



Contact: Sangeeta Brown  
Resources Development Manager  
Direct: 020 8379 3109  
Mobile: 07956 539613

e-mail: [sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

---

## SCHOOLS FORUM

Meeting to be held from **17:30** on **13 December 2017**

**Venue: Chace Community School, Churchbury Lane, Enfield, EN1 3HQ**

(NOTE: Sangeeta Brown, Resources Development Manager - 07956 539613)

---

### **Schools Members:**

Governors: Ms Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary),  
Mr T McGee (Secondary), Vacancy (Primary), Vacancy (Primary)

Headteachers: Ms H Thomas (Primary) (Chair), Ms H Ballantine (Primary), Mr  
D Bruton (Secondary), Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit), Ms H  
Knightley (Primary), Ms K Baptiste (Primary), Ms G Weir (Special), Ms  
M O'Keefe / Ms T Day (Secondary)

Academies: Ms L Dawes, Ms A Nicou, Mr Sadgrove

---

### **Non-Schools Members:**

16 - 19 Partnership	Mr K Hintz
Early Years Provider	Ms A Palmer
Teachers' Committee	Mr J Jacobs
Education Professional	Ms C Seery
Head of Behaviour Support	Ms J Fear
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Tbc

---

### **Observers:**

Cabinet Member	Cllr A Orhan
School Business Manager	Ms A Homer
Education Funding Agency	Mr Owen

---

**MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ARRIVE AT 17:15**  
**WHEN SANDWICHES WILL BE PROVIDED**  
**ENABLING A PROMPT START AT 17:30**

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP**

Note:

a) Apologies from Ms Hurst & Ms Dawes

b) Reported:

- Ms Gopoulos had stepped down as the Early Years representative and Ms Angela Palmer had been nominated to take over the vacated position;
- Ms Whitaker had also stepped down as a primary Headteacher representative and Ms Kate Baptiste had been nominated to take over the vacated position;
- Secondary Headteachers had nominated three Headteachers for the two positions for secondary Headteachers on the Forum. The three secondary Headteachers will attend the meetings on a rotational basis;
- Confirmations of the nominations for the two primary governor vacancies were awaited.

The Forum is asked to confirm the nominations and to welcome the new members.

## **2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members are invited to identify any personal or prejudicial interests relevant to items on the agenda. A definition of personal and prejudicial interests has been attached for members' information.

## **3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)**

- (a) School Forum meetings held on 6 November 2017 (*attached*)
- (b) Minutes from the Education Resources Group meeting held on 31 October (*attached*) and the draft minutes from the meeting held on 30 November 2017 (*to follow*)
- (c) Matters arising from these minutes.

## **4. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR DECISION (Pages 5 - 30)**

- (a) Schools Budget 2017/18 – Monitoring (*attached*)
- (b) School Funding Arrangements – 2018/19: Responses to consultation (*attached*)
- (c) Schools Budget 2018/19 – Update (*attached*)
- (d) Central Services Schools Block (*attached*)

## **5. ITEM FOR INFORMATION (Pages 31 - 34)**

DfE Consultation: Eligibility for Free School Meals under Universal Credit  
(*attached*)

**6. WORKPLAN** (Pages 35 - 36)

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS**

(a) Date of next meeting is Wednesday 17 January 2018 at 5.30pm at Chace Community School;

(b) Dates of future meetings:

- 7 March 2018 at Chace Community School;
- 9 May 2018 (Provisional)
- 11 July 2018 (Provisional)

**9. CONFIDENTIALITY**

To consider which items should be treated as confidential.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING****Held on Monday 6 November 2017 at Chace Community School****Schools Members:**

Governors: Mrs J Ellerby (Primary), (Primary), *Mrs J Leach (Special)*, Mrs L Sless (Primary), *Mr T McGee (Secondary)*, Vacancy (Primary), Vacancy (Primary)

Headteachers: Ms H Thomas (Primary) Chair, *Ms H Ballantine (Primary)* – substituted by Ms K Jaeggi (Primary), Mr D Bruton (Secondary), *Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit)*, *Ms H Knightley (Primary)*, *Ms G Weir (Special)*, Ms L Whitaker (Primary) Vacancy (Secondary),

Academies: *Ms L Dawes (Secondary)*, Ms A Nicou, *Mr A Sadgrove*

**Non-Schools Members:**

Early Years Provider	Ms C Gopoulos
16 - 19 Partnership	<i>Mr K Hintz</i>
Teachers' Committee	Mr J Jacobs
Head of Behaviour Support	Ms C Seery
Education Professional	Ms J Fear
Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Vacancy

**Observers:**

Cabinet Member	Cllr A Orhan
School Business Manager	Ms A Homer
Education Funding Agency	<i>Mr O Jenkins</i>

**Also attending:**

Assistant Director, Education	Mr J Carrick
Assistant Finance Business Partner	Mrs L McNamara
Head of Budget Challenge	Mr N Goddard
Resources Development Manager	Mrs S Brown
Resources Development Officer	Ms J Bedford
Observer - PVI	Ms S Roberts
Observer - Unison	Ms T Adnan
Observer - Finance	Ms D Amos

\* Italics denote absence

**1. MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE****a) Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Leach, Mr McGee, Ms Ballantine, Ms Hurst, Ms Knightley, Ms Weir, Ms Dawes, Mr Sadgrove and Mr Hintz.

**Noted** Ms Jaeggi was substituting for Ms Ballantine.

**Reported** that nominations were being sought:

- For the Secondary Headteacher vacancy from the Secondary Headteachers Conference;
- For two primary governor vacancies from the Member Governor Forum.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest expressed.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING****(a) Meeting of 20 September 2017**

- (i) **Received** and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum held on 20 September 2017, a copy of which is in the minute book.

**(ii) Matters arising from these minutes**

Pupils with ECHPs requiring Element 3 top-up funding (Item 4a)

**Reported** due to the information containing personal data, officers had been advised the report could only be sent to a named individual. To ensure that the information was sent to the right person, each school will be asked to confirm the named individual and then it would be the responsibility of the named individual to liaise with anyone else at the school. Headteachers would be contacted following this meeting.

(iii) **Scheme for Financing**

Reported, as part of the annual process, the Scheme would be reviewed and any amendments to reflect the view of the Schools Forum would be brought to the Forum.

**(b) Meeting of 20 September 2017**

(i) **Received** and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the School Forum held on 15 September 2017, a copy of which is in the minute book.

(ii) **Matters arising from these minutes**

The Chair advised that the minutes would be sent to Mr Charalambous and an update sought.

It was commented Ms Kate Osamor, MP for Edmonton had visited schools in her constituency to discuss the financial difficulties facing schools. It was requested if information could be sent to Ms Osamor and she be asked to raise the Forums concerns regarding insufficient school funding.

Resolved information on financial difficulties facing schools would be send to Ms Osamor, MP.

**Action: Chair**

**4. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION & INFORMATION**

**a) School Budget 2017/18 – Monitoring**

**Received** an update from the monitoring of the DSG position for 2017/18, a copy of which is in the Minute book.

**Reported** there were no changes to the DSG position since last reported, other than an adjustment to the cash provided to reflect schools who have converted to academies.

**Noted:**

- i) The School Block's underspend was due to the Growth Fund underspending and a reduced liability for rates for schools converting to academies during the year.
- ii) Latest DSG projection was indicating a £4.6m overspend; by yearend, this position could change because of further demand to support SEND pupils and any underspend in the Early Years block.

In response to the question as to why the 30 hours provision was underspending, it was stated that the process required parents to apply online and this was then verified by the Provider. Unfortunately, during a significant proportion of the Summer term, the online system was inaccessible either it was not available or functioning properly. This had led to a low level of take up and in the meantime, most parents would have made alternative arrangements.

- iii) The High Needs Block had continued to overspend due to the need to place further pupils in out-borough provision.

It was reported London Councils had recently carried out a survey and the findings were across London, local authorities were reporting overspend of £95m in their High Needs block. London Council was lobbying the Government on this issue.

To counteract the increase in places, the Authority was continuing to work with Enfield schools to develop further in-borough provision.

The Forum noted the report.

**b) School Funding Arrangements – 2018/19**

**Received** an extract of the Consultation document, which contained proposals for funding arrangements for 2018/19, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

**Reported** the proposals detailed in the document had been discussed and supported by the Education Resources Group.

**Noted**

- i) The DfE had confirmed that a soft national funding formula would be implemented for 2018/19 and 2019/20. Based on 2017/18 data, it was indicated that Enfield would receive an additional £7m for 2018/19. This would increase the overall DSG from £320.6m to £327.6m. A further increase in funding was expected for 2019/20.
- ii) Full implementation of the national funding formula was unaffordable, so a number of models were developed and the models included in the consultation were deemed most appropriate models for Enfield.

The work on the modelling had indicated the national funding formula would transfer resources from primary to secondary and schools with more able and / or less deprived pupils will see a reduction in funding.
- iii) It was queried if consideration had been given to applying a different level of minimum funding guarantee and the models where full funding was not being utilised, the percentage rate for applying the national funding formula increased until the funding was fully utilised. It was stated that consideration was given to applying different levels for the minimum funding guarantee, but it was felt that it would be best to limit for the consultation document the current percentages of -1.5% and 0% with the minimum funding guarantee was being funded by capping the gains to 3%. The 0% ensured no school saw a loss in their 'per pupil' funding and would provide losing schools another year to plan for a reduction in funding due to the implementation of the national funding formula. Officers would do further work on model 3 so that all the funding was utilised.
- iv) There were views that the model showing full implementation of the national funding formula should be included as an information item in the consultation document. By including the information, schools would have an indication of the level of reductions they will experience when the national funding formula was implemented.
- v) The Forum was advised that the Education Resources Group had commented on the need to ensure that the local arrangements minimised turbulence for individual schools and, as far as possible, primary schools be supported from significant loss of funding.

It was questioned if all schools had to be consulted on the local arrangements or could each sector submit a response on behalf of all schools in their sector. It was stated that the regulations required all schools and the Schools Forum to be consulted before a final decision was made by the Cabinet Member.

There were some concerns that in considering the consultation, individual schools would consider the position for their own school and not the effect the changes will have on all Enfield schools.

Following a discussion on how individual schools would respond to the proposals, the Forum considered the local arrangements needed to be fair for everyone and accepted the Education Resources Group's view the primary schools that would be losing under the national funding formula should be given the coming year to plan for the reduction in funding. It was agreed that a briefing session to explain the changes required and the proposals contained in the consultation document be held for all Headteacher.
- vi) Any changes to the criterion for the growth fund because of the need to fund start-up costs for new free schools proposed as part of the Local Authority's basic need would be reviewed during the year and any revisions will be brought back to the Forum for consideration.
- vii) The changes to the SEND place funding. It was commented that some schools with Additionally Resourced Provision (ARPs) were unable to name pupils attending the provision because the name was not listed on the Education Health and Care Plan. If

the view was only to fund filled places for the per pupil amount, there was a need to ensure the provision was named on the Education Health and Care Plan for each pupil. It was confirmed that the review of ARPs had concluded and the findings would be presented to the Forum.

- viii) The Forum noted and supported, in principle, the move of 0.5% funding from the Schools block to High Needs block to continue to support inclusive schools.
- ix) The current spend on the Early Years Inclusion Fund was just over £35k and it was projected this would increase to £100k by the year-end. Following feedback from some of the providers, the Authority had reviewed how best to use of the Inclusion Fund during 2018/19 and the proposals contained in the document outlined the outcomes from the review.

There was concern that it had not been a formal review and a change was being considered when the Inclusion Fund had been in place for less than a year. It was also felt that the Panel was restrained in their decision-making, the amounts allocated were not sufficient to employ a member of staff, and access to direct support would be more helpful. The proposal to support settings to apply for specialist provision was noted, but most settings were inundated at having to complete the paperwork required to support funding for three and four year olds and did not have time to complete more paperwork.

It was stated that the feedback from settings had been the need for support from educational psychologists and an area SENCO. The regulations required all settings to be consulted, and so it seemed appropriate to circulate the current proposals for comment to inform the final arrangements.

The Forum noted the report and proposals being made the Authority.

**Resolved to:**

- A. Amend the models with the changes suggested by the Forum before circulating the document;
- B. Note the proposal for transferring 0.5% of funding from the Schools to High Needs block to support inclusive schools;
- C. Note the comments received on the changes proposed for the Inclusion Fund;
- D. Arrange a briefing for Headteachers to explain the proposals contained in the consultation document and share the views of the Schools Forum.

**Action; Mrs Brown /Mrs McNamara**

**5. WORKPLAN**

Any additional items arising from the meeting would be added to the workplan.

**ACTION: Mrs Brown**

**6. FUTURE MEETINGS**

- a) The date of the next meeting is Wednesday 13 December 2017 at 17:30 at Chace Community School
- b) Dates for future meetings:
  - 07 March 2018 17:30 - 19:30
  - 09 May 2018 (Provisional) 17:30 - 19:30
  - 11 July 2018 (Provisional) 17:30 – 19:30

**7. CONFIDENTIALITY**

No items were considered confidential.

The meeting closed at 19:30



## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2019 REPORT NO. 16

### MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Education Resources Group 30 Nov 2017  
Schools Forum 13 December 2017

### REPORT OF:

Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services

### Contact officer and telephone number:

Louise McNamara 020 8379 4720

E mail: [louise.mcnamara@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:louise.mcnamara@enfield.gov.uk)

Agenda –

Item: 4a

**Subject: Schools Budget -  
2017/18 Monitoring Update**

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report provides an update of the DSG budget monitoring position for 2017/18.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To note the contents of the report.

### 3. 2017/18 DSG ALLOCATION

#### 3.1 DSG 2017/18

Since the last meeting there has been no further update to our DSG allocation for 2017/18. Our current gross allocation remains at £318.679.

#### 3.2 Academies Recoupment

The 2017/18 DSG allocation has been reduced in cash terms by £76.438m to reflect the recoupment for all academies as at 01 April 2017. We are expecting further adjustments to reflect the 2 primary schools that converted on 01 September 2017 and other schools converting to academy status during the autumn term. This adjustment has a nil effect on the overall the school's budget position as a reduction in income is matched by a reduction in expenditure.

#### 4. 2017/18 DSG Budget Monitor

Appendix A details the DSG budget monitoring position as at the end of October 2017.

#### 4.1 Schools Block

There are projected underspends in the Schools Block. These relate to the Growth Fund, where the additional classes required for the 1718 academic year are lower than expected, and rates where there will be reduced demand on the DSG for schools converting to academy status as they will be entitled to 80% charitable relief.

## **4.2 Early Years Block**

At this stage of the financial year, it is assumed that any under/overspends within the various areas of early years will be contained within the Early Years Block funding. Officers will be reviewing October census information when this is available to project expenditure for the remainder of year and a further update will be brought to the next meeting.

## **4.3 High Needs**

The current projected overspends in High Needs mainly relate to:

- out-borough placements where there continues to be an increase in the number of pupils placed in out-borough provision. Projections reflect new September placements and allow 10% contingency to make some provision for new placements over the autumn and spring terms.
- Exceptional needs allocations are expected to exceed budget provision due to the allocation of the Transition Fund and projected increases in EHCPs and associated funding over the next 2 terms.

The monitoring also reflects additional in borough provision as follows

- 30 additional places at West Lea School wef Sept 2017
- new ARP managed by Durants at Winchmore School wef Sept 2017
- ASD provision at St Mary's managed by Russet House – starting with 7 places wef Feb 2018.

There has been a net reduction in the High Needs Block overspend due to leavers in outborough provision and some revisions in placement costs.

## **5. DSG Outturn Position**

Based on the latest monitoring position and the ongoing and additional pressures identified above, the 2017/18 DSG allocation is anticipated to be significantly overspent by the end of the financial year. As previously reported, the school funding regulations governing the DSG Conditions of Grant would apply and any deficit in would be the first call on the 2018/19 DSG budget and this would need to be agreed by Schools Forum.

The 2017/18 budget will be monitored closely for the remainder of the financial year monthly and updates will be provided to the Forum at future meetings.

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018 REPORT NO. 17****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Education Resources Group – 30 November 17  
Schools Forum – 13 December 17

**REPORT OF:**

Executive Director of Children's Services

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

E mail: [sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

<b>Item: 4b</b>
-----------------

**Subject:**

**School Funding Arrangements –  
2018/19: Responses to Consultation**

**Wards: All**

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1. This report provides the responses received to the proposals contained in the consultation document on the school funding arrangements for 2018/19.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 Members are asked to note and comment on the final recommendations for the funding formula.

**3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 At the last meeting, the Forum was informed of the options and the Authority's preferred options to inform the funding arrangements for the Schools and Early Years blocks. Following the discussion at the meeting, the proposals were amended to include the views of the Forum and published for comments from all maintained schools, academies, free schools and private, independent & voluntary early years providers.
- 3.2 This report provides a summary of the responses received and seeks the Forum's views on the final proposals for the local funding arrangements for 2018/19.

In providing their view's, the Forum is reminded that the proposals in the consultation were based on 2017/18 data and indicated funding rates provided by the DfE. Both the data and funding will be subject to change: pupil data for the October Census and funding on the final budget settlement received from the Government. Therefore, the proposals in this document will be subject to the resources available.

**4. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

- 4.1 As reported previously, the timetable for reviewing and publishing proposals for the local arrangements had been tight and with the agreement of the Schools Forum, the consultation period for receiving responses was just over two weeks. By the deadline of 27 November 2017, 36 responses had been received and of these three were received just after the deadline. Table 1 provides a summary of the response received.

Table 1: Summary of Responses Received

Number of Responses	Total Number = 36	1 - Primary	2 - Secondary	3 - Special	4 - Academies	5 - PVI&C
		12	3	0	1	20
		33%	8%	0%	3%	56%

**4.2 Local Funding Formula for Mainstream Schools**

As advised at the last meeting, the Government have confirmed that they are implementing a national funding formula (NFF) from April 2018, but for 2018/19 and 2019/20 it will be a "soft formula". So, this effectively means funding continues to be provided to local authorities and is calculated using the NFF for schools with and the total amount for schools in each authority is then adjusted by the additional 0.5%. Local authorities, then still continue to have the

responsibility for consulting and determining within the regulatory parameters the local funding formula for mainstream schools in their area.

The Forum's comments at the last meeting were used to finalise the two options included in the consultation documents. The two options were:

- Model B: to use the NFF unit rates for factors used for Enfield's current funding formula and 82% of the NFF unit rates for all the other not used locally;
- Model C: to partially implement the NFF unit rates: by moving 50% of the way towards NFF.

For both models, illustrations of -1.5% and 0% minimum funding guarantee (MFG) were included. A summary of the responses received is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Responses to the local funding formula for mainstream schools**

1	Formula Funding for mainstream: Use of Either Model	Primary Secondary Special Academies and Free Schools PVI's Total %	1 - Agree	2 - Disagree	3 - No response
			1	0	11
			0	0	3
			0	0	0
			0	0	1
			3	3	14
			4	3	29
			11%	8%	81%
1a	Model B	Primary Secondary Special Academies and Free Schools PVI's Total %	1 - Agree	2 - Disagree	3 - No response
			1	1	10
			1	0	2
			0	0	0
			1	0	0
			0	0	20
			3	1	32
			8%	3%	89%
1b	Model C	Primary Secondary Special Academies and Free Schools PVI's Total %	1 - Agree	2 - Disagree	3 - No response
			10	0	2
			2	1	0
			0	0	0
			0	0	1
			3	0	17
			15	1	20
			42%	3%	56%

Additional comments received were as follows:

- (a) Model C with 0%MFG/3%cap seems the fairest option. Worst case scenario means some schools get exactly the same as last year, others gain in varying degrees. Having a soft approach to NFF makes sense so that the variation is not too much when and if it comes into being. It is clear government want to change how funding is distributed so it is wise to be prepared. Model C seems to be the kindest option particularly when giving protection to those who will be worse off under NFF, giving a couple of years grace to deal with the changes.
- (b) St. Anne's would prefer Model B (– 1.5% MFG) as it favours our school. However, we do understand the logic of Model C – 0% MFG and the reasons for it. In a spirit of collective partnership, we will support Model C although our funding will be less.

### **Recommendation**

When considering both models, the Authority's proposes the implementation of Model C with 0% MFG because this will ensure:

- No school sees a reduction in their per pupil amount from the 2017/18 level;
- Primary to secondary per pupil ratio would be close to the national average.

#### 4.3 **Funding for Pupils with High Needs in Mainstream Schools**

Schools were asked to respond on the proposal to transfer 0.5% funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to continue to support schools with an above average incident of pupils with SEND. The average incident is currently calculated to be 1 in 75 pupils; and for 2018/19, this average will be reviewed to reflect October 2017 pupil numbers. A summary of the responses received is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Responses received for funding pupils with High Needs in Mainstream Schools**

2	Transfer of 0.5% from the Schools to High Needs block to provide additional funding to inclusive schools supporting an above average number of pupils with SEND	Primary Secondary Special Academies and Free Schools PVI's Total %	1 - Agree	2 - Disagree	3 - No response
			11	1	0
			3	0	0
			0	0	0
			0	1	0
			7	3	10
			21	5	10
			58%	14%	28%

Additional comments received were as follows:

- (a) SEND: Providing that they are not receiving funding elsewhere i.e. via ARP
- (b) Losing £6,000 per pupil for children with an EHCP is having a hugely detrimental impact on our budget. To be told we were double funded is no help. We have a lot of SEN children who will not get an EHCP but will need a lot of additional support and resources and our allocated SEN budget was being used for that.  
We have children whose EHCPs are being agreed and we have an additional funding to do anything for them. IT's a huge amount of SENCO time to get all the paper work for very little gain (especially when the plan stipulates only 15 hours).
- (c) This is one of the hardest budgeting problems for schools so maintaining the current arrangements would continue to assist schools with the cost. It is clear Govt. has not demonstrated how it will fund SEND in the future but transferring 0.5% from schools block will help schools with maintaining support for the time being.  
It would be invaluable to schools and PVI's to have some extra specialists available to help with support and advice on supporting NEF children with SEND. The hourly rate does not give settings any allowance to fund support. The only concern is that all settings should have fair access to the new staff as there is a risk some settings may have more support than others receive so a fair system of allocation should be administered.
- (d) School with above average incident of pupils with SEND should be supported by transferring funding from school with no or marginal amounts of pupils with SEND. The established principle of funding following the student should apply in regard to SEND. An historic review over the past two to three years will highlight the spread of such pupils across the borough and where they are concentrated.  
To simplify the administration a lagged approach could be used similar to schools and sixth forms where the funding follows the student numbers one year behind. There is no comparative figure for the funding allocated to Central Services in 2017/18. Without this figure, there is a lack of transparency on the level of increase or decrease in Central services, consequently a meaningful challenge against the amount of funds allocated to Central services is difficult. It is assumed that Central costs are in decline but this is not supported by the figures used in the presentation.

#### Recommendation

The Authority is proposing the transfer 0.5% from the schools to the high needs block to support mainstream schools with higher than the average incident of SEND pupils. In line with other school funding arrangements, the average incident will be calculated using pupil data from the October Census.

#### 4.4 **Early Years Inclusion Fund**

It was suggested in the consultation document that the use of the Inclusion Fund be amended to include direct support from three Education Psychologists and an Area SENCO, as well as the direct award through the Inclusion Panel. A summary of the responses received is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Responses received to the use of the Early Years Inclusion Fund**

			1 - Agree	2 - Disagree	3 - No response
3	Early Years - Inclusion	Primary	9	1	2
		Secondary	1	0	2
		Special	0	0	0
		Academies and Free Schools	1	0	0
		PVIs	12	8	0
		Total	23	9	4
		%	64%	25%	11%

Additional comments received were as follows:

- (a) I agree with the comments that there is not enough EP's in the borough, and the time we have to wait as a setting from initial referral to a child being seen by CDT for a diagnosis, is ridiculous. I have an Autistic child who had to wait 10 months for a diagnosis from CDT. The waiting times are not good enough to get these children the help and support they need.  
The Inclusion fund did help me pay for another member of staff to give her 1:1 support and enabled her key person to complete an Autism Awareness course, which we have found invaluable as a setting. It would be a great help to all settings if there is a point of call we could contact for advice for children with SEND, and strategies we could put in place while we are waiting so long for any help.
- (b) There should be some funding set aside for staff of pre-schools to attend specialist training, such as speech and language and maybe some support classes from the SENCo department as in reality the advice we are given is very helpful but it would be helpful if settings staff can be trained in specialist support for our children.
- (c) We were not consulted about the proposals and we don't know of any PVI's who were involved in the discussion. We feel that rather than the appointment of 3 EP's the funding could be spent on specialised training for PVI staff  
To better equip them to deal with the SEN issues that they encounter for erg  
Makaton Training  
Elklan Training  
Autism Training  
Courses for existing SENCO's within the settings
- (d) 5.3 Inclusion fund. The rate of £4.59 is not sufficient for settings to employ an extra member of staff to give 1:1 support to a child. If they apply for the fund and are therefore expected to allocate a member of staff to give 1:1 support they are faced with an extra financial burden which they cannot afford to cover and remain financially viable. This is one reason why settings may not apply for the fund.  
As was highlighted by the PVI reps and PVI observer at the last schools forum meeting the PVIs had not been asked for their feedback on how any unused inclusion fund could be used. We said that we would bring this issue and the proposals up at the next early years forum on Wednesday 22/11. The majority of PVIs were represented at this meeting and when asked if they had actually received the consultation document many of them said they hadn't. Several others thought that as it mentioned schools it had been sent to them in error so ignored it/deleted it. The PVIs present at the meeting requested that the deadline for the consultation be extended to give them the opportunity to respond. The LA officers present said that they would try to delay the deadline date if they could but they would ensure that the consultation document was resent to all PVIs. PVI Association reps asked all their colleagues if any of them had been asked for their feedback about the inclusion fund, the response was an overwhelming NO. Not one PVI had been asked or given any feedback so the claim that they had is incorrect. The PVIs present did not agree that it is appropriate or sensible to divert money from this fund to employ educational psychologists. Their view is that this would not benefit the majority of children with SEND in the PVI sector or 'help them to fill in forms' [even if EPs did help with form filling, which is doubtful, it would not be a very cost effective method.] The PVIs present at the meeting felt that a much better use of the inclusion money that has not been used and one which would benefit a much larger number of children with SEND would be to increase the amount of training available to the PVI sector, e.g. on how to support children with S&L difficulties, emotional & social difficulties, communication and social difficulties, behavioural issues and to reinstate the autism training. The PVIs were not against having some overall SENCO support but they did feel that just initial training for those new to the SENCO was not sufficient and that ongoing training for SENCOs in the sector would be beneficial too. Training in all the areas mentioned would improve the skills and knowledge of all the people working in the sector and ensure they are better equipped to support all the children with additional needs both now and in the future. Surely this would be a much more effective use of this

money? The PVI's present were very unhappy that yet again proposals that directly affect them and the children in their care are being put forward by people who do not work in the sector and have not asked those that do for their opinion on what would be the best use of funding.

- (e) We have two children diagnosed by Enfield with Autism  
And a few children with speech and language difficulties
- (f) Maintain the current arrangements for allocating a fund to individual settings.  
To include support to early years settings for EPS service.  
Enable pre-statutory work to be carried out with children.  
Increase the central provision for the work currently carried out by area SENCO.
- (g) We agree that an allocated fund should be available to support children in their setting. We do not however feel that allocating such a large amount of money from the fund to employ 3 Educational Psychologists is helpful as we feel the money should be spent on the children and on staff training. Settings need support even before referring to EPS and once they have been allocated an EP visits are infrequent. How accessible would dedicated EP's be given the number of early years (both PVI and school) settings in Enfield?  
We feel that increasing the provision for Area SENCO work to offer practical support by coming in and confirming in a settings mind that a child does have an additional need would be really beneficial. Settings would also benefit from having help with writing IEP's and could be encouraged to apply for inclusion funding. In the main settings now do referrals to professionals, meet with parents, chair meetings etc. which is all additional work and having support with this would really help.  
We feel we should get the 95% of funding we are entitled to for 2018/19. This may mean that you need to reduce the deprivation payments if the level of 2.5% inclusion fund is retained.
- (h) There should be some funding set aside for staff of pre-schools to attend specialist training, such as speech and language and maybe some support classes from the SENCO department as in reality the advice we are given is very helpful but it would be helpful if settings staff can be trained in specialist support for our children
- (i) Point 5.1.4 of the consultation document and 5.3.1 of the Proposal. The hourly rate for 3 year old funding should be increased to PVI's in 2018/19 as the Government has stated that the local authority needs to pay PVI's 95% of the funding it receives (as opposed to the interim amount of 93% currently). We disagree with the 5.3.1 proposal that the current levels of funding are maintained at 93.5% (for basic hourly rate per child); 4% for Deprivation and 2.5% for Inclusion fund and would suggest that 95% of funding be paid to providers for 2018/19.  
With regard to the Inclusion Fund (2.5% of the funding provided) the changes over this financial year have been that Inclusion Funding is distributed to all settings educating 3-5 year olds (including schools) on the basis of applications sent into the panel at given dates throughout the year. The very good thing is that the PVI sector is represented at these panel meetings (the first time we have been able to have a say on how funding is distributed) and we are surprised that funding in this block is underspent which may be that panel members were advised at the very first meeting in March to be very conservative in allocating funding requests so that funding would last the year. We do not agree with the analysis in 5.2.2 for the underspending which is more likely to be 1) lack of PVI knowledge about the current system and 2) the above mentioned encouragement to panel members to be conservative with applications. We do not agree with the proposal that 3 Educational Psychologists are needed to support PVI's to fill out the necessary paperwork and would like to see the current system, that has been given a very short opportunity to work, continue with greater publicity to the PVI sector so that we can obtain the funding we need which we believe will be more effective.
- (j) It was brought to my attention last week that certain proposals had been put forward to spend any funding that had not been allocated to settings. These include the funding of EP's and an area SENCO.  
It is my opinion that although we are in desperate need of more EP's to support our children with additional needs this should be funded not by taking monies from the inclusion fund. This fund provides settings with the opportunity to access funding to purchase necessary equipment or send staff on training that they would not be able to afford.  
In addition it would be wonderful to have an area SENCO to support us like we did previously, but again I feel that this should be something that is funded by a different budget.  
Any underspend could be spent more constructively to provide a sustained programme of training for practitioners in PVI's to develop their knowledge/skills and how best to identify and support children that they care for in SEN, building confidence and in turn making them less reliant on outside agencies.
- (k) How do we access the Inclusion Fund? We were unaware of its existence. This may be why so little has been applied for ...



Who is the area SENCO?

We disagree with the proposal for the use of the Inclusion Fund. We are able to manage the current EP arrangements; however, our difficulty in Early Years (as with the rest of the school is in providing support for the disproportionate amount of children that we have in the school with severe needs, most of whom have EHCPs for our size of school. The existing funding is insufficient to support the work of the Inclusion Team within the School.

- (l) SEN children in pre-school settings: funding should have the same funding as mainstream schools. 0.5% regarding High needs to allow them to go to special needs school, i.e. Russet House, Cheviots are always full and SEN children's needs are not met.

#### Response and recommendation

The comments received have been considered and the Authority would respond as follows:

- (i) Noted the inaccuracy detailed in the document and to confirm the Authority will be compiling with regulatory requirements, that is 95% of funding received for the early years block will be delegated to providers.
- (ii) In response to the comment that the Inclusion Fund Panel being overly 'conservative'; the data on the use of Inclusion Fund for each term has been reviewed. In summary, it was found, 75% of applications submitted in the summer term and 76% of the autumn term applications were agreed. Those not agreed were outside the published criteria and applicants were advised of the specific reason for declining the application. There appears to be a gradual increase in applications; this could be a combination of more providers and schools becoming aware of the funding, and the needs of the new cohort of children emerging as the term progresses.
- (iii) In response to the comment that setting/schools not knowing about the fund; the Inclusion Fund guidance and information is detailed on the Local Offer and the School Portal. In addition, information was sent via email to every school and setting, as well as presentations delivered this term to all school SENCOs at the SENCo Forum, and similarly to the PVI Early Years Forum.
- (iv) The request that the Inclusion funding supports settings beyond EP support by having additional Area SENCO: the Authority has noted this request and recognises that the benefit of increasing the number of Area SENCOs would enable settings to have a named point of contact for all SEND enquiries and advice with regard to specific children with SEND as opposed to generic inclusion advice to the setting.

#### Recommendation

It is proposed in light of the comments received that the initial proposal is revised from three to two EPs and the Area SENCOs (Early Years Practitioners) are increased from one to three. We believe the additional Area SENCOs would increase capacity, and by them acting as first point of contact and working alongside the Early Years Practitioners, EPS (with two additional EY EPs) and EISS teams, they would provide settings easier access to advice on next steps, appropriate targets and referrals, modelling strategies, in order to bring any training attended 'to life' and embed it and offer guidance on paperwork for Inclusion funding, EHCPs and DLA applications.

The Authority will work with settings to develop and provide appropriate induction and training within the available resources.



**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/18 REPORT NO. 18****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Education Resources Group  
30<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
Schools Forum  
13<sup>th</sup> December 2017

**REPORT of:**

Director of Finance, Resources & Customer  
Services

**Contact officer and telephone number:**

Louise McNamara 0208 379 4720

E-mail: [Louise.McNamara@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Louise.McNamara@enfield.gov.uk)

<b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>	<b>Item: 4c</b>
<b>Subject: Schools Budget: Update 2018-19</b>	

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The government funding settlement for 2018/19 is expected in mid to late December. A draft budget has been prepared based on initial projections of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and estimated pupil data; this is subject to the actual settlement and dataset in order to finalise allocations. Further reports will be presented to Schools Forum early in 2018 to agree the application of the DSG for 2018/19, including finalisation of the Schools Funding Formula.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Schools Forum is asked to note the draft budget position for the Schools Block and the High Needs Block for 2018/19 as summarised in Tables 3 and 4.
- 2.2 The Schools Forum is asked to agree the following recommendations:
- Sector representatives are asked to make a decision regarding the options for services that have previously been de-delegated as detailed in paragraph 7.
  - Forum is asked to agree the continuation of the growth fund for 2018/19 at a cost of £0.800m.
  - Forum is asked to agree a 0.5% transfer from the school's block to the high needs block to support the current arrangements for exceptional needs pupils in mainstream schools;
  - Forum is asked to agree an MFG disapplication request so that secondary schools becoming all through schools are not protected at the higher secondary rate.

**3. Schools Budget – Monitoring Position 2017/18**

The DSG budget monitoring position as at the end of October 2017 is detailed in a separate report and Appendix A. A summary of the position is shown in **Table 1** below and indicates a projected overspend of £4,505k.

**Table 1: Summary Monitoring Position 2017/18**

	£000
DSG Deficit Balance 01/04/17	1,903
1617 High Needs Contingency	-1,650
<b>TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE</b>	<b>253</b>
Schools Block	-227
High Needs Block	4,479
<b>TOTAL NET PRESSURES 17/18</b>	<b>4,252</b>
<b>NET MONITORING POSITION 17/18</b>	<b>4,505</b>

At this stage, it has been assumed that the Early Years Block will have a net balanced position. Further detailed work is being carried out by officers to confirm this position.

The monitoring position will continue to be closely monitored for the remainder of the financial year and updates will be present to the Forum at future meetings.

#### **4. Schools Budget 2018/19**

##### **4.1 Indicative DSG Allocation 2018/19**

As reported at the last meeting, the DSG settlement and datasets will not be announced until mid to late December, following which the funding formula and budget allocations will be reviewed and reported back to Schools Forum in January 2018. Indicative DSG funding allocations for 2018/19 were published by the EFA in September and are summarised in Table 1 below. This information indicated a net increase in funding of nearly £7m across the schools and high needs blocks.

**Table 1 – Indicative DSG Allocation 2018-19 (EFA Sept 2017)**

Blocks	Initial Allocation for 2017/18	Baseline for 2018/19	Transfer from High Needs for Planned Places	Revised for 2018/19	Indicative Allocation for 2018/19	Variance
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) = (b) + (c)	(e)	(e) - (d)
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Schools	254.467	248.363	0.457	248.820	254.350	5.531
High Needs	41.515	44.604	-0.457	44.147	45.641	1.494
Early Years *	24.662	24.662	-	24.662	24.662	-
CSSB	In Schools block	3.014	-	3.014	2.962	-0.053
Total	320.643	320.643	-	320.643	327.615	6.972

Draft data from the October 2017 census is now available and has been used to update these indicative allocations as shown in Table 3 below.

##### **4.2 Pupil Number Data**

**Table 2** shows the variance in pupil numbers between October 2015 and October 2017. The 2017 census data is estimated at this stage.

**Table 2: Pupil Number Data (Gross Census Nos)**

Sector	OCT 2015	OCT 2016	Variance	Estimate OCT 2017	Variance
PRIMARY	31,862	32,333	471	32,309	-24
SECONDARY	17,896	18,160	264	18,510	350
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>49,758</b>	<b>50,493</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>50,819</b>	<b>326</b>

The data indicates that whilst secondary numbers continue to increase, there has been an overall decrease in primary numbers.

Primary numbers in growing academies have increased by 282 between Oct 16 and Oct 17 but this increase is offset by a decrease of 306 pupils across other primary schools.

In secondary the increase in numbers largely relates to an increase of 309 for Heron Hall and Ark John Keats with the balance of 41 being the net increase across other secondary and all through schools.

The year on year change in numbers varies significantly between schools but for schools losing pupil numbers this will have a significant impact on the budget allocations for 2018-19.

#### 4.3 Schools Block

Based on the indicative pupil data from the October 2017 Census the Schools Block DSG Allocation has been estimated as shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Pupil Number Data (Gross Census Nos)**

Sector	Prim	Sec	TOTAL	Prim	Sec	TOTAL
Pupil Nos	32,333	18,160	50,493	32,309	18,510	50,819
Unit of Funding	4,416	5,647		4,416	5,647	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>142,792,443</b>	<b>102,550,697</b>	<b>245,343,140</b>	<b>142,686,451</b>	<b>104,527,170</b>	<b>247,213,621</b>
Premises, Growth & Mobility			9,007,339			9,007,359
<b>TOTAL Schools Block</b>			<b>254,350,479</b>			<b>256,220,960</b>
Growth Fund			800,000			800,000
0.5% to HNB			1,217,751			1,281,105
<b>TOTAL through Funding Formula</b>			<b>252,278,726</b>			<b>254,139,855</b>

The estimated 2018/19 Schools Block DSG funding is higher than the baseline information provided by the EFA due to an overall increase in numbers. It should be noted that the actual allocation for 2018/19 may vary due to

- Final validated Oct 17 Census Nos
- Confirmation of Primary and Secondary Units of Funding

Of the total Schools Block Allocation received

- £800,000 will be retained centrally for the ongoing requirements of the primary expansion programme
- 0.5%, equating to £1,281k, will be transferred to the High Needs Block to fund the additional £6ks for schools with a higher than average level of SEN pupils

The balance of funding will be allocated via the funding formula based on the chosen model following the outcome of the consultation exercise with schools. The model may have to be tweaked due to affordability and to fully utilise the funding available. Schools should note that their actual formula funding allocation for 2018-19 may vary from the consultation models due to

- Change in pupil nos between Oct 16 and Oct 17
- Variation in percentage of pupils attracting funding through other factors
- Final formula unit rates

Officers will be updating models with local data prior to the October 17 dataset being issued by the EFA in mid-December. It should be noted that the funding for rates and PFI shortfall is within the premises allocation which is based on historical costs. The 2018-19 allocations will be assessed as part of the budget setting process and may vary from the funding allocation.

#### **4.5 MFG Disapplication**

As in previous years we have applied to the EFA to disapply the MFG for secondary schools who are becoming all through schools. This is to prevent the primary element of the school funding being protected at the secondary funding level. The EFA provide a calculation template so that the methodology applied is consistent. We are awaiting the outcome of our application from the EFA but this is expected to be agreed.

#### **4.6 Growth Fund**

The estimated cost of funding pupil growth in 2018/19 based on the methodology previously agreed by School's Forum is £0.800m, which is a saving of £0.2m from 2017/18. This saving largely relates to primary school expansions programmes that have now been completed. Schools Forum are asked to agree to the continuation of the Growth Fund at this level for 2019/19.

### **5. High Needs Block**

#### **5.1 Indicative DSG Allocation 2018/19**

In September 2017, the EFA published an indicative High Needs Block allocation for 2018/19 of £45.641m. This allocation is based on new formulaic methodology based on pupil nos and other factors and replaces the previous method based on historic spend. This amount may change when the allocations for 2018/19 are confirmed in December.

High Needs expenditure for 2018/19 has been estimated based on current expenditure, new developments and ongoing pressures. A summary of the position is shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4 – Indicative High Needs Block 2018/19**

	2017/18		2018/19
	£000	£000	£000
Estimated HNB DSG	41,515		45,641
Trf from Schools Block	1,945		1,281
<b>TOTAL HN FUNDING</b>			<b>46,922</b>
Delegated HN Funding	24,608	1,143	25,752
Placement Funding	11,303	3,434	14,736
HN Contingency	1,665	-1,115	550
Commissioned & Central Services	5,884	0	5,884
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>43,460</b>	<b>3,462</b>	<b>46,922</b>
<b>Deficit Balance b/f</b>			<b>4,505</b>

### 5.2 Delegated High Needs Funding 2018/19

The increase in delegated high needs funding mainly relates to the development of additional in borough provision in 2018/19. The details of this additional provision is shown in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Additional In-Borough Provision 2018/19**

Special Provision	£000	Description
West Lea School	563	Addit 30 places wef Sept17
St Marys (Russet House)	300	Addit ASD provision – 7 places wef Feb18 increasing to 14 Sept18
Waverley Early Years Provision	58	Full Year Effect of new provision offering 24 addit places
Durants	100	Addit £1,000 per place to reflect increased need of pupils
Fern House (formerly Aylands)	100	Addit 4 places wef April 18
<b>TOTAL In-Borough Provision</b>	<b>1,121</b>	
ARP Funding	-478	Reduction in place funding to reflect the £4k that will now be allocated via formula funding
Exceptional Needs	400	Estimated increase in Top Up funding
PRU	100	Addit allocation to reflect in year admissions
<b>TOTAL Delegated HN Funding</b>	<b>1,143</b>	

### 5.3 Placement Funding

The estimate for placement funding for 2018/19 is based on current projections for 2017/18. It is expected that the number of pupils being placed in outborough schools and establishments will gradually reduce as additional in borough provision is developed over the next 2 to 3 years. The projected outturn position for the current year will continue to be closely monitored and the 2018/19 budgets will be revised if required.

The position regarding post 16 SEN learners is still being finalised as students continue to enrol over the autumn term and funding negotiations with local colleges continue. At this stage, it is assumed that costs will remain within current budget provision.

#### 5.4 Contingency

The general high needs contingency had been reduced to enable a balanced in year budget position for 2018/19. With a significantly reduced contingency there will be minimal additional funding to address any in year overspends. Once the contingency amount has been utilised, any deficit will add to accumulated deficit position.

#### 6. Central School Services Block

The Central Schools Services Block is a new block effective for 2018/19 and is detailed in a separate report.

#### 7. Services provided by the Local Authority from de-delegated budgets

Under the Schools and Early Years 2012 regulations, certain services can be provided centrally if the Schools Forum, on behalf of the maintained schools in a phase, gives agreement to the de-delegation of part of their budget to fund the service. This approval for de-delegation is required on an annual basis. It should be noted that academies are not required to agree to this process, but may buy back services from the Local Authority from their allocated budget share.

The Table of De-delegated Services below has been prepared on the same basis as previous years

**Table 6: De-delegated Services 2018-19**

Budget	Sector	Total Budget	Allocation per pupil / FSM *
		£	£
Licenses & Subs - CLEAPPS	Prim & Sec	6,098	0.12
Staff Advertising	Prim & Sec	15,246	0.30
Primary Pool	Primary	18,416	0.57
Union Duties	Prim & Sec	154,998	3.05
Free School Meals Eligibility	Prim & Sec	54,908	6.40
School Improvement Service	Primary	385,769	11.94

Budgets would be delegated on a per pupil basis except for the Free School Meal Eligibility assessment budget, which will be allocated on FSM eligibility. The per pupil allocations shown above are based on indicative data from the October 2017 census and will be revised once the DfE dataset has been received but the changes are expected to be minimal.

For each of these services there are various options for 2018/19 as follows

**Option 1** – Continue to delegate this funding and operate these services on a de-delegated basis

**Option 2** – Delegate this funding to schools and offer services on an SLA basis where this is appropriate

**Option 3** – Delegate funding to schools with no de-delegation/SLA

Please note that that 2 new areas of de-delegation are being proposed from the Central Schools Services Block and these are detailed in a separate report.

## **8. Early Years Block**

We are awaiting the outcome of the consultation exercise for the Early Years National Funding Formula and our own LA consultation exercise. An update on the position will be presented at the next meeting.

## **9. Other Schools Funding**

### **9.1 Pupil Premium**

The general Pupil Premium rates for 2018/19 have not been published by the DfE at this stage, other than to confirm that the amount for Looked After Children will increase by £400 to £2,300. We assume that Pupil Premium rates for Ever6, Service Children and Post LAC will be provided at the same unit rates as 2017/18. Over the last 3 years there has been a decrease in the overall level of funding provided through this grant and we are expecting this trend to continue in 2018/19, reflecting the year on year decrease in the percentage of pupils eligible for FSM.

### **9.2 Sixth Form Funding**

Funding arrangements for the 2018/19 academic year will be in line with 2017/18.

### **9.3 Other Grants**

It is expected that the following grants will continue in 2018/19 and further information is expected to be announced as part of the funding settlement in December 2017

- Primary PE & Sport Premium
- Universal Infant Free School Meals Funding
- School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant

## **10. Risks and Uncertainties**

The latest budget projections for 2018/19 and based on the latest information available at this time which includes raw October 2016 census data and assumptions regarding the level of DSG funding we will receive. This means that there are several risks and uncertainties surrounding the budget projections which could affect the final 2018/19 budget position. The risks and uncertainties include

- Increase in SEN outborough placement costs
- Final 2017/18 outturn position
- Final DSG settlement for 2018/19
- DfE dataset from October 2017 census

Updates on these issues will be included in future reports to the Forum as soon as information becomes available.

This page is intentionally left blank



**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018 REPORT NO. 19****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 13 December 2017

**REPORT OF:**

Executive Director of Children's Services

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

E mail: [sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)**Item: 4d****Subject:****Central Schools Services Block & Further De-delegation of Services for 2018/19****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1. This report provides information and planned use of new Central Schools Services block (CSSB).

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Forum is asked to approve the continuation of the services listed in Table 2.
- 2.2 The maintained schools Forum members are asked to consider and approve the de-delegated services listed in Table 3.

**3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 In previous years, the Schools Forum has been provided with information on the central services funded from the DSG and, as required, the Forum has been to either confirm or provide a view on the proposed use.

As part of the second phase of implementing the national funding formula (NFF), the DfE have confirmed the arrangements for central services.

- 3.2 For 2018/19, the DfE have confirmed that they are creating a new Central Schools Services block (CSSB), which brings together funding previously provided through the Education Services Grant (ESG) and the Schools block of the DSG for:

- the retained duties element of the ESG
- for ongoing central statutory functions, such as admissions
- for historic commitments

There is no funding provided for the general regulatory duties previously provided through the ESG for maintained schools. Going forward, these services have to be provided as de-delegated services.

Appendix A provides a summary of the statutory and regulatory duties.

- 3.3 Similar to the Schools block, the DfE used the planned spend in 2017/18 for central services to carry out a baseline exercise and introduce a national funding formula for to inform the CSSB. Going forward, the statutory duties element will be based on a national funding formula and the historic commitments on previous spend. Table 1 details the outcomes from the baseline exercise and also the indicative funding to be provided for 2017/18.

**Table 1: Funding for the CSSB**

Areas of Funding	Baseline for 2018/19	Indicative Allocation for 2018/19	Variance	Method for allocating funding
------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------

	£000s	£000s	£000s	
Statutory Duties	2,101.8	2049.0	-0.0528	NFF: based on pupil numbers and pupils from deprived backgrounds
Historical Commitments	912.6	912.6	0	Spend in 2017/18
Total	3,014.4	2,961.6	-0.0528	

#### 4. PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR 2018/19

- 4.1 With the creation of the new block and use of the NFF, there is considerable uncertainty regarding these changes, the Authority is proposing that the services previously funded be continue to be funding within the reduced available resources. The services the Authority is planning to fund from the CSSB are detailed in Table 2.

**Table 2: Planned Use of CSSB**

Areas of Funding	Baseline for 2018/19	Indicative Budget for 2018/19	Variance	Further Information
	£000s	£000s	£000s	
Education Welfare	385	385	-	Following a review of the services supported by this funding, savings have been identified by reducing funding provided for the Appeals Services and support to the Schools Forum.
Admissions	624	624	-	
Appeals	259	229	-30	
Central Licenses	226	226	-	
Management and support	518	504	-14	
Place Planning	90	90	-	
Prudential Borrowing	337	328	-9	Reduction in annual cost
Joint Services for Disabled Children	25	25	-	Detailed in Appendix B
HEART	39	39	-	Detailed in Appendix B
Out of School Activities	41	41	-	Detailed in Appendix B
Parenting Support Service	386	386	-	Detailed in Appendix B
Adolescent Support Service	84	84	-	Detailed in Appendix B

The Forum is asked to confirm the agreement to these services being continued to be funded.

- 4.2 As stated above there is no funding for general duties for maintained schools previously funding from the ESG. Some of the items previously supported for de-delegation are detailed in the Budget report. Following the cessation of the ESG, it has been noted even with the Authority supporting the areas previously supported by the grant, there now some gaps in provision that cannot be supported. These include supporting schools in difficulties, meeting requirements of the general landlord duties and no provision for a school redundancy fund.

The schools in difficulties could be related to both financial and premises issues. Previously, the maintained schools members agreed to a fund to support schools in financial difficulties and this provided to be an invaluable resource for the schools in this position. It enabled one school to move out of deficit because of the improvements the funding supported and another to see an increase in pupil numbers. It is requested funding is delegated to set up a similar fund and approval arrangements (copy attached at appendix B). De-delegation of £2.95 per pupil would provide £150k.

Another area where it is proposed funding is de-delegated is support maintained schools to meet the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) which come into effect on 25 May 2018. The GDPR is a mandatory requirement for all public sector bodies. The GDPR extends and seeks further safeguards, including a named Data Protection Officer (DPO), for the duties covered under the current Data Protection Act.

Officers have provided information to Headteachers and School Business Managers on the main requirements of the Act, but there is a concern that schools will not be in a position to fulfil the

requirements of the GDPR. Non-compliance of the requirements of the GDPR could lead to a fine of up to £17m. To ensure schools have arrangements in place, it is proposed to de-delegate £4.13 per pupil for 2018/19. This level of “per pupil” cost will enable a skilled DPO to be employed. As this is the first year of implementation, demand for skilled DPO familiar with the new requirements is very high. The funding would enable the Authority to employ skilled DPO to:

- Review compliance;
- Assistance with setup of requirements and revision of policy/privacy statements etc.
- Provide DPO advice and guidance to fulfil role required by Regulation
- Act as DPO liaison with school local data protection lead
- Acts DPO contact point for schools to the public and regulator
- Provide training and any information about changes supplied electronically as required.
- Assistance with data breach management (MUST be reported within 7 hours of discovery), which includes reporting to ICO within 72 hour timeline and informing persons who are affected by the breach.

The maintained schools Forum representatives are asked to consider and agree to de-delegating funding for services listed in Table 3:

**Table 3: New Services for De-delegation**

Areas of Funding	Sector	Total Budget	Amount per pupil
		£	£
Support for schools in difficulties	Prim & Sec	150,000	2.95
GDPR	Prim & Sec	210,000	4.13

Statutory and regulatory duties

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>Director of children's services and personal staff for director (Sch 2, 15a)</p> <p>Planning for the education service as a whole (Sch 2, 15b)</p> <p>Revenue budget preparation, preparation of information on income and expenditure relating to education, and external audit relating to education (Sch 2, 22)</p> <p>Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure not met from schools' budget shares (Sch 2, 15c)</p> <p>Formulation and review of local authority schools funding formula (Sch 2, 15d)</p> <p>Internal audit and other tasks related to the authority's chief finance officer's responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 except duties specifically related to maintained schools (Sch 2, 15e)</p> <p>Consultation costs relating to non-staffing issues (Sch 2, 19)</p> <p>Plans involving collaboration with other LA services or public or voluntary bodies (Sch 2, 15f)</p> <p>Standing Advisory Committees for Religious Education (SACREs) (Sch 2, 17)</p> <p>Provision of information to or at the request of the Crown other than relating specifically to maintained schools (Sch 2, 21)</p>	<p>Functions of LA related to best value and provision of advice to governing bodies in procuring goods and services (Sch 2, 56)</p> <p>Budgeting and accounting functions relating to maintained schools (Sch 2, 73)</p> <p>Functions relating to the financing of maintained schools (Sch 2, 58)</p> <p>Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets, and related financial administration (Sch 2, 57)</p> <p>Monitoring of compliance with requirements in relation to the scheme for financing schools and the provision of community facilities by governing bodies (Sch 2, 58)</p> <p>Internal audit and other tasks related to the authority's chief finance officer's responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 for maintained schools (Sch 2, 59)</p> <p>Functions made under Section 44 of the 2002 Act (Consistent Financial Reporting) (Sch 2, 60)</p> <p>Investigations of employees or potential employees, with or without remuneration to work at or for schools under the direct management of the headteacher or governing body (Sch 2, 61)</p> <p>Functions related to local government pensions and administration of teachers' pensions in relation to staff working at maintained schools under the direct management of the headteacher or governing body (Sch 2, 62)</p> <p>Retrospective membership of pension schemes where it would not be appropriate to expect a school to meet the cost (Sch 2, 75)</p> <p>HR duties, including: advice to schools on the management of staff, pay alterations, conditions of service and composition or organisation of staff (Sch 2, 63); determination of conditions of service for non-teaching staff (Sch 2, 64); appointment or dismissal of employee functions (Sch 2, 65)</p> <p>Consultation costs relating to staffing (Sch 2, 66)</p> <p>Compliance with duties under Health and Safety at Work Act (Sch 2, 67)</p> <p>Provision of information to or at the request of the Crown relating to schools (Sch 2, 68)</p> <p>School companies (Sch 2, 69)</p> <p>Functions under the Equality Act 2010 (Sch 2, 70)</p> <p>Establish and maintaining computer systems, including data storage (Sch 2, 71)</p> <p>Appointment of governors and payment of governor expenses (Sch 2, 72)</p>

## Education welfare

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>Functions in relation to the exclusion of pupils from schools, excluding any provision of education to excluded pupils (Sch 2, 20)</p> <p>School attendance (Sch 2, 16)</p> <p>Responsibilities regarding the employment of children (Sch 2, 18)</p>	<p>Inspection of attendance registers (Sch 2, 78)</p>

## Asset management

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>Management of the LA's capital programme including preparation and review of an asset management plan, and negotiation and management of private finance transactions (Sch 2, 14a)</p> <p>General landlord duties for all buildings owned by the local authority, including those leased to academies (Sch 2, 14b)</p>	<p>General landlord duties for all maintained schools (Sch 2, 76a &amp; b (section 542(2)) Education Act 1996; School Premises Regulations 2012) to ensure that school buildings have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>appropriate facilities for pupils and staff (including medical and accommodation)</li> <li>the ability to sustain appropriate loads</li> <li>reasonable weather resistance</li> <li>safe escape routes</li> <li>appropriate acoustic levels</li> <li>lighting, heating and ventilation which meets the required standards</li> <li>adequate water supplies and drainage</li> <li>playing fields of the appropriate standards</li> </ul> <p>General health and safety duty as an employer for employees and others who may be affected (Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974)</p> <p>Management of the risk from asbestos in community school buildings (Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012)</p>

## Central support services

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>No functions</p>	<p>Clothing grants (Sch 2, 52)</p> <p>Provision of tuition in music, or on other music-related activities (Sch 2, 53)</p> <p>Visual, creative and performing arts (Sch 2, 54)</p> <p>Outdoor education centres (but not centres mainly for the provision of organised games, swimming or athletics) (Sch 2, 55)</p>

## Premature retirement and redundancy

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>No functions</p>	<p>Dismissal or premature retirement when costs cannot be charged to maintained schools (Sch 2, 77)</p>

### Monitoring national curriculum assessment

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
No functions	Monitoring of National Curriculum assessments (Sch 2, 74)

### Therapies

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
No functions	This is now covered in the high needs section of the regulations and does not require schools forum approval

### Other ongoing duties

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>Licences negotiated centrally by the Secretary of State for all publicly funded schools (Sch 2, 8); this does not require schools forum approval</p> <p>Admissions (Sch 2, 9)</p> <p>Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils (Sch 2, 10)</p> <p>Remission of boarding fees at maintained schools and academies (Sch 2, 11)</p> <p>Servicing of schools forums (Sch 2, 12)</p> <p>Back-pay for equal pay claims (Sch 2, 13)</p> <p>Writing to parents of year 9 pupils about schools with an atypical age of admission, such as UTCs and studio schools, within a reasonable travelling distance (new addition to CSSB, to be included in 2018 to 2019 regulations)<sup>1</sup></p>	No functions

### Historic commitments

Responsibilities held for all schools	Responsibilities held for maintained schools only
<p>Capital expenditure funded from revenue (Sch 2, 1)</p> <p>Prudential borrowing costs (Sch 2, 2(a))</p> <p>Termination of employment costs (Sch 2, 2(b))</p> <p>Contribution to combined budgets (Sch 2, 2(c))</p>	No functions

## **Schools Forum – Schools in Financial Difficulties Panel**

This paper outlines the process in respect of decisions by the Schools Forum Panel to support schools in financial difficulties.

### 1. Introduction

The school funding regulations enable maintained schools representatives of the Schools Forum to agree to de-delegate funding to support schools in financial difficulties due to a significant drop in pupil numbers.

The Schools Forum schools representatives agreed:

- to de-delegating funding to support schools in financial difficulties
- that the allocation be based on a business case submitted by the school seeking support
- that the business case be considered by a Panel of Schools Forum schools representatives
- that the decision of the Panel be reported back to the Schools Forum

It was also agreed that there should be an appeals process for schools where they did not agree with the decision of the Panel.

This paper outlines the arrangements for the initial decision Panel and then the Appeal Panel to hear the school's case.

### 2. The Panel

The Panel will comprise at least three representatives from the Schools Forum.

The Panel will consist of the following representatives either:

- one / two Headteacher from the primary / secondary sector
- one / two Governor from the primary / secondary sector
- Assistant Director, Education

No member of the Schools Forum who has any connection with any of the schools seeking financial support may sit on the Panel.

### 3. The Appeal Hearing

Following monitoring meetings with the Local Authority, schools seeking financial support will be invited to submit a business case for financial support.

The business case will provide information, where appropriate actual for previous years and forecast for future years:

- pupil numbers
- budgetary position
- staffing pressures
- requirements in the delivery of the curriculum
- requirements related to Ofsted judgments
- issues related to the building or other assets, e.g. ICT
- links with feeder schools to support transition
- what financial support is required
- how the financial support will be used
- what outcomes are anticipated from the support

If further information is required, the Panel may contact the school and request this.

The administrator to the Panel will send confirmation of the date, time and venue of the Panel hearing to the school. The administrator will also confirm arrangements for submission of written information to the Panel.

The Headteacher and one Governor from the school will attend the Panel hearing to put their case in person.

The administrator will be responsible for notifying the decision of the Panel.

4. The Role of the Panel

The Panel's role is to consider the Business Case submitted by the School seeking financial support.

The Panel will need to consider whether:

- the financial difficulties experienced by the school
- are due to a significant drop in roll
- the one-off support requested will help the school to resolve the immediate issues related to the financial difficulties.

5. The Panel's Decision

The Panel will consider the request for financial support submitted by the school and inform all parties of their decision and the reason for their decision as soon after the meeting as possible.

If the school disagrees with the Panel's decision, then the school may appeal.

6. The Appeal Panel

The Panel will comprise at least three representatives from the Schools Forum who were not involved in the original decision.

The Panel will consist of the following representatives:

- one Headteacher from the primary / secondary sector
- one Governors from the primary / secondary sector
- Assistant Director, Schools and Children's Services

7. The Role of the Appeal Panel

The Appeal Panel will consider each school's specific grounds for appeal. In doing so they will consider whether:

- the procedure followed by the Panel in deciding not to provide financial support was in line with the arrangements outlined in paragraph 4 above;
- the decision not to support the school will have an unavoidable and adverse impact on the quality of education provided to the pupils.

8. The Appeal Panel's Decision

The Panel will consider the grounds for appeal submitted by the school and inform all parties of their decision and the reason for their decision as soon after the appeal hearing as possible.

The Panel's decision is final.



**Schools in Financial Difficulties**

<b>School Name</b>																																								
<b>Area of Consideration</b>	<b>Response</b>																																							
<b>Brief introduction</b>																																								
<b>Pupil Numbers: Data (actuals &amp; projections) and any known reasons for the change.</b>	<p><b><u>Data:</u></b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Year Group</b></th> <th><b>Actual Pupil Numbers 2013/2014</b></th> <th><b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2014/2015</b></th> <th><b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2015/2016</b></th> <th><b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2016/2017</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><b>TOTAL</b></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><u>Known reasons for drop in pupil numbers:</u></b></p>					<b>Year Group</b>	<b>Actual Pupil Numbers 2013/2014</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2014/2015</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2015/2016</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2016/2017</b>																										<b>TOTAL</b>				
<b>Year Group</b>	<b>Actual Pupil Numbers 2013/2014</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2014/2015</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2015/2016</b>	<b>Projected Pupil Numbers 2016/2017</b>																																				
<b>TOTAL</b>																																								
<b>Please detail the impact of the reduction in pupil numbers and the changes that have had to be implemented to as a result.</b>																																								
<b>Staffing pressures</b>																																								
<b>Requirements for the delivery of the curriculum</b>																																								

<b>School Name</b>	
<b>Area of Consideration</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Meeting Ofsted or other statutory / regulatory requirements</b>	
<b>Transition</b>	<b>Detail the work being done with feeder schools to increase number of pupils on roll</b>
<b>For what purpose is the financial support required?</b>	
<b>How much one-off funding is required?</b>	
<b>What are the expected outcomes from the financial support?</b>	
<b>Any other comments</b>	

Completed by: .....

Approved by:

Headteacher .....

Chair of Governors .....

**Report No 20****Eligibility for Free School Meals & the EY Pupil Premium under Universal Credit**

1. The DfE have published a consultation document outlining their arrangements for calculating eligibility for free school meals & the early years pupil premium with the roll out of Universal Credit. It is proposed to implement these arrangements from April 2018. The link to the consultation document is as follows:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/eligibility-for-free-school-meals-and-the-early-years-pupil-premium-under-universal-credit>.
2. The Government is proposing to change the criteria for qualifying from measuring against a basket of measures to net earnings threshold. They have further confirmed that their proposals do not include:
  - Universal infant free school meals;
  - Free school meals criteria for children whose parents receive support provided under Part 6 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 or the guarantee element of Pension Credit
  - Disadvantaged two-year-olds. There will be a separate consultation for this.
3. The current benefits used to assess free school meals eligibility include:
  - Income Support;
  - Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance
  - Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
  - Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
  - The guaranteed element of Pension Credit
  - Child Tax Credit, provided they are not also entitled to Working Tax Credit and have an annual gross income of no more than £16,190
  - Working Tax Credit run-on – paid for four weeks after they stop qualifying for Working Tax Credit
  - Universal Credit (regardless of income amount, as a temporary measure during the early stages of rollout).
4. It is proposed that a net earnings threshold of £7,400 per annum for a household's eligibility for free school meals will be applied.
5. Data for single parents and couples with one or two children claiming housing benefit was assessed and Table 1 below details the findings.

Earnings		Benefits				
From	To	Working Tax Credit	Child Tax Credit	Both	Total	%
£	£	Number	Number	Number	No	%
7,400	16,190	3,400	520	2558	6,478	57%
0	7,400	3,952	968		4,920	43%
		7,352	1,488	2558	11,398	

These proposals have been assessed and a draft response to the consultation document is detailed below.

---

**Q1 Do you agree with our proposed net earnings threshold to determine eligibility for free school meals and the early years pupil premium under Universal Credit?**

**Response: Don't agree**

We believe the income threshold should be in line with the national living wage and enable single parents and couples to be able to work up to 36 hours. Our reasons for the proposed threshold have outlined our reasons below.

The current arrangements of using the basket of measures for assessing eligibility are flawed. This is because of:

- the cliff edge created by the current system and
- the inclusion of the criteria of excluding parents of pupils entitled to Working Tax Credit with an annual gross income of no more than £16,190 to support the Welfare Benefit reforms. Using the current FSM measure as used in the funding formula for mainstream schools, this inclusion saw the number of pupils eligible for free school meals drop from 28.9% of the pupil population in 2011 to 19.9%. This reduction in the number of pupils eligible for FSM can now be seen in the funding provided through the Pupil Premium.

Assuming the current percentage of claimants remains a constant, the proposal to move to earning thresholds of £7,400 will see:

- 5% of the claimants receiving child tax credit and earning between £7,400 and £16,190 whose children are currently eligible for FSM will no longer be eligible;
- 30% of claimants receiving working tax credit will find their children continue not to be eligible for FSM;
- Over 21s could only work up to 18 hours at the national living wage, in order for the child(ren) to be eligible free school meals;

In addition, the proposed threshold does not factor in the higher living costs in London. Current experience of the benefit changes has seen families and their children having to wait six (five from April) weeks before their assessment have been confirmed. As a consequent of this the Trussell Trust has reported that 65% of their foodbanks have seen an increase in the number of people needing help from foodbanks during this six weeks waiting period, with 27% of foodbanks said this increase was significant. This has had a direct impact for the children of these families.

This is before the debt families are incurring because they do not have the funds to pay their rent. The Association of retained council housing (ARCH) and National Federation of ALMOs have reported that nearly three quarters of UC household tenants (73%) were in arrears. In London area, this was slightly higher at 78% and had average arrears of £1032.17.

If the Government's aim is to narrow the educational achievement gap between rich and poor pupils, then it is unclear how the current proposal will support this aim. There is considerable evidence from research carried out pupils need to have been fed, if they are to remain focussed and achieve their educational outcomes. The threshold used should consider all pupils from deprived background and not just those pupils absolute poverty.

For these reason, we believe as a minimum the earnings threshold should be set at an individual being able to work at least 36 hours on the national minimum wage.

- Q2 Do you agree with our intention to protect those pupils who would otherwise lose their entitlement to free school meals, and those children who would otherwise lose their entitlement to the early years pupil premium, under the new eligibility criteria?

**Response: Agree, but the protection should be up to Year 11 for pupils.**

- Q3 Do you feel that the proposals in this consultation may adversely affect any children who share one or more of the relevant protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act 2010?

**Response: Yes, we are concerned that they will adverse effect our children and young people.**

The equality impact assessment states that pupils with a special educational need or disability (SEND) are more likely to be in receipt of free school meals, with 26.8% claiming compared to 13.9% of those without SEND and households from particular ethnic groups are likely to have income below the national median household income of £15,800. With the low threshold set for FSM eligibility, there is a assumption that the child(ren) of these families will be able to access FSM. We believe unless parents work less than 18 hours this will not be the case. Therefore, these proposals do have an impact on pupils from deprived backgrounds to reach their full potential.

- Q4 Do you have any views on the proposed management of the changes to the disadvantage measures or on the metrics we publish for the measurement of disadvantaged pupils' performance?

We feel that the proposed threshold of £7,400 will mask and not truly reflect performance of all pupils from disadvantage backgrounds. It will exclude a significant number of pupils who are also living in deprivation rather than absolute poverty. The inclusion of some pupils as part of the transitional arrangements will not be sufficient when comparing the performance of pupils from deprived backgrounds against their peers.

As a key performance measure, it is unclear how the caveats can possible explain the impact on school performance. This change is likely to have the same effect on performance and funding as the 2015 update of the IDACI measure. The concern with this change is that it is used widely for assessing school performance on supporting pupils from a deprived background, but schools will not receive sufficient funding to support all pupils from a deprived background to achieve their potential.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018 – REPORT NO. 21****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 13 December 2017

**REPORT OF:**

Executive Director of Children's Services

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

E-mail: [sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)**Recommendation**

To note the workplan.

<b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>	<b>Item: 6</b>
<b>Subject:</b> <b>Schools Forum: Workplan</b>	
<b>Wards: All</b>	

<b><u>Meetings</u></b>		<b><u>Officer</u></b>
March 2017	School Budget 2017/18: Update SEND & High Needs – Update School Academy Transfers – Contribution towards Costs Scheme for Financing Schools & High Needs NFF - Draft Response	LM JC SB SB SB
June 2017	School Budget 2016/17 Outturn: Update Pupils with High needs in Mainstream Schools Dedicated Schools Grant – 2017/18: Analysis Schools Balances – Update	LM SB SB SB
September 2017	School Balances – 2016/17: Update Schools Budget: 2017/18 – Monitoring High Needs Review: Update School Funding Arrangements (2018/19) Annual Audit – Update	SB SB SB SB JC
November 2017	Schools Budget – Update (2017/18) School Funding Arrangements (2018/19)	LM SB
December 2017	Schools Budget: 2018/19: Update, Inc. De-delegation School Funding Arrangements (2018/19) Central Services Budgets	LM SB JC
January 2018	Schools Budget: 2018/19: Update School Funding Arrangements Central Services Schools Block DfE Consultation: Eligibility for FSM under Universal Credit	LM SB SB SB
March 2018	Schools Budget: 2018/19: Update High Needs Places	LM SB
May / June 2018	Single Item Agenda - TBC	
July 2018	Schools Budget – Update (2017/18) School Funding Review (2017/18) Funding Arrangements (2019/20)	LM SB SB

**Dates of Meetings**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Comment</b>
15 September 2017	2.00 - 3.00PM	Chace Community	With B Charalambous, MP
20 September 2017	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
06 November 2017	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
13 December 2017	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
17 January 2018	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
07 March 2018	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
09 May 2018	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	
11 July 2018	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community	

This page is intentionally left blank