



Contact: Sangeeta Brown  
Resources Development Manager  
Direct: 020 8379 3109  
Mobile: 07956 539613  
e-mail: sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

## THE SCHOOLS FORUM

Wednesday, 6th October, 2021 at 5.30 pm : Virtual / Microsoft  
Teams Meeting

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP** (Pages 1 - 4)

Agenda cover sheet (*attached*)

- (a) Apologies for absence
- (b) Membership

**2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relating to items on the agenda.

**3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** (Pages 5 - 12)

- (a) School Forum meetings held on 14 July 2021 (*attached*)
- (b) Matters arising from these minutes.

**4. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION** (Pages 13 - 26)

- (a) DSG Budget Monitoring Report 2021/22 (*attached*)
- (b) School Funding Arrangements & Areas of Review 2022/23 (*attached*)

**5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION** (Pages 27 - 32)

- (a) Response to DfE Consultation: Fair school funding for all: completing our reforms to the National Funding Formula (*attached*)

**6. WORKPLAN** (Pages 33 - 34)

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS**

(a) Date of next meeting is Wednesday 19 January 2022 at 5.30pm.

The Forum are asked to confirm if this meeting should be held virtually or in person.

(b) Dates of future meetings are detailed below.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>
09/03/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
11/05/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
06/07/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
05/10/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
07/12/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC

**9. CONFIDENTIALITY**

To consider which items should be treated as confidential.

# SCHOOLS FORUM

Meeting to be held from **17:30** on **Wednesday 6 October 2021**

**Microsoft Teams Virtual Meeting**

---

## Schools Members:

Governors: Mr J Ellis (Primary), Mr T Hellings (Primary), Ms H Kacouris (Primary), Ms C Davies (Special), Mr J Donnelly (Secondary),  
 Headteachers: Ms K Baptiste (Primary), Ms N Husband (Primary), Mr D Smart (Primary), Ms T Day (Secondary), Ms M O'Keeffe (Secondary), Ms G Taylor (Special), Ms C Fay (Pupil Referral Unit)  
 Academies: Ms H Thomas (Chair), Ms S Ellingham, Mr M Lewis, Ms A Nicou, Ms Z Thompson, Ms K Turnpenney

---

## Non-Schools Members:

16 - 19 Partnership	Mr K Hintz
Early Years Provider	Ms A Palmer
Teachers' Committee	Mr T Cuffaro
Education Professional	Mr A Johnson
Head of Admissions	Ms J Fear
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Cllr S Erbil

---

## Observers:

Cabinet Member	Cllr M Uddin
School Business Manager	Ms S Mahesh/Ms E Campbell
Education & Skills Funding Agency	Mr G Nicolini

---

**MEMBERS ARE ASKED TO TRY AND JOIN THE MEETING FROM 17:20.**

**THIS WILL ALLOW TIME TO RESOLVE ANY CONNECTION DIFFICULTIES THAT MAY ARISE IN JOINING THIS MEETING AND ENABLE A PROMPT START AT 17:30**

## AGENDA

(Target time)

(17:30)

**Mr Peter Nathan will start and chair the meeting until the election of the Chair**

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

### **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.

(17:35)

### **3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

- (a) School Forum meetings held on 14 July 2021 (*attached*)
- (b) Matters arising from these minutes.

(17:45)

### **4. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION**

- (a) DSG Budget Monitoring Report 2021/22 (*attached*)
- (b) School Funding Arrangements & Areas of Review 2022/23 (*attached*)

(18:30)

### **5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- (a) Response to DfE Consultation: Fair school funding for all: completing our reforms to the National Funding Formula (attached)

(18:35)

**6. WORKPLAN** (attached)

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS**

- (a) Date of next meeting is Wednesday 19 January 2022 at 5.30pm.

The Forum are asked to confirm if this meeting should be held virtually or in person.

- (b) Dates of future meetings are detailed below.

Date	Time	Venue
09/03/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
11/05/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
06/07/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
05/10/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
07/12/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC

**9. CONFIDENTIALITY**

To consider which items should be treated as confidential.

## Schools Forum Membership List

Name		Sector	Organisation	Member / Sub Since	End of Term
Ms H Kacouris	G	P	St Andrew's Southgate	Autumn 2017	Autumn 2021
Mr J Ellis	G	P	George Spicer	Autumn 2019	Summer 2023
Mr T Hellings	G	P	Tottenham Infant	Spring 2020	Summer 2024
Ms C Davies	G	Sp	Russet House	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Mr J Donnelly	G	S	St Ignatius	Spring 2019	Summer 2023
Ms C Fay	H	PRU	Orchardside	Required	
Mr D Smart	G	P	De Bohun	Autumn 2019	Summer 2023
Ms N Husband	G	P	Firs Farm	Autumn 2019	Summer 2023
Ms K Baptiste	H	P	St Monica's	Autumn 2017	Autumn 2021
Ms T Day	H	S	Bishop Stopford's	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Ms M O'Keeffe	H	S	St Ignatius	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Ms G Taylor	H	Sp	Russet House	Autumn 2020	Summer 2024
Ms H Thomas	H	A	Alma - Attigo	Autumn 2018	Summer 2022
Ms K Turnpenney	H	A	Wilbury - Children First	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Ms A Nicou	CFO	A	Enfield Learning Trust	Autumn 2019	Summer 2023
Ms Z Thompson	H	A	Oasis Hadley	Summer 2020	Summer 2024
Ms S Ellingham	CFO	A	Cuckoo Hall Academy Trust	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Mr M Lewis	CFO	A	Wren Academy	Spring 2021	Autumn 2024
Ms A Palmer		EY	Right Start Montessori	Autumn 2017	Summer 2021
Mr K Hintz		P16	CONEL	Autumn 2015	Summer 2019
Mr T Cuffaro		All	Union	Summer 2017	Spring 2024
Ms J Fear		All	Local Authority	By Appointment	
Ms A Johnson		All	Local Authority	By Appointment	
Clr S Erbil		All	Chair of Overview & Scrutiny	By Appointment	
Clr Uddin	O	All	Cabinet Member	By Appointment	
Ms S Mahesh	O	All	School Business Manager	Nominated	
Mr G Nicolini	O	All	EFSA	By Appointment	

### **Key**

G – Governor  
 H – Headteacher  
 O - Observer  
 P – Primary  
 S – Secondary  
 Sp – Special  
 Ac – Academy  
 EY – Early Years  
 P16 – Post 16

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING**  
**Held on Wednesday, 14 July at 17:30 on Microsoft Teams**

**Schools' Members**

**Governors:**

Mr J Ellis	Primary
<i>Mr T Hellings *</i>	Primary
Ms H Kacouris	Primary
Ms C Davies *	Special
Mr J Donnelly	Secondary

**Headteachers**

Ms T Day	Secondary
Ms K Baptiste	Primary
Ms C Fay	Pupil Referral Unit
<i>Ms N Husband*</i>	Primary
Ms M O'Keeffe	Secondary
Mr D Smart	Primary
Ms G Taylor	Special

**Academies:**

Ms H Thomas (Chair)  
 Ms S Ellingham  
 Mr M Lewis  
 Ms A Nicou  
 Ms Z Thompson  
 Ms K Turnpenney \*

**Non-School Members**

Mr K Hintz	16-19 Partnership
Ms A Palmer *	Early Years Provider
Mr T Cuffaro	Teachers' Committee
Mr A Johnson *	Education Professional
Ms J Fear	Head of Admissions
Cllr S Erbil *	Overview & Scrutiny Committee
<b>Observers</b>	
Cllr M Uddin *	Cabinet Member
Mr G Nicolini *	Education & Skills Funding Agency

**Also present:**

Mr P Nathan, Director of Education  
 Mr N Goddard, Head of Budget Challenge  
 Mrs L McNamara, Finance Manager  
 Mrs S Brown, Education Resources Manager  
 Mr N Best, Head of Education Strategic Resourcing and Partnerships  
 Mr A Farmiloe, Clerk

**Clerk's Notes**

Mr Lewis arrived at 17:34  
 Ms Ellingham arrived at 17:36  
 Ms Taylor arrived at 17:40  
 Ms Thompson arrived at 17:44  
 Mr Hintz left at 17:21  
 Ms Thompson left at 18:53  
 John Ellis left at 18:54  
 Mr Smart left at 18:57

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP**

(a) Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Hellings, Ms Husband, Ms Turnpenney Cllr Uddin and Mr Johnson.

Noted the absence of Ms Dawes, Cllr Erbil and Ms Palmer.

(b) Membership

**REPORTED** Ms Baptiste and Ms Kacouris terms of office were due to finish at the end of the Autumn term 2021 and both were primary school representatives. Due to the change in pupil numbers, this would leave one vacancy for a primary school representative and another for an academy representative. The Forum was asked to consider whether the primary vacancy should be filled with a governor or headteacher.

The Forum considered if it was acceptable, then it might be helpful to fill the vacancy with a primary Headteacher. Ms Kacouris stated that she was happy to step down and enable either Ms Baptiste or another headteacher to be a member of the Forum.

Ms Baptiste confirmed that she was happy to continue to be a member of the Forum.

**RESOLVED** that Ms Baptiste remain on the Schools Forum as a primary representative and the Enfield Primary Headteachers' Association be advised accordingly.

**ACTION: MRS BROWN & MR SMART**

2. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to identify any personal or prejudicial interests relevant to items on the agenda. No declarations were received.

3. **MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**RECEIVED** the Minutes of the School Forum meeting held on 12 May 2021.

**NOTED** that:

- (a) the Minutes were a correct record of the meeting.
- (b) there were no matters arising from the Minutes which were not addressed in items on the Agenda.

4. **ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION**

(a) DSG Budget Outturn Report 2020/21

This item was presented by Ms McNamara.

**RECEIVED** the DSG Budget Outturn Report 2020/21.

**REPORTED** that the report detailed the final position of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the year ending 31 March 2021. The cumulative deficit balance brought forward into 2020/21 was £4.5m.

The DSG budget was monitored on a monthly basis and variances were presented to the Forum. The final position was an overall deficit of £8.05m and with the post year-end adjustments expected to rise to £9m. The adjustments related to funds recouped from a primary school for an advance payment. In addition, possible recoupment from the Early Years block for the low take of nursery provision because of the Covid pandemic.

**NOTED**

- (i) Other variances included an increase in spend in the latter part of the year to support exceptional needs in mainstream schools and Post 16 High Needs
- (ii) The Forum was advised that expenditure on High Needs was expected to increase in the short term and the cumulative deficit may reach £12 million by the end of 2021/22, however with the interventions being put in place, the expectation was that expenditure should reduce thereafter. The budget will continue to be monitored.
- (iii) In reply to a **question**, it was agreed that quarterly variance columns would be included in the information presented.

**ACTION: MRS MCNAMARA**



(b) School Balances 2020/21

**RECEIVED** the Maintained School Balances 2020.

**REPORTED** that

(i) School balances

The total balances held by schools as at 31 March 2021 was **-£242k** (including community facilities). The balances held by secondary increased by £2.248m, primary by £0.358m and special schools by £0.396m. The report included information on the net movement of balances between 2019/20 and 2020/21 across the three sectors and other data analysis.

**NOTED**

- A. All sectors had seen an increase in balances with secondary schools seeing the biggest in-year increase with the deficit reducing from **-£7.102m** to **-£4.795m** at year-end with the range of balances narrowing.
- B. A number of factors were responsible for the change in balances including the impact of the pandemic and the move to online lessons.
- C. The threshold for primary and special schools to submit a request to retain balances had been reduced from 8% in 2019/20 to 6.5% for 2020/21. The number of schools reporting a surplus above 6.5% had increased.
- D. Two primary and one special school had submitted a request to retain surplus balances in the spring term. The returns at year end from the remaining six schools were discussed with the Education Resources Group and it was recommended that the surplus balances should not be recycled from these schools with the exception of one school. It was recommended an underspend of £56k reported by West Lea school for the Home and Hospital Service be clawed back because the School was commissioned to deliver this service.

**RESOLVED** to note and approve recycling of the £56k of surplus balance from West Lea for the Home and Hospital Service.

**ACTION: MRS MCNAMARA**

- E The Forum was reminded that the threshold for primary and special schools to submit a request to retain balances would further reduce to 5% for 2021/22.

The Forum noted the deficit reported as part of the outturn for 2020/21.

(ii) Schools in deficit**NOTED**

- A. The number of schools reporting a deficit had reduced from 16 in 2019/20 to 13 in 2020/21. For 2021/22, 13 schools were reporting a deficit and a number of others predicting a deficit in year 2 or 3 in their 3 year budget plans.
- B. The LA was continuing to follow the process agreed regarding schools in deficit. As well as the update in the report, the Forum was advised that a key element was the training programme devised and detailed in the report to support schools. It was requested to consider whether Headteachers, Chairs of Governors, Chairs of Resources and School Business Managers be required to attend.

**RESOLVED** that the Schools Forum maintained schools representatives supported the proposal that all maintained schools be expected to attend if not all, then must attend the three year budget planning, benchmarking tool and interactive tool training sessions.

**ACTION: MRS BROWN & MAINTAINED SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES**

(iii) Pupil numbers

**REPORTED**

- A. The October 2020 Census confirmed the continuing decline in overall pupil numbers. The reduction in primary school numbers was notable in the years 2019 and 2020. It was a concern that the reduction in primary pupil numbers would in due course impact the secondary numbers.
- B. There were probably a number of factors for this change including the effect of welfare benefit reforms and departing from the European Union among others. In discussion, the following **questions** and comments were made:

**NOTED**

- To manage the change some schools were reducing their PAN;
- It was commented schools with fall in pupil numbers should manage the change and not incur an increasingly large deficit year on year;
- It was stated that further information would be provided to show the change in pupil numbers across the various year groups;
- The reasons for the reduction in pupil numbers was not entirely clear but could include a reduction in the birth rate, impact of departing from the European union and families leaving London. Further analysis of the School Census would be carried out;
- The rate of reduction in pupil numbers for Reception for London was 6-7% whereas for Enfield the figure was 12%. This change was likely to impact upon secondary pupil numbers possibly in two - three years' time;  
Other local factors, which could result in variances included local housing development that might actually result in increased "child yield";
- Pupil numbers were likely to vary from school to school with one school having rising numbers and another in the same locality experiencing a reduction for any number of reasons;
- The Admission and Pupil Planning Board had been set up to work collaboratively with headteachers on pupil numbers; the aim was to be open and transparent.

The Forum noted the update on schools balances.

(c) School Funding Arrangements 2022/23

**RECEIVED** the School Funding Arrangements Report 2022/23.

**REPORTED** the update and proposals outlined in the report were likely to be affected from 2023/24 following the result of the recent Consultation referred to later. The DfE had confirmed for 2022/23 no significant change was expected. The updates included:

(i) Pupils in Mainstream Schools with EHCPs

**REPORTED** for 2021/22, following consultation with schools and approval by Schools Forum, 0.5% (£1.367m) was transferred from the Schools to the High Needs Block. This money was used to allocate funding for element 2 (£6ks) to eligible schools up to the total amount of the transfer. It was recommended that until the outcomes from the SEND Reforms and Call for Evidence were published that the 0.5% continue to be transferred.

The Forum's views were being sought as to whether to consult on the transfer of 0.5% from Schools to High Needs block for 2022/23.

**NOTED**

- A. It was commented until there was clarity the current arrangements be maintained.

- B. In response to a **question**, it was stated that it was perceived there was unfairness in the system for funding high needs. The allocation of funding varied within London and between local authorities nationally.
- C. The LA had developed a local Funding Calculator, which should reflect actual costs and enable adjustments to reflect any changes to be made, such as hourly pay rates. Due to low number of EHCPs received from the pilot schools, the Local Authority's was recommending the pilot be extended to the other schools and a review be carried out later in the Autumn / early Spring term.

**RESOLVED** the Schools Forum supported the recommendation to consult on the transfer of 0.5%.

(ii) Nurture Groups

**REPORTED** following the review of Nurture Groups commissioning, the current full time Nurture Groups had been decommissioned and new Nurture Groups had been commissioned on a part time basis. The overall funding available for Nurture Groups enabled up to 27 groups to be commissioned and also provide a central outreach service.

The Forum was advised that eligible schools had been invited to bid. The uptake had been lower than expected, with only 16 schools bidding for a group. Officers had considered a number of options and following a discussion with the Education Resources Group, it was proposed that the LA should work with the 16 schools commissioned to host Nurture Groups and other eligible schools in order to support and encourage more schools to host a Nurture Group.

(iii) Special Units

**REPORTED** with the increasing demand for supporting pupils with autism and speech, language & communication needs, the LA was working with a partnership between De Bohun and Oaktree Schools to develop a Special Unit. The partnership required De Bohun to be supported by Oaktree. As part of the pilot the schools would provide feedback to the LA on progress, challenges and successes. Other schools had shown an interest in hosting a Special Unit. Depending upon the feedback, officers would then work with other schools to host a Special Unit, so resulting in Units across the borough, thus reducing need to develop new special school places.

(iv) Place Funding – Special Schools and PRU

**REPORTED** it had been agreed that a review of special school place funding would be carried out during 2021/22. An independent Consultant had been commissioned to carry out an initial review of the place funding arrangements and the financial position of each special school. The findings from that review had been presented at the previous meeting of the Schools Forum and it revealed considerable inconsistencies in how each school used the resources provided from the HNB. However, a methodology was required to assess the appropriateness of the current place funding and the types of needs being supported at each school. Another independent Consultant had been engaged to test the findings against an appraisal of the pupils in each school and their needs.

**RESOLVED** feedback would be provided to the Schools Forum in the Autumn term.

**ACTION: MRS BROWN**

(v) Outreach

**REPORTED** the special school place funding review had highlighted that four schools received £112k to provide an outreach service and for one of these schools the funding was included in the money provided to the Enfield Advisory Service for Autism. The other schools provided services to mainstream schools. However, the funding was not ring fenced solely to outreach, so possibly was being treated as delegated funding, nor monitored by the LA and the schools were potentially retaining any unspent allocations. It was proposed that the three schools currently funded to provide an outreach service be advised that the funding will cease at the end of the next academic year (2021/22) and a new criteria and process be developed during the next academic year.

**NOTED**

- A. In reply to a **question**, it was stated that it was not clear whether the schools were or not providing the services.
- B. As this provision had not been reviewed for a number of years, it was commented that it was important to have a clear process and schools should be held accountable for commissioned services.
- C. It was requested that the review process involves special school headteachers.

**RESOLVED** to support the proposal to cease funding for outreach at the next academic year (2021/22) and to develop criteria and process during the year.

(vi) High Needs Block: Alternative Provision

**REPORTED** It had been agreed at the Schools Forum in March 2021 that Alternative Provision be considered as an area of review.

**NOTED** a sub-group of key stakeholders had been set up and a consultant was being engaged to carry out an independent review.

(vii) Early Years Block: Inclusion Fund

**REPORTED** due to some changes to the regulations governing the Inclusion Fund. Officers were assessing the regulations and the outcomes from the assessment would be presented to Forum in the Autumn term.

**ACTION: MRS BROWN**

(d) Mainstream Schools Funding Consultation 2023/24

**RECEIVED** a PowerPoint presentation on the Mainstream School Funding Consultation.

**REPORTED** that:

- (i) The DfE had published the consultation on 8 July 2021 and the deadline for responses was 30 September 2021 and therefore before the next meeting of the Forum. The consultation was proposing a fundamental change to the basis of school funding. It would potentially remove local authorities responsibilities for managing and allocating funding to schools in their area. The National Funding Formula (NFF) would operate to allocate funding directly to maintained schools. The new process would be similar as that applied currently to Pupil Premium and possibly no local flexibility in the allocation of funds. The consultation was seeking to implement the changes from 2023/24.
- (ii) There were also proposals for the NFF to allocate funding for growth and falling rolls. The treatment of PFI and split sites was still under review. The consultation also stated:
  - the Government's aim to increase academisation;

- De-delegation would be limited to specific areas;
  - Statutory functions would be reviewed;
  - Licenses would continue to be funded by the DfE;
  - Historic commitments to support central services would cease with a grant to replace unavoidable costs e.g. Prudential Borrowing.
- (iii) The outcome of the SEND Reform Consultation was awaited. There would be a further consultation on a mechanism to support schools with EHCPs and a review of the block transfer, i.e. 0.5%.
- (iv) The consultation was also seeking views on maintained schools in future being funded on an academic year basis.

**NOTED** in response to **questions** and ensuing discussion that:

- (i) Despite calls from local authority education departments not to do so, the funding consultation was an example of government consulting during the August holidays.
- (ii) The purchasing power afforded to maintained schools by centralised funding should be recognised.
- (iii) The change to funding on an academic year basis was likely to create an additional burden for maintained schools and LAs.
- (iii) In view of the deadline for responses and despite the lack of a meeting of the Forum before then, the Chair would endeavour to formulate a collective response and to work with Mr Smart to prepare a letter and possibly of convening a special meeting of the Forum in September.

**ACTION: CHAIR AND MRS BROWN**

(e) De-Delegated Services for Maintained Schools for 2021/22 and 2022/23

**RECEIVED** a report on De-Delegated Services For Maintained Schools for 2021/22 and 2022/23.

**REPORTED** that the report provided an update on the current position with regards de-delegated services.

The maintained school representatives were informed that the cessation of de-delegation for long service awards by primary schools was becoming an issue. It was creating an inequity between Council and maintained school staff. This issue had been raised with the Education Resources Group and it had been confirmed that secondary schools would continue to support long service awards and primary headteachers on the Group would discuss this with their primary colleagues.

The Forum was informed that the issue regarding long service awards had been discussed with primary colleagues. The primary representatives advised that primary colleagues had confirmed that they would continue to support long service awards.

Other updates included:

**NOTED**

- (i) The Forum were advised that the SLA for union duties was being drawn up by union representatives.
- (iii) A new permanent Data Protection Officer (DPO) had started and would be joined by a Deputy DPO.

(iii) The services available for de-delegation in 2022/23 were noted.

**RESOLVED** that the Schools Forum maintained school representatives agreed with the option to reinstate de-delegation for long service awards in order to retain equity between staff working for the Council and schools. The Chair would consider further with Mr Smart and the matter would be brought back in the Autumn when maintained schools representatives would be asked to confirm services to be de-delegated for 2022/23.

**ACTION: CHAIR AND MRS BROWN**

**5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

Annual Audit for Maintained Schools

**NOTED** the 2020/21 Annual School Audit Report of June 2021 from the LA to all Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Chairs of Financial Resources.

**6. FUTURE MEETINGS**

(a) The date of next meeting of the Forum was Wednesday 6 October 2021 at 5.30pm. The meeting would be virtual. Whether meetings thereafter should be virtual or physical, or combined, should be considered at a later date.

**ACTION: MRS BROWN**

(b) **NOTED** the dates of future meetings as detailed below.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>
19/01/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
09/03/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
11/05/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
06/07/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
05/10/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC
07/12/2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM	TBC

**7. CONFIDENTIALITY**

No items discussed within the agenda were to be treated as confidential.

Meeting finished at 19.15.

## London Borough of Enfield

Schools Forum  
Education Resources Group

Meeting Date: 6 October 2021  
Meeting Date: 22 September 2021

**Subject: DSG BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2021/22**

**Cabinet Member: Cllr Uddin**

**Report Number: 14**

**Item Number: 4a**

### Purpose of Report

This report provides details of the latest DSG budget monitoring position for 2021/22 including confirmation of the latest DSG allocation from the EFA as at July 2021.

### Proposal

To note the contents of the report and the projected DSG cumulative deficit position for 31 March 2022.

### Relevance to the Council's Council Plan

The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ringfenced grant which funds schools and some central education functions. Updates on the DSG position are provided on a quarterly basis to EMT and Cabinet as part of the council's overall financial monitoring reports.

### Main Considerations for ERG and Schools Forum

#### 1. Cumulative DSG Deficit Position

Table 1 sets out the cumulative DSG deficit position as at 31 March 2021 as presented at the last meeting.

**Table 1 – Accumulated DSG Carry Forward 2020/21**

		£'000s
<b>Balance brought forward 1 April 2020</b>		<b>(4.482)</b>
Net Overspend 2020/21		<b>(3.567)</b>
<b>Cumulative Deficit Balance 31 March 2021</b>		<b>(8.049)</b>
Outstanding Adjustments 2020/21		0.950
<b>Net 2020/21 Carry Forward</b>		<b>(8.999)</b>

The outstanding adjustments largely relates to the clawback of Early Years funding and this is still to be confirmed by the ESFA. This would normally be confirmed as part of the July DSG update but has been delayed for 2021/22 due to additional data collections requested by the ESFA to identify trends in pupil numbers in early years settings.

#### 2. DSG Allocation 2021/22

The original estimate of gross DSG resources for 2021/22 amounted to £373.187m. Of this amount £2.1m would be provided direct by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) to fund places in mainstream academy units and academy special schools. Budget allocations for 2021/22 were agreed within this level of resources.

In March and July 2021, revised DSG allocations for 2021/22 were published. These allocations reflected updated academy and college recoupment for the Schools Block and High Needs. The latest DSG position for 2021/22 is summarised in Table 2.

**Table 2 – DSG Allocation 2021/22**

DSG Summary 2021/22	ORIG 2021/22	Academy Recoup	Import/Export Adj 21/22	Early Years Adj 21/22	REVISED 2021/221
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
SCHOOLS BLOCK	283.399	(145.835)			137.564
CENTRAL SERVICES	2.537				2.537
EARLY YEARS BLOCK	26.554				26.554
HIGH NEEDS BLOCK	60.697				60.697
<b>GROSS DSG</b>	<b>373.187</b>	<b>(145.835)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>227.352</b>
High Needs Recoupment	(2.100)	(0.069)			(2.169)
<b>NET TOTAL DSG</b>	<b>371.087</b>	<b>(145.904)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>225.183</b>

Further DSG allocation updates could be received between now and the end of the financial year and any changes will be shared at future meetings.

### 3. DSG Monitoring Update 2021/22

The DSG budget is monitored on a monthly basis and any variances are shared with DMT. The table below shows the monitoring position to the end of June 2021, Quarter 1.

**Table 3 – DSG Monitor 2021/22 as at 30/06/2021**

DSG Monitor 2021/22	£000	Aug-21 £000
DSG Deficit b/f 01/04/2021	8,049	
<b>Schools Block</b>		
Funds adv to schl moved to Rolling Credit		(450)
<b>Central Schools Services Block</b>		
Appeals Service vacancy		(38)
<b>Early Years Block</b>		
- Backdated Funding Adj 20/21 tbc		1,330
<b>High Needs Block</b>		
- Variance from initial 21/22		3,108
- Outborough Placements		(18)
- Home & Hospital 20/21 underspend		(56)
- Parenting Support		63
<b>DSG Monitoring Position 21/22</b>		<b>3,940</b>
<b>Cumulative DSG TOTAL 21/22</b>		<b>11,988</b>

Further increases in the High Needs Block overspend are expected over the next 2 terms as additional EHCPs are agreed and placements made. Some financial provision was built into the 2021/22 budget to allow for the expected increase in EHCP pupils in mainstream schools and the planned increase in special school and ARP places with effect from September 2021. The position for the new academic year is currently being updated to assess whether the



provisions made are sufficient or whether there are any increased pressures on the High Needs Block. Further updates will be provided at each meeting.

## **Conclusions**

The DSG budget remains under considerable pressure due to ongoing high needs overspends. As part of an ongoing programme, additional in borough places have been made available from September 2021, providing the most cost effective way of meeting pupil needs. New early intervention programmes have also been introduced from September 2021 to identify and pupils with special needs as early as possible and provide them with support with the aim of reducing the longer term financial impact. Updates on the monitoring position will be provided at future meetings.

---

Report Author: Louise McNamara  
Finance Manager – Schools and Education  
Louise.mcnamara@enfield.gov.uk  
0208 132 1272

Date of report Sept 2021

## **Appendices**

None

## **Background Papers**

DSG Updates to ERG/Schools Forum during Summer term 2021/22.

This page is intentionally left blank

## London Borough of Enfield

Schools Forum

Meeting Date: 6 October 2021

**Subject: School Funding Arrangements: Update and Summary of Proposals for 2022/23**

**Cabinet Member: Cllr Uddin**

**Report Number: 15**

**Item Number: 4b**

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This paper is an extract from the draft school funding consultation document. It details the proposals for consultation to inform the funding arrangements for 2022/23.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.2 The Schools Forum are asked to note and provide their views on the proposals outlined for consultation.

### EXTRACT OF DRAFT CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

#### 2.1 School Funding Reforms: Background

- 2.1.1 In 2013/14, the Government began their implementation of their School Funding Reforms with the aim of providing a fairer, more consistent and transparent national funding system.

- 2.1.2 The implementation process began with the Government freezing the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to the level received by individual local authorities (LAs) as at 2012/13. The DSG was then notionally separated into three blocks as detailed in (a) - (c) below:

- (a) Schools Block: funds 5 – 15 years old in mainstream primary and secondary schools.

The key change, at this point, was to restrict the number of factors LAs could use to reflect the contextual data relating to pupils in their local formulae.

- (b) High Needs Block (HNB) fund pupils with SEND<sup>1</sup> from 0 to 25 years old, who have EHCP<sup>2</sup> and require additional support above what is normally provided by the schools or the educational setting / institutions.

The key change was to freeze the total funding provided at 2012/13 levels for this block and introduce a place plus approach.

- (c) Early Years Block (EYB) to fund free nursery education for pupils from 2-4 years of age in schools and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) settings and child minders.

- (d) Central Services Schools Block (CSSB) was introduced in 2018/19 to fund statutory services provided by the Local Authority to schools, academies and free schools.

- 2.1.3 In 2017, the Government confirmed their intention to continue with the funding reforms and implement a National Funding Formula (NFF) from 2018/19. To do this, the Government committed an additional £1.3bn across two years to support the changes.

<sup>1</sup> Special Educational Needs and Disabilities

<sup>2</sup> EHCP is Education Health Care Plans

The full implementation of the NFF was delayed because the primary legislation governing school funding had to be amended to remove the responsibility from local authorities and transfer it to the DfE.

## 2.2 **School Funding: 2022/23**

In August 2019, following an annual Spending Review, the Minister of State for School Standards confirmed the overall increase in school funding over three years with £2.6 billion for 2020-21, £4.8 billion for 2021-22, and £7.1 billion for 2022-23. Analysis carried out by the Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) at that time suggested the increase by 2022/23 would represent 7.4% real terms growth in spending per pupil for the period between 2019/20 and 2022/23. This growth was sufficient to reverse the 8% cuts seen by schools since 2009/10. If delivered, this will leave school funding per pupil at about the same level in 2022/23 as it was in 2009/10, i.e. no real terms growth.

For 2023, the DfE has confirmed school funding will increase by £7.1 billion. They have also stated that the full implementation of the NFF for the Schools and High Needs Blocks has been postponed to earliest 2023/24. Therefore, the same arrangements for allocating the funding as this year will continue.

The arrangements continue to be a 'soft' NFF, whereby local authorities are funded using the NFF, but the distribution of funding to schools is decided and managed by the LA in consultation with the Schools Forum and schools. The reason for the continuation is that until the primary legislation is amended to remove the statutory duty from LAs to maintain a local funding formula, a national system cannot be introduced. Separate funding arrangements apply for high needs and early years, where the Authority sets funding in line with the government's NFF and other associated regulations.

For 2022/23, the calculation for the money allocated to each block is as follows:

- **Schools block** will be calculated using the national formula factors and rates and individual school data and then allocated to LAs. The national increase announced by the Government is 3% (rounded up) and increase for Enfield is approximately 2%. This increase includes the teachers' pay and pension grants added last year to the DSG.

It is important to note that not all schools may receive this level of increase. This is due to interrelationship between the funding formula and individual school's contextual data.

- **High Needs block** will increase by approximately 8% with 50% of the money being allocated using proxy indicators and 50% on actual spend from 2017/18. Added to this increase is money transferred last year for the teachers' pay and pension grants.

Again, it is important to emphasise the funding to be provided is unlikely to meet the current demand to support pupils with EHCPs.

- **Early Years block**: the funding will be allocated to local authorities using the NFF implemented in 2017-18.
- **Central Services Schools Block (CSSB)** covers the statutory duties provided by LAs, historic commitments and central licenses purchased by the ESFA on behalf of all schools. The statutory duties are allocated using pupil numbers and Ever 6 Free School Meals deprivation indicator. For statutory duties, Enfield will see an increase of 5.35%. For a number of years, allocation for historic commitments have been reducing by 20% year on year. The aim has been to cease funding this element altogether from 2023/24. Therefore, the overall change to the CSSB is a reduction of 0.48%

Table 1 summaries actual funding provided for 2021/22 and indicative allocation for 2022/23.

**Table 1: Summary of DSG for 2021/22 and 2022/23**

<b>DSG FUNDING</b>	<b>Schools Block</b>	<b>High Needs Block</b>	<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>Central Schools Services Block</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Indicative 2022/22	289.32	65.24		2.524	357.08
Actual 2021/22	282.35	60.88		2.537	345.76
<b>Variance</b>	6.97	4.36	0	<b>-0.012</b>	11.32

\* Early Years: These figures exclude funding for the Early Years block because these haven't been confirmed and will be amended to reflect actual take up.

For Enfield, the change to NFF will see an increase in funding for both the Schools and High Needs block.

## 1. Schools Block

### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This block is the main source of funding for mainstream schools. Schools may access some funding from the other two blocks, high needs and early years, that form the DSG. Post 16 and Pupil Premium funding are not part of the DSG.

The funding provided to mainstream schools is derived by using a funding formula. The factors to inform the formula are governed by statutory regulations. LAs with their Schools Forum have limited flexibility to determine which or how these factors should be used for the local funding formula. The aim of the **NFF** has been to fund all schools in the country using the same formula factors and unit rates with some adjustment to reflect area costs.

### 3.2 National Arrangements

3.2.1 For 2022/23, the DfE has confirmed the following changes to the current arrangements that will impact Enfield for the national and / or local funding formula:

National Funding Formula Factor:

- Free school meals Ever 6: The October 2020 Pupil Census instead of January Census will be used for this factor;
- Low prior attainment Due to the cancellation of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) and Key Stage 2 (KS2) assessments for 2020 and 2021, data from 2019 assessments will be used for funding purposes;
- Some core proxy factors used for the **NFF**'s will increase by 3%;
- Mobility: Usually based on the census in which pupils first appear at their current school. Due to the cancellation of the May 2020 Census, pupils who joined a school between January and May 2020 will attract funding for mobility on the basis of their entry date;
- Business Rates: Payment will be centralised with the ESFA paying billing local authorities;
- Minimum per pupil funding levels: These have been set at £4,265 for primary year groups, £5,321 for KS3 and £5,831 for KS4. These include the pay and pension grants previously added to the Schools block;

- No gains cap for schools gaining and to protect the pupil led funding received by schools, ability to set the **MFG** between 0.5% and 2.0%. The positive MFG should result in schools seeing some increase in their per pupil led funding;
- No changes to the current arrangements for mobility and growth funding for expanding and new schools;

3,2,2 From 2023/24, the Government aim is still to move fully to a national funding system with no local flexibility. To begin the implementation, the DfE have published a consultation document outlining their proposals on moving to a national funding system. The consultation document can be found by using the following link:  
<https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/completing-our-reforms-to-the-nff/consultation/intro/>.

### **3.2 Local Arrangements for 2022/23**

- 3.2.1 Since the Government introduced the school funding reforms, the aims governing the local arrangements have been to maintain stability and least turbulence for individual schools and, as far as possible, will continue to be our aims for 2022/23.
- 3.2.2 Following last year's consultation on funding arrangements, the NFF unit rates were used locally to allocate funding to individual schools. This change did see some movement in funding between schools. This was partly due to the change in how funding is targeted across the various formula factors and also due to contextual changes for individual schools. Whilst the national framework provides some protection for schools through the minimum funding guarantee for pupil led funding, it does not allow for a decrease in the number of pupils on roll.
- 3.2.2 During the summer, the Local Authority has been discussing with the Education Resources Group and the Schools Forum the basic principles to inform the local funding arrangements for 2022/23. It was noted that the Government will be seeking to fundamentally change school funding arrangements from 2023/24 and the outcomes from the consultation on the SEND Reforms were still unknown, the principles agreed to support our overriding aims was to continue with the current arrangements, which included use of national funding formula factors and associated unit rates, set a minimum funding guarantee to protect individual school's per pupil led funding and maintain the 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block to fund Element 2 (first £6,000) to schools with high number of pupils EHCPs.
- 3.2.3 The information published by the DfE has been used to model indicative allocations for individual schools.

## **4. High Needs Block**

### **4.1 Introduction**

#### **4.1.1 NFF for High Needs**

The Government has confirmed 8% per head increase for the HNB with a gain cap of 11% per head.

The increase is welcomed but it does not address the ongoing rising demand being experienced in meeting the needs of pupils with SEND. The Authority is continuing to work with schools to increase the number of places in both special schools and additionally resourced provision (ARPs) & special units in mainstream schools. This is in addition to the development of a new secondary special free school for pupils with social emotional and Mental Health needs.

#### 4.1.2 Place Plus Approach

No change is planned to the place plus approach. This approach provides specialist provision with a base amount for an agreed number of places and then a top up to address the requirements of the EHCPs and enable pupils to meet their outcomes. Table 3 details the funding arrangements for specialist provision.

**Table 3: Summary of Funding Arrangements for Specialist Provision**

Education provision	Funding
Mainstream schools – ARPs	£10,000 per place plus top up for individual pupils. The £10,000 place funding will be calculated as follows: – £4,000 from the school’s individual budget for the number of pupils in the ARP recorded on the October Pupil Census – £6,000 to be provided by the Local Authority from HNB.
Special schools	£10,000 per place plus top up for individual pupils
Pupil referral units	£10,000 per place plus top up for individual pupils
Post 16 provision for special needs – all providers	£10,000 per place plus top up for individual pupils

4.1.3 As stated Enfield has received a basic increase of 8% which includes the amount previously provided to special schools and alternative provision through the teachers’ pay and pension grants. Similar to this year, to facilitate the inclusion of the teachers’ pay and pension grants, the allocations:

- For special schools: the basic entitlement for pupils will include £660 per pupil;
- For alternative provision: a factor within the NFF will be used to allocate this money.

This arrangement will ensure the regulatory requirements are met.

#### 4.2 Mainstream Schools – Pupils with EHCPs (Element 2)

4.2.1 Mainstream schools are funded from the Schools block using the NFF. The NFF aims to provide:

- basic per pupil costs of approximately £4,000 per pupil (described as Element 1)
- additional educational needs (AEN) and SEND cost up to £6,000 (described as Element 2) per pupils.

The LA from the HNB then meets any costs above £6,000 identified on the EHCP (described as Element 3).

Appendix C: a diagram explaining separation of funding to support a pupil with SEND.

#### 4.2.2 Current Arrangements

In Enfield, the funding arrangements outlined above were not implemented because the Government was still providing annual increases to the DSG and also there was sufficient local flexibility to decide the allocation of the DSG to meet local needs. Locally, it was agreed to transfer funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs block to fund additional £6,000 (Element 2) per pupil to schools with above average number of pupils with EHCPs.

The Government then introduced new restriction on the use of the DSG, which included restrictions in moving funds between blocks within the DSG. However, the restrictions allowed the transfer of only 0.5% from the Schools to the High Needs block. For a number

of years, funding has been transferred from the Schools Block to the High Needs block to support schools with high number of pupils with EHCPs. Recently, the expectation was that outcomes from the DfE Call for Evidence would be published and these should address the pressure being faced by schools to support pupils with SEND needs.

The outcomes from the DfE Call for Evidence were not published for 2021/22, therefore it was agreed with the Schools Forum to transfer 0.5% from the Schools block to High Needs block and so continue to support schools with above average number of pupils with EHCPs by providing a contribution towards the £6,000 per pupil (Element 2) for the number of pupils above a calculated percentage at each school.

#### 4.2.2 Proposal

As already mentioned above, for 2022/23, the Government are not planning to change the current arrangements. Any changes will be considered when the outcomes from the SEND Reforms Consultation and the Call for Evidence have been published. It is envisaged this is likely to be at some point next year.

Following discussion with the Education Resources Group and Schools Forum, it is proposed due to the considerable uncertainty that the current arrangements for the 0.5% continue for 2022/23. The rationale for suggesting this is because it is hoped the outcomes from the two SEND consultations will result in a change for 2023/24 that addresses the pressure created by the current requirement for schools to fund Element 2 (£6,000) from within their delegated budget. It would also act as evidence of how this element has been and is being managed by schools with high number of pupils with EHCPs.

### 4.3 Special Schools & Pupil Referral Unit – Place Funding

#### 4.3.1 Background and current arrangements

Enfield has six special schools and a pupil referral unit. In 2013, an average cost model was introduced to calculate funding per place at each school and the pupil referral unit. For each school, the place funding calculation was derived by dividing the total funding delegated to the school by number of pupils on roll. This has resulted in each school having their own unique average cost per place. The average costs calculated in 2013 have remained at the same level. The special schools have sought a review of their place funding. In consultation with the Schools Forum, it was agreed that a review of special school place funding would be carried out during 2021/22.

Independent Consultants have been commissioned to carry out reviews of the place funding arrangements and assess the financial position and type of needs supported at each special school.

#### 4.3.2 Principles

There is a case to move away from a historic funding model which has been in place since 2013. Options for an alternative funding model have been considered by the local authority in collaboration with special school headteachers and the PRU, with support from the independent consultant. The following guiding principles were agreed.

- Fairness – a fair distribution of funding across schools in accordance with a clear rationale
- Simplicity – easily understood and not time consuming to administer
- Transparent – clear to all concerned what funding is being provided for what purpose
- Aligned to pupil needs -takes into account the resources required to meet different types of need and able to be adjusted as the profile of needs changes
- Predictability – supports schools in their financial planning as well as assisting the management of expenditure within the High Needs Block



#### 4.3.3 Funding for special schools

Following discussion of possible funding models, it is proposed that a benchmarked average cost model is adopted for special schools, based on:

- expenditure on classroom staffing requirements for pupils with different levels of need
- expenditure on other staffing including leadership teams and administrative staff
- non staffing costs, for example on premises and resources
- any significant school-specific costs, such as costs of running and maintenance of hydrotherapy pools

Modelling will be undertaken based on the profile of pupil needs at each school, assumptions about the adult/pupil ratio required for different levels of needs and analysis of current actual costs, moderated using financial benchmarking data for similar schools.

#### 4.3.4 Funding for pupil referral unit

The PRU is currently funded on the basis of an indicative number of 100 places, although current numbers on roll are below this figure as permanent exclusions in Enfield have reduced. In addition to providing full-time placements, the PRU undertakes a number of preventative activities to support schools and pupils at risk of exclusion.

The advantage of the indicative place model is that it gives predictability of funding in a context where there is a volatility of numbers on roll, with frequent in-year admissions and leavers.

Further work is required to develop this model in more detail.

#### 4.3.5 Individual funding for pupils outside of core budget

It should also be noted additional funding is provided for a small number of pupils in special schools whose needs are particularly challenging and fall outside of the normal range catered for by the school. The level of additional funding is determined on a case-by-case basis. During the academic year 2020/21, special schools received additional support for 19 pupils on a time limited basis. Spend on additional support has varied year upon year and is in the region of £300k to £500k.

Two options are under consideration

- a. Maintaining the current arrangements with clearer criteria for eligibility for individual funding and greater transparency of decision-making arrangements
- b. Building the projected spend on pupils with exceptional needs into core budget provision giving predictability of funding to schools and the ability to respond to needs flexibly, without the need to make a separate funding submission to the local authority

#### 4.3.6 In addition to the above, related work is being undertaken, in order to:

- assess the current range of needs met by each special school
- develop admission guidance on the type and level of needs expected to be met by each school to help guide placement decisions
- determine how current resources are being utilised and, where possible, how costs compare with similar schools in other authorities

## 5. EARLY YEARS BLOCK

- 5.1 Since April 2017, funding provided to local authorities for the free nursery entitlement for three and four year olds has been based on NFF and, in a similar way to mainstream schools, local authorities determine the local funding formula for distributing funding to local early years settings.

DfE have not advised of any changes to the funding arrangements for 2022/23. The hourly rate for Enfield remains as £5.76 for three and four year olds and £5.82 for two year olds.

### 5.2 Regulatory Update

- (a) The regulations require 95% of the total Early Years block funding be passed onto providers and up to 5% may be retained by local authorities to support early years' central functions.

The regulations require the local funding arrangements include the following factors for allocating funding to providers:

- a per pupil amount;
- support for pupils from a socially deprived background;
- a supplement linked to quality;
- an Inclusion Fund.

- (b) Recently, the DfE have further defined the use of the Inclusion Fund. The guidance states that the Inclusion Fund should be used to target support for children with lower level or emerging SEND. The intention of the update is that the Inclusion Fund supports LAs to work with providers to address the needs of individual children with SEND, thus enabling LAs to undertake their responsibilities to strategically commission SEN services as required under the Children and Families Act 2014.

In delivering its responsibility, LAs are required to ensure the Inclusion Fund is accessible to all three and four-year olds with SEND who are taking up the free nursery entitlement, regardless of the number of hours taken.

- (c) The guidance has also clarified that:

- The Inclusion Fund should be applied to children attending settings in the relevant local authority area, regardless of where they live;
- For children with more complex needs and in receipt of EHCP funding should be allocated from the High Needs Block of the DSG.

- (d) The Inclusion Fund is required to be allocated in the form of a 'top up grants' on a case-by-case basis with the Fund being used for direct support to providers or resources to support an individual child to access the curriculum.

### 5.3 Current Local Arrangement

In Enfield, the local funding arrangement includes an amount per pupil, a deprivation factor and an Inclusion Fund.

Currently, the use of the Inclusion Fund is split between:

- individual providers being able to access targeted resources to support pupils with SEN
- centrally commissioned specialist provision to support all providers.

The targeted resources are administered through an Inclusion Panel consisting of officers, with representation from headteachers, settings and other professionals as required. Specialist support is commissioned from Educational Psychology Service (EPS) and the Early Years Inclusion Team (provided in the form of Area SENCOs).

The demand for support from the Inclusion Fund has been increasing year on year with the total allocation overspending.

Following the updates to the regulatory guidance and the increasing demand for support, the provision of specialist support has had to be reviewed.

#### 5.4 Proposal for 2022/23

The updates to the regulatory guidance will enable the majority of the areas currently included in the Inclusion Fund to continue with the one exception, which is the commissioning of support from the EPS. Going forward, if providers require support from the EPS, it will have to be accessed in a different way.

It is proposed where a provider requires an assessment for an EHCP from the EPS, then the provider seeks the agreement of their Area SENCO and the cost is met from money that is currently identified as Inclusion Fund Plus.

With this proposal, Table 5 details the final allocation of the funding for 2022/23.

**Table 5: Breakdown of Early Years Funding for last two years and proposed for 2022/23**

Factors	2020/21		2021/22		2022/23	
	Rate per hour		Rate per hour		Rate per hour	
	£	%	£	%	£	%
Basic hourly rate per child	£5.18	91%	£5.24	91%	£5.24	91%
Deprivation: Based on IDACI	£0.12	2%	£0.12	2%	£0.12	2%
Inclusion Fund	£0.11	1.85%	£0.11	1.85%	£0.11	1.85%
Inclusion Plus Fund	£0.01	0.15%	£0.01	0.15%	£0.01	0.15%
Central Support	£0.28	5%	£0.28	5%	£0.28	5%
Total	£5.70	100%	£5.76	100%	£5.76	100%

This page is intentionally left blank

## London Borough of Enfield

Schools Forum

Meeting Date: 6 October 2021

**Subject: RESPONSE TO DFE CONSULTATION ON FAIR SCHOOL FUNDING FOR ALL**

**Cabinet Member: Cllr Uddin**

**Report Number: 16**

**Item Number: 4b**

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This paper provides a copy of the response submitted to the DfE consultation on proposals for continuing with the Government's implementation of the national funding reforms.

At the last meeting, the Forum was briefed on the consultation. The deadline for responses was 30 September. For this reason, it was agreed that a draft response would be shared, for comment, with the Forum members prior to the response being submitted. The draft response was circulated to all Forum members at the beginning of this term.

No amendments were sought to the draft response and it was submitted as the joint response of the Local Authority and the Schools Forum.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.2 The Schools Forum are asked to note the response submitted.

### Consultation Questions

Question 1: Do you agree that our aim should be that the directly applied NFF should include all pupil-led and school-led funding factors and that all funding distributed by the NFF should be allocated to schools on the basis of the hard formula, without further local adjustment through local formulae?

No.

Each area has its own context in terms of make up of the pupil population and /or school organisation requirements, therefore it is important that there is local flexibility to review and allocate resources for any actual or expected local needs. The national context will not and possibly cannot address any fluctuations and changes experienced within each local area.

If the Department is fully supportive of its key principles of fairness, simplicity, transparency, efficiency and predictability, then enabling local flexibility will ensure that these principles are supported both at a national and local level because the general context and local requirements are being met.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on how we could reform premises funding during the transition to the directly applied NFF?

Since the introduction of the School Funding Reforms, it has been found that most schools have put greater priority on raising standards than maintaining the school buildings and premises due to the financial pressure being experienced from rising costs because of national changes, i.e. National Insurance contributions or other inflationary or demand led pressures.

The funding arrangements for the premises factors are a major weakness within the current system. To date the premises factor has been funded based on historic spend and only fund PFI, split site or exceptional circumstances. The key concern is that there appears to be no recognition of maintenance issues confronting schools on a daily basis. There needs to be a robust process in place that ensures schools are adequately funded to maintain their estate to an appropriate standard and thereby reduce the need for far more costly capital investment. It is not just about PFI or split site.

Previously, the local formulae may have had a higher amount within the lumps sum to provide some flexibilities for individual schools. With the reduction in the amount allocated through the lump sum within the national funding formula, it is questionable how a national funding formula will support a premises factor because of the number of variables associated with school buildings, e.g. age, size, being considered of historic value, situated on several sites, etc.

**Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to use national, standardised criteria to allocate all aspects of growth and falling rolls funding?**

Not sure

**Growth Fund:**

There is insufficient information relating to either the standardised criteria or the measure to assess significant change to comment.

Withstanding this, we are concerned that the proposal to include popular growth funding is limited to academies and not available for maintained schools. This proposal does not fulfil the key principle of fairness.

**Falling Rolls:**

The definition suggested for supporting schools with falling rolls could be considered a misnomer and possibly against the Department's key principles of fairness and equity.

The aim of a falling rolls fund is to support schools to manage a change in their circumstances yet the use of the fund is restricted to schools with a Good or Outstanding grade at their most recent Ofsted inspection. We do not believe this restriction is in the best interest of the individual schools or the pupils currently attending the school because it is viewed as an unfair funding system. A school can move from a good or outstanding judgement for a number of reasons that are not linked to a falling pupil roll. For example, we have seen approximately 2.5% reduction over the last five years in the pupil populations across all types of schools with different level of Ofsted gradings. This level of reduction is not uncommon across London. A recent survey commissioned by London Councils stated that there was a general decline in the birth rate with a decrease of 2.5% in live births in England and Wales in 2019 and a 12.2% decrease since the most recent peak in 2012.

We would ask that if a falling roll factor is included in the NFF that it treats all schools fairly because of the need to provide and enable all pupils to achieve and meet their expected outcomes.

**Question 4: Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to growth and falling rolls funding?**

From the information provided, we do not feel able to comment on the Department's approach.

Our preference would be for the factor previously in place of a protection arrangements for a three year period for all schools irrespective of their Ofsted grading. This would enable schools a period of time to manage the change in their pupil numbers without impacting on educational standards.

Question 5: Do you agree that, in 2023-24, each LA should be required to use each of the NFF factors (with the exception of any significantly reformed factors) in its local formulae?

No.

Individual local authority should continue to have the flexibility based on their local circumstances to decide whether or not to use the NFF factors / unit rates.

Question 6: Do you agree that all LA formulae, except those that already 'mirroring' the NFF, should be required to move closer to the NFF from 2023-24, in order to smooth the transition to the hard NFF for schools?

No.

Individual local authority should continue to have the flexibility based on their local circumstances to decide whether or not to use the NFF factors / unit rates.

Question 7: Do you agree that LA formulae factor values should move 10% closer to the NFF, compared with their distance from the NFF in 2022-23? If you do not agree, can you please explain why?

No.

Individual local authority should continue to have the flexibility based on their local circumstances to decide whether or not to use the NFF factors / unit rates.

Question 8: As we would not require LAs to move closer to the NFF if their local formulae were already very close to the NFF, do you have any comments on the appropriate threshold level?

No.

Individual local authority should continue to have the flexibility based on their local circumstances to decide whether or not to use the NFF factors / unit rates.

Question 9: Do you agree that the additional flexibility for LAs in the EAL factor, relating to how many years a pupil has been in the school system, should be removed from 2023-24?

No.

Individual local authority should continue to have the flexibility based on their local circumstances to decide whether or not to use the NFF factors / unit rates.

Question 10: Do you agree that the additional flexibilities relating to the sparsity factor should remain in place for 2023-24

Yes

If this factor enables pupils across the country to have equal access to education, then it should continue to be in place.

Question 11: are there any comments you wish to make on the proposals we have made regarding ongoing central school services, including on whether in the future central school services funding could move to LGFS?

**Statutory Duties for all schools**

We do not support the proposed changes to the Central Services Schools block to be part of the Local Government Finance Settlement.

We consider any element of educational statutory duties deemed to be the responsibility of the LAs that these should be funded as part of the education settlement and not the MHCLG's Local Government Finance Settlement. This would provide clear accountability of the requirements for LAs. We ask going forward that the Department shares its views and consults on the statutory duties that are the responsibilities of LAs. It is important any changes that are put in place enable LAs to meet this obligation. It is not reasonable to push the cost of these duties to local residents and taxpayers.

### **Statutory Duties for maintained schools**

LAs still have responsibilities for various statutory functions a large number of maintained schools.

We do not believe the proposals for supporting maintained schools are in line with the principles of fairness, reasonableness or equity. For example, it is unclear why it is assumed it is reasonable for Multi Academy Trusts to pool and / or top slice resources from the schools within their trust and yet it is not reasonable for LAs to have a similar flexibility. The use of the governance structure is not a reasonable claim.

If the premise for the NFF is that the resources provided through the NFF to schools are used for pupils currently at the school, then these should not be used to prop up and build up reserves for a national or large trust within an area. Recent financial information published indicated an academy within a national MAT had an amount top sliced, which resulted in the MAT reporting high levels of reserves (above 6%) with little information why individual academies within the trust were posting a deficit. This would indicate that the trust was not fully supporting the individual academies within their MAT.

We would ask that national arrangements that are put in place treat both Trusts and LAs in the same way, so there is clarity around top slicing and pooling.

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposal for a legacy grant to replace funding for unavoidable termination of employment and prudential borrowing costs? We will also invite further evidence on this at a later stage?

No.

Some elements of the central services funded enable pupils to remain and be educated within their local community and we feel should be included in the legacy grant, especially for those pupils who do not meet the thresholds in place for support.

It would be helpful to understand where an academy receives historic funding whether this funding will be subject to similar limitations.

Question 13: How strongly do you feel that we should further investigate the possibility of moving maintained schools to being funded on an academic year basis?

We are strongly against this idea. It will only move the administrative burden for maintained schools and unfunded LAs.

Question 14: Are there any advantages or drawbacks to moving maintained schools to being funded on an academic year basis that you feel we should be aware of

This will create an additional burden and may conflict with statutory reporting requirements for LAs and maintained schools.



## Other Areas

SEND: we are concerned that there has been no information on the outcomes from the two consultations on SEND and how any resulting changes to the high needs formula will impact mainstream or special schools.

Schools Forum: We sense that the changes being proposed will centralise all decision making related to school funding. Our view is that this will lead to removing schools having the opportunity, ability and accountability to inform funding arrangements in their local area to meet the needs of their pupils.

Finally, we ask any changes implemented do reflect the key principles outlined in the document and aim to level up any variations in funding policy and operational arrangements between maintained schools and academies.

This page is intentionally left blank

## London Borough of Enfield

Schools Forum

Meeting Date 6 October 2021

**Subject:** Workplan  
**Cabinet Member:** Cllr Uddin  
**Report Number:** 17

Item: 6

### Recommendation

To note the workplan.

<u>Meetings</u>		<u>Officer</u>
May 2021	High Needs	PN
July 2021	Schools Budget – Outturn (2020/21) School Balances (2020/21) & Budget Review (2020/21) School Funding Arrangements (2022/23) De-delegation of Central Services Annual Audit – Update	LM SB SB SB LB
October 2021	Schools Budget: 2021/22 – Monitoring School Funding Arrangements (2022/23)	LM SB
December 2021	Schools Budget: 2021/22 – Monitoring Schools Budget: 2022/23: Update School Funding Arrangements (2022/23) High Needs Monitoring and Review - Update Central Services Budgets	LM LM SB PN/SB CS
January 2022	Schools Budget: 2021/22 – Monitoring Schools Budget: 2022/23: Update West Lea Annual Report 2020-21 BSS & SWIRREL Annual Reports 2021-22 Advisory Service for Autism Speech & Language Hub High Needs Strategy – Update	LM LM WL MC / NE-J RW BT SB
March 2022	Schools Budget: 2021/22: Update High Needs Places & Review Scheme for Financing - Revisions	LM SB SB
May 2022	Single item agenda	
July 2022	Schools Budget – Outturn (2021/22) School Balances (2020/21) & Budget Review (2021/22) High Needs Review Annual Audit – Update	LM SB SB LB

### Dates of Meetings

Date	Time	Venue	Comment
20 January 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Virtual meeting	
3 March 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Virtual meeting	
12 May 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Virtual meeting	
14 July 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Virtual meeting	
06 October 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
08 December 2021	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
19 January 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
09 March 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
11 May 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
06 July 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
05 October 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		
07 December 2022	5:30 - 7:30 PM		

**Report Author:** Sangeeta Brown, Education Resources Manager  
[sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk) / 0208 132 0450  
**Date of report** 5 July 2021

This page is intentionally left blank