognised that there will be circumstances when support over and above formula budget share will be necessary, local authorities are allowed to ask the schools forum to top slice the Dedicated School Grant in order to create a fund to support 'good' or 'outstanding' schools with falling rolls where local planning data show that the surplus places will be needed in the near future.

2. Current Criteria

- 2.1 The DfE has suggested that an acceptable methodology would generally contain some of the features set out below:
- support is available only for schools judged 'Good' or 'Outstanding' at their last Ofsted inspection (note that this is a mandatory requirement)
 - surplus capacity exceeds x pupils or x% of the published admission number
 - local planning data shows a requirement for at least x% of the surplus places within the next x years
 - formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort
- 2.1 In 2015 Lambeth schools Forum agreed the following Criteria for Lambeth Falling rolls fund after a working group was set up to discuss the different factors and how this was Identified via a fair formula. A pot of £585k was set aside from the Dedicated schools Grant to support schools following the formula below:-

- Support is available only for schools judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection.
- Threshold for funding to be set at over 20%, therefore the school will absorb falling rolls of less than 20%.
- Growing schools do not qualify for falling rolls funding
- Pupils in Special Units are excluded.
- There must be intent for the school to regain its planned admissions numbers (PAN) within 3 years

To qualify, schools must meet all the criteria

2.2 Exceptions

There is an agreement from the Schools Forum, that the Local Authority can bring funding proposals for schools that do not meet all of the qualifying criteria for the Forum's consideration, on an exceptional basis.

Such cases must be brought to the Schools Forum for agreement on an annual basis as any agreement only covers one funding period (year).

2.3 Funding Methodology

Funding is based on the prevailing school sector average weighted pupil unit (AWPU), which is set in the Authority's funding formula for key stages. For primary schools this is KS1 AWPU unit value and for secondary schools, KS3.

The formula determines the difference between the number on roll (NOR) recorded in the October pupil census and the planned admissions number (PAN) for the academic year in question. For primary schools, the NOR is Reception year- group and for secondary, it is year- group 7.

This difference between the NOR and PAN is expressed as a percentage of PAN.

If the % change exceeds 20%, then number of pupils above this level are funded at the prevailing AWPU.

If the £585,000 is exceeded the AWPU rate will be adjusted to ensure it is distributed evenly but does not exceed the budget.

3. Current Projections for 19-20 Falling rolls allocation

- 3.1 Lambeth Place planning team have provided the current number of entry as per the 11th September 2018. These are not the approved Oct-18 Census and the projections for Falling rolls eligibility will have to be updated once the final census data is cleared and published.

Based on the data provided the following schools will be eligible for falling rolls funding in 19-20. Noting that this will change if there are significant changes in reception and Year 7 figures from the 11th September 2018.

School	School Ofsted	PAN 2018/19	Projected NOR Oct-18 based on 11th September information	Movement of NOR over PAN	Number of pupils to be funded by LA	Total Funding based on APWU	Year of Eligibility
Glenbrook Primary School	Good	60	17	-43	31	£128,314.89	3
Lark Hall Primary School (Including Lark Hall Centre for Pupils with Autism)	Good	60	42	-18	6	£24,835.14	3
Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School	Good	60	41	-19	7	£28,974.33	1
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	Good	30	18	-12	6	£24,835.14	3
Loughborough Primary School	Good	90	53	-37	19	£78,644.61	3
St John the Divine Church of England Primary School	Good	30	17	-13	7	£28,974.33	3
Fenstanton Primary School	Good	90	62	-28	10	£41,391.90	2
Allen Edwards Primary School	Good	60	32	-28	16	£66,227.04	1
St Helen's Catholic School	Good	38	25	-13	5	£20,695.95	1
Rosendale Primary School	Outstanding	120	88	-32	8	£33,113.52	1
Hill Mead Primary School	Outstanding	60	44	-16	4	£16,556.76	1
Oasis Academy Johanna	Good	30	21	-9	3	£12,417.57	1
Durand Academy	Good	90	66	-24	6	£24,835.14	1
Totals					128.00	£529,816.32	

3.2 The schools highlighted at the bottom of the table with year of eligibility as year 1 are the schools who are projected to access the fund in 19/20 based on projections.

The table demonstrates the possible funding that schools could have been eligible for but unfortunately they do not meet the criteria of good or outstanding they are not entitled to the support funding for falling rolls.

School	School Ofsted	PAN 2018/19	Projected NOR Oct-18 based on 11th September information	Number of pupils to be funded by LA	Total Funding based on APWU	Total Funding Scaled back to Budget
Kings Avenue School	Requires Improvement	60	27	21	£86,922.99	£61,733.67
St John's Angell Town Church of England Primary School	Requires Improvement	60	30	18	£74,505.42	£52,914.57
Archbishop Tenison's School	Inadequate	92	69	4	£16,556.76	£11,758.79

3.3 The following schools are no longer eligibility for Falling rolls funding due to movement in reception intake rolls or access fund for 3 years.

- **St Martin in the Fields** – have accessed 3 years of fund as per criteria –still meet criteria on numbers
- **Christ Church Streatham** – Accessed fund for 1 year and now have increased reception intake roll
- **St Anne’s**– Accessed fund for 1 years and now have increased reception intake roll
- **Henry Fawcett** – Accessed fund for 2 years and now have increased reception intake roll
- **Herbert Morrison** – Accessed fund for 2 years and now have increased reception intake roll

4. Total Allocation

- 4.1 The total fund for falling rolls is £585k and this is distributed on the AWPU for the school multiplied by 80% of number of empty places in reception or Y7 intake.

In 16-17 and 17-18 the amount of funding needed to fund the 80% of empty places based on AWPU was significantly higher than the £585k so the amounts were scaled back to the budget

In 18-19 and on the projected figures for 19-20 the funding needed is less than the 80% funding based on AWPU as demonstrated below.

Year	Total Funding based on APWU £	Total Funding Scaled back to Budget £	Scale
2016-17	718,186	585,000	- 133,186
2017-18	940,334	585,000	- 355,334
2018-19	550,512		
2019-20- Projection	529,816		

5. Recommendations / Decisions

- 5.1 Schools Forum to agree current falling rolls criteria for 19/20
- 5.2 Schools Forum to agree to provisionally allocate an amount of £585k in 2019/20 – this can be revised once final census figures are known and any funding that is not allocated will be carried forward to future years.

Agenda Item 9

Title:	Growth Funding 2019-20			
Date:	06th October 2018			
Report to:	October 2018 Schools Forum			
Report for:	Information X	Decision X	Consultation	Action
Author:	Dominique Johnston –Franklin Group Manager - Education			

1. Background

- 1.1 Local authorities may top-slice the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to form a Growth Fund, to support schools which are required to provide extra pupil places, in order to meet basic need within the authority. The local authority is required to publish the criteria for which schools can become eligible for Growth funding and the methodology for allocating it.
- 1.2 The Growth Fund is typically used to fund schools taking one-off bulge classes or schools expanding their forms of entry (FE).
- 1.3 The Department of Education (DfE) has outlined the circumstances in which local authorities can vary pupil numbers used to set 2019-20 school budgets and these will be increased as part of the budget submission on the Authority Performance Template (APT) which is the tool used to submit all Lambeth schools budgets. In these cases the school receives the pupil driven element of their funding as part of their budget share rather than from the growth fund.

2. Current Criteria

- 2.1 The current Lambeth criteria for growth is as follows:

With the agreement of the Schools Forum, Lambeth are permitted to retain DSG to form a specific schools' contingency to support those schools that, with the prior agreement of the Authority, are permanently expanding and those schools experiencing significant in-year pupil roll increases. This specific schools' fund is known as the Schools Growth Fund.

Schools Growth Fund funding allocations:

The calculation method in allocating the Schools Growth Fund payment will be based on the following:

For permanently expanding schools / schools taking one-off bulge classes

- Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) basic entitlement funding x the planned number of additional pupils to be admitted in the Autumn term x 7/12 months.
- This funding is equivalent to pro-rata financial-year (September to March) funding for the number of additional pupils expected to join the school in the autumn as a result of the temporary expansion within a particular year group.
- For permanently expanding schools this will be reflected in adjustment of pupil numbers within the APT and will be confirmed with schools in Dec for the following financial year budgets

- For one off bulge classes this will be profiled over the period for which they cover and will be paid with the monthly payments to schools via cash summary but is not reflected in APT budgets.
- An additional fund is accessible to support the additional direct revenue costs associated with the expansion; resourcing equipment for the classrooms.

2.2 The criteria for determining allocations from the Growth Fund have been previously agreed by the Forum. DfE guidance requires that the Forum is consulted on the allocations themselves.

3. Planned Growth Fund for 19-20

3.1 For the schools who are permanently expanding they will have their pupil number increase as demonstrated in the table below:

School	7/12ths Adjustment Increase in Pupil Number APT
Stockwell Primary School	30 pupils
Granton Primary School	30 pupils
Paxton Primary School	60 pupils
Woodmansterne Primary School & Children's Centre	60 pupils Primary, 90 Pupils Secondary
St Leonard's Church of England Primary school	30 pupils
Julian's Primary School	60 pupils
Dunraven School	60 pupils
Gipsey Hill Secondary Potential	90 Pupils - No APT

3.2 For the additional allocations for growth planning provisions the following is the breakdown for support for classroom provisions and dis economies of scale funding for Woodmansterne and Potential Gipsey Hill Secondary School

School	7/12ths Adjustment Increase in Pupil Number APT	Additional Classroom Provisions £
Stockwell Primary School	30 pupils	20,000
Granton Primary School	30 pupils	20,000
Paxton Primary School	60 pupils	40,000
Woodmansterne Primary School & Children's Centre	60 pupils Primary, 90 Pupils Secondary	100,000
St Leonard's Church of England Primary school	30 pupils	20,000
Julian's Primary School	60 pupils	40,000
Dunraven School	60 pupils	40,000
Gipsey Hill Secondary Potential	90 Pupils - No APT	60,000
		340,000

Dis-economies of Scale and place planning Provision 340,000

Total Growth £680,000

Note the diseconomies of scale for place planning provision is based on 2 schools lump sum of £170k

3.2 In 18-19 there was a need for growth funding that was outside of what we had predicted which totalled £307k. This was for historical growth agreed not funded to St Johns Angel town and Bishop Thomas Grant – 1FE and Norwood 2FE

5. Recommendations / Decisions

- 5.1 Schools Forum to agree current Growth fund criteria for 19/20
- 5.2 Schools forum to review allocation of Growth fund of £680k and agree amount for 19/20.

Agenda Item 10**Title: Vulnerable Schools Fund****Note that this paper is for Maintained School Representatives only****Date: 8th October 2018****Report to: Schools Forum October 2018****Report for: Information and Decision****Author: Colm Doyle****1. Summary of Tasks**

1.1 Note the expenditure on additional support to schools using the Vulnerable schools Fund

2. Update on Current Spend

2.1 In 2017-18 financial year Schools Forum agreed to the de-delegation of funding to establish a Vulnerable Schools Fund (VSF) for maintained schools and a figure of £9.70 per pupil was agreed. The funding was charged against school's budget shares in the 2017/18 financial year and a similar amount per pupil was de-delegated in 2018/19.

The fund is allocated to pay for additional support to schools that are vulnerable to adverse outcomes in teaching and learning or leadership

The school's budget is taken into account when allocating the additional support.

The support allocated forms part of an overall package with an action plan and is monitored by the School Improvement Monitoring Group and the Lambeth Schools Partnership.

The aim is to ensure that any vulnerabilities or issues are addressed quickly to avoid school failure. Any urban school can become vulnerable for example if significant numbers of staff leave at once, if there are leadership issues or where there are pupil roll issues.

2.2 The table below illustrates the 2017-18 expenditure and the current (to date) 2018-19 expenditure

Amounts received in 2017/18	£235,444	
Amounts de-delegated in 2018/19	£233,570	
Expenditure 2017-18	Description	Amount
	Additional support for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christ Church SW9 PS • The Elmgreen School • Kings Avenue PS • Jubilee PS • Saint Gabriel's College 	£34,950

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archbishop Tenison School • St. Stephen's CE PS 	
Expenditure for 2018-19 to date	Additional support for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. John's (Angell Town) CE PS • St. Stephen's CE PS • St. Helen's RC PS • Kings Avenue PS • Jubilee PS • Crown Lane PS • The Michael Tippett School • Stockwell PS • Lansdowne School • The London Nautical School • St. Saviour's CE PS • Christ Church SW9 PS • Glenbrook PS • Saint Gabriels College 	£72,500
Current balance		(£361,564)

Note that the amount of de-delegation reduces when a school becomes an academy

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 There is sufficient funding in the fund to cover the remainder of this year and next year and thus there is no intention to request de-delegation of funding in 19/20.
- 3.2 As there is currently a healthy balance in the Fund, the Schools Forum is asked to consider the following options:
- a) Keep the money in the fund and continue to use it as planned, meaning that we would probably not need to de-delegate again for the next two (or more) years.
 - b) Pay some of the funding back to the maintained schools. (Note that schools that have become academies during 2018/19 will not receive a refund as the DfE has already recouped a proportion of the de-delegated amount).