



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

e-mail: sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

## **SCHOOLS FORUM**

**Meeting to be held from 17:30 on Wednesday 6 July 2016**

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

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

### **Schools Members:**

Governors: Ms I Cranfield (Primary): Chair, Mr C Clark (Primary), Ms Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr T McGee (Secondary)

Headteachers: Ms H Ballantine (Primary), Mr D Bruton (Secondary) Mr P De Rosa (Special), Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit), Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Ms H Knightley (Primary), Ms A Nicou (Primary), Ms H Thomas (Primary), Ms L Whitaker (Primary)

Academies: Ms L Dawes, Mr G Stubberfield, Vacancy

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

|                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Overview and Scrutiny Committee | Tbc                          |
| 16 - 19 Partnership             | Mr K Hintz                   |
| Teachers' Committee             | Mr S McNamara / Mr T Cuffaro |
| Education Professional          | Tbc                          |
| Head of Behaviour Support       | Mr J Carrick                 |
| Early Years Provider            | Ms C Gopoulos                |

### **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**

## **AGENDA**

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

Reported:

- a) Mr D Bruton had been nominated by Secondary Headteachers' Conference as a secondary representative;
- b) Following the conversion of Southgate to an academy, Mr Stubberfield had decided to remain as a member on the Forum, but Mr Lavelle had decided to resign. All academies and free schools had been advised of the vacancy for an academy and free school representative on the Schools Forum and a nomination was awaited;
- c) Mr D Bruton had been nominated by the Headteachers' Conference as a secondary representative;
- d) Confirmation was awaited for a representative from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and also the Local Authority Professional.

**2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

**3. ITEM FOR DECISION**

- (a) Election of Chair of the Schools Forum for the municipal year (2016/17)
- (b) Election of Vice Chair of the Schools Forum for the municipal year (2016/17)

**4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES (Pages 1 - 6)**

- (a) Schools Forum meetings held on 11 April 2016 (*attached*)
- (b) Matters arising from these minutes

**5. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION & INFORMATION (Pages 7 - 28)**

- (a) School Funding Review (2016/17) (*attached*)
- (b) Central Services Funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant & Education Services Grant – Update (*attached*)
- (c) School Funding Arrangements (2017/18) (*verbal update*)
- (d) School Places (*verbal update*)

**6. WORKPLAN (Pages 29 - 30)**

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS**

(a) Date of next meeting is Thursday 13 October 2016 at 5.30pm, Chace Community;

(a) Proposed dates for future meetings:

- 18 January 2017
- 01 March 2017
- 19 April 2017
- 05 July 2017

## **9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

If necessary, to consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for any items of business moved to part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

(There is no part 2 agenda)

## Schools Forum Membership List

| Name                            |   | Sector | Organisation                           | Member / Sub Since         | End of Term |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|--|----------------------------|-------------|
| Ms I Cranfield (Ch)             | G | P      | Eversley                               | Summer 2013                | Spring 2017 |
| Mr C Clark                      | G | P      | Field Federation                       | Autumn 2014                | Summer 2018 |
| Ms J Ellerby                    | G | P      | Eldon                                  | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Mrs J Leach                     | G | Sp     | Waverley                               | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Mrs L Sless                     | G | P      | Galliard                               | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Mr T McGee                      | G | S      | Highlands                              | Spring 2013                | Autumn 2016 |
| Ms H Ballantine                 | H | P      | George Spicer                          | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Mr P De Rosa                    | H | Sp     | Durants                                | Autumn 2013                | Summer 2017 |
| Ms M Hurst                      | H | PRU    | Enfield Sec Tuition Centre             | Req'd - July 2014          |             |
| Mr B Goddard                    | H | S      | Highlands                              | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Ms H Knightley                  | H | P      | St Johns & St James                    | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Ms A Nicou                      | H | P      | Bowes Learning Alliance                | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Ms H Thomas                     | H | P      | Alma                                   | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
| Ms L Whitaker                   | H | P      | St Matthew's                           | Summer 2016                | Spring 2020 |
| Mr D Bruton                     | H | S      | Chace Community                        | Summer 2016                | Spring 2020 |
| Ms L Dawes                      | H | A      | Oasis Hadley                           | Spring 2016                | Autumn 2020 |
| Mr G Stubberfield               | G | A      | Southgate                              | Spring 2016                | Autumn 2020 |
| VACANCY                         |   | A      |  |                            |             |
| Ms C Gopoulos                   |   | EY     | Bright Stars Nursery                   | Spring 2016                | Autumn 2020 |
| Mr K Hintz                      |   | P16    | CONEL                                  | Autumn 2015                | Summer 2019 |
|                                 |   | All    | Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee | By Appointment             |             |
| Mr S McNamara /<br>Mr T Cuffaro |   | All    | NUT                                    | Autumn 2013<br>Autumn 2015 | Spring 2017 |
| Mr J Carrick                    |   | All    | Local Authority                        | By Appointment             |             |
| VACANCY                         |   | All    | Local Authority                        | By Appointment             |             |
| Cllr Orhan                      | O | All    | Cabinet Member                         | By Appointment             |             |
| Ms A Homer                      | O | All    | Prince of Wales                        | Summer 2015                | Spring 2019 |
| Mr O Jenkins                    | O | All    | EFA                                    | By Appointment             |             |

### Key

G – Governor  
H – Headteacher  
O - Observer  
P – Primary  
S – Secondary  
Sp – Special  
A – Academies & Free Schools  
EY – Early Years  
P16 – Post 16



This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING****Held on Wednesday 11 April 2016 at Chace Community School****Schools Members:**

Governors: Ms I Cranfield (Primary) Chair, Mr Clark (Primary), Mrs J Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), *Mr T McGee (Secondary), Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary)*

Headteachers: *Ms H Ballantine (Primary)*, Mr P De Rosa (Special), *Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit)*, Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Ms H Knightley (Primary), *Mr M Lavelle (Secondary)*, Ms A Nicou (Primary), Ms H Thomas (Primary), Ms L Whitaker (Primary),

Academies: Ms L Dawes, *Vacancy*

**Non-Schools Members:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee | <i>Cllr D Levy</i>                               |
| 16 - 19 Partnership                      | Mr K Hintz                                       |
| Teachers' Committee                      | <i>Mr S McNamara</i> substituted by Mr T Cuffaro |
| Head of Behaviour Support                | Mr J Carrick                                     |
| Early Years Provider                     | Ms C Gopoulos                                    |
| Education Professional                   | Ms E Stickler                                    |

**Observers:**

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

**Also attending:**

|                                    |                  |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Chief Education Officer            | Ms J Tosh        |
| Head of Finance Business Partner   | Mrs J Fitzgerald |
| Assistant Finance Business Partner | Mrs L McNamara   |
| Resources Development Manager      | Mrs S Brown      |
| Observer                           | Ms S Watson      |

\* Italics denote absence

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

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Levy, Mr McGee, Ms Ballantine, Ms Hurst and Mr Lavelle.

Noted the absence of Mr Stubberfield.

**b) Membership**

Reported:

- (i) Ms Gaudencio had resigned as primary representative on Schools Forum and Ms Whitaker had taken over the vacated position.

The Forum noted Ms Whitaker had previously acted as substitute for Ms Gaudencio at meetings, but now formally welcomed Ms Whitaker to the Schools Forum.

- (ii) The pupil numbers from the January PLASC had been assessed to inform the membership composition of the Forum. Following the conversion of Southgate School to an academy, there was a need to change the composition and membership.

Noted:

A. The changes to PLASC meant:

- the secondary representation needed to be reduced from four to three members;
- the academy representation needed to be increased from two to three members;

- B. Currently, the secondary representation included Mr Lavelle and Mr Stubberfield, both of whom were from Southgate School. With the change in status of Southgate School, both Mr Lavelle and Mr Stubberfield would have to resign as secondary representatives but could remain on the Forum as academy representatives. This was because there was currently a vacancy for an academy representative and also the need to increase the number of academy members to reflect the changes in pupil numbers.

It was commented that Mr Lavelle had expressed that he no longer wanted to be a representative on the Schools Forum.

- C. With the resignation of Mr Lavelle and Mr Stubberfield as secondary representatives, there was a vacancy for a secondary representative. The Forum was asked if they had a preference as to whether this vacancy should be filled by a Headteacher or Governor.

It was questioned why there was a choice. It was stated that, as only three secondary representatives were required, the terms of reference did not stipulate if a particular type of member took precedence over another.

There was a view that the vacancy should be filled by a Headteacher. It was observed that there were currently more Headteachers than Governors on the Forum, so perhaps a Governor should be considered to cover the vacancy. This was because of the number of members required to represent primary schools.

It was commented that, in the uncertain economic climate, the national changes around funding and proposals for schools to become academies, it was important to consider a Headteacher for the vacancy.

Resolved:

- A. To confirm with Mr Lavelle and Mr Stubberfield whether they wanted to continue to remain on the Schools Forum as academy representatives.
- B. If Mr Lavelle and Mr Stubberfield decided not to continue as academy representatives, then nomination would be sought from one of the other academies;
- C. To seek a nomination from the Secondary Headteachers' Conference for the secondary representative vacancy.

**ACTION: Mrs Brown**

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were given the opportunity of declaring an interest relating to any items on the agenda. No declarations were made.

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

- (a) Schools Forum meeting held on 2 March 2016

**Received** and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum held on 2 March 2016, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

- (b) Matters arising from these minutes

**Noted** the matters arising from the minutes would be covered by the items on the agenda.

**Clerk's note: Ms Dawes and Mr Kurt arrived at this point.**

## **4. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR DECISION**

- a) Schools National Funding Formula: Draft Response

**Received** a draft response to the DfE consultation documents on the Schools National Funding Formula and the High Needs National Funding Formula, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

**Reported** the DfE had published two consultation documents on the implementation of the National Funding Formulae (NFF) for the Schools and High Needs blocks. The DfE had



described these as being 'the first stage' in the process and were seeking views on general principles and indicators which should be used to allocate funding. However, the documents provided no information on the financial impact of any of the proposals. The DfE had stated that they would have a second consultation process later in the year.

**Noted:**

- (i) The documents indicated that the introduction of the NFF would be carried out within existing resources. If this were the case, with no information rates and weightings to be applied, London Councils had carried out an analysis of the potential funding changes in the Schools Block received by individual London local authorities. The analysis indicated that, if the proposals were to be implemented, London would be a net loser and the loss for Enfield could be in the region of minus 1.9% of the Schools Block budget. It was stated that this was an overall loss and would not be evenly spread across schools, so at school level there could be considerable volatility.

If the analysis by London Council was proved accurate, then the reduction in funding for schools would be over and above the real term reduction of between 7 and 10%, because of the pay awards and National Insurance increases schools had to meet.

- (ii) There was insufficient information available for the High Needs Block to form any view of the impact on London, other than a statement in the consultation document that 'local authorities will need to manage with less'.
- (iii) The transitional arrangements for schools were to be managed by applying a minimum funding guarantee.
- (iv) The proposals indicated some role for local authorities and the Schools Forum for the next two years.
- (v) With the proposed changes, there was a concern that in the future there would be no local accountability or flexibility to inform the use of resources to meet local needs and priorities.
- (vi) It was commented that a single formula could be managed but it was unclear how the data used would address the needs of all pupils. The current Government proposals for academisation seemed to remove local accountability further, owing to the removal of the requirement for parent governors. These proposals did not support some of the principles for the SEND reforms for co-production and working with parents. The current DfE publications did not indicate a joined-up approach across Government departments.
- (vii) It was questioned what difference a response from the Forum would make to the final proposals implemented by the Government. It was suggested that, rather than consider the response to each individual question, the Forum consider developing a response that could be used as a public document and shared widely. It was stated that the DfE would have to log and consider every response and it was important for the Forum and also individual members to respond to the two consultation documents.

The Forum's view was that there was a need for as many responses as possible to be submitted.

- (viii) It was observed that it was important to consider the target audience for any document to be shared. It was important to share information on the Forum's view with schools, parents and members of the local communities but any document that was shared needed to be clear and concise.

It was suggested that there should be two separate documents: one that was a detailed response from the Local Authority and Schools Forum which encompassed in full the effect on Enfield and another brief and succinct document, which could be shared with key organisations and if required could be provided to parents. The second document could be used by individuals to assist them in responding to the two consultations.

(ix) The Forum was advised that there was a period of purdah now owing to the Mayoral elections and also the EU Referendum. This limited the Local Authority's ability to engage with Members, MPs, the press, etc.

(x) It was commented that the resources for special schools should be provided to the Local Authority and then allocated by the Local Authority to individual special schools.

It was important that the funding arrangements supported and met the needs of Enfield's most vulnerable pupils.

(xi) It was proposed that schools should receive the AWPU for specialist units and to reflect this change that the basic cost of a place commissioned by the Local Authority for the specialist provision reduces from £10k to £6k.

(xii) The document included 'Invest to save' proposals. It was commented that Enfield was already working hard to do this.

(xiii) It was questioned if there was an update on the review of central services. It was stated that the review was being linked with the work already being carried out on Early Help and on the Council savings individual services were required to meet. Information was being collected on each service. The arrangements and documentation being used had been shared with the Education Resources Group.

It was commented if further savings were required to be made for 2017/18, then it was important for an update on the review to be provided as soon as possible and so enable discussions to be carried out early in the Autumn term.

**Resolved to:**

- Finalise a full joint response from the Local Authority and Schools Forum;
- Draft a document with shorter headline response to each question and circulate to Chairs of Governors, schools and other key partners and stakeholders;
- Provide an update on the review of central services.

**Action: Mrs Brown**

b) Post-16 High Needs Funding – Briefing Paper

**Received** a report providing an update on Post-16 High Needs funding, a copy of which is in the Minute Book.

**Reported** following the brief update provided at the last meeting, officers had considered a range of actions which could be implemented to attempt to control the overall financial pressure created on the High Needs block by the Post-16 placements. The Forum was asked to consider and comment on actions being proposed.

**Noted:**

- (i) These proposals aimed to ensure that there was clarity regarding educational outcomes and the cost which would be met by the Local Authority for Post-16 students in colleges. It was commented some colleges did not have clear pathways for their High Needs students and hence additional funding was being sought for long-term placements.
- (ii) It was commented that there appeared to be a wide cost differential between some of the colleges. It was stated that some colleges provided specialist programmes for students, for example Capel Manor and Oaklands offered specialist horticultural courses for these vulnerable students. Furthermore, the cost information did not show the level of need for each student and some colleges were dealing students with very complex high needs.
- (iii) The North London Strategic Alliance, a partnership between six local authorities, had developed acceptable margins regarding hourly rates charged for professional support. These rates would be used to seek clarity around payments with providers. The partnership also enabled an opportunity to monitor and assure continued quality of provision.

- (iv) The Post-16 study programmes developed for High Needs learners is capped at 600 hours per year, in line with the support currently provided by the EFA.
- (v) It was commented that the duration period for funding provided should be dependent upon the course pursued and the outcomes to be achieved. In some instances, the college placement had become a form of care and there was a need to have clarity about the aspiration and outcome in the EHCP for students.
- (vi) It was observed that the EHCP should be reviewed annually to ensure that the Plan was still required to address the needs and outcomes for the young person. It was stated that this was done but it was the individual college's responsibility to do this. Colleges had found setting up the multi-disciplinary meeting to be challenging and time-consuming to organise.

It was commented that colleges could not fund students for the same qualification more than once. Previously, colleges may have funded students doing additional units, but now the focus for colleges was on students learning to become independent, as well as introducing internships. These changes in focus had to be managed carefully as part of the annual review process. This included managing the parents' assumption that the college placement would replicate the school provision.

The Forum noted and supported the range of actions detailed in the report.

## **5. WORKPLAN**

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

**ACTION: Mrs Brown**

## **6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business

## **7. FUTURE MEETINGS**

- (a) NOTE: since the meeting and publication of the consultation documents, the next meeting would be held on 6 July 2016 at Chace Community School.
- (b) Dates of future meetings were as follows:
  - 13 October 2016
  - 8 December 2016
  - 18 January 2017
  - 01 March 2017
  - 19 April 2017 - tbc
  - 05 July 2017`

## **8. CONFIDENTIALITY**

No items were considered to be confidential.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 4****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Education Resources Group – 16 June 2016  
Schools Forum – 6 July 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Chief Education Officer

Contact officer and telephone number:

Sangeeta Brown – 0208 379 3109

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

Item: 5a

**Subject:**

**School Funding Review: 2016/17**

**Wards: All**

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report provides information on the Section 251 and also comparative data on funding provided to school in 2016/17 and 2015/16.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members are asked to note and comment on this report.

**3. BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION**

3.1 This report is in three parts and includes the following information:

Part 1: Section 251 Analysis

Part 2: Funding delegated to individual schools from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

**4. Section 251 Analysis**

4.1 In line with the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009, local authorities are required to complete and submit to the DfE annually the Section 251 Budget Statement. The Statement provides information to schools and members of the public about the spending plans for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and other children's services funding. The Statements submitted enable some benchmarking to be carried out. Enfield's Section 251 Statement can be found by using the following link:

<https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/children-and-education/children-young-people-and-education/school-welfare-and-information/school-budgets-and-finances/#2>.

4.2 Following the Schools Forum discussions on the use of the DSG and the savings requirement, a comparison of the Statement submitted for 2015/16 and 2016/17 has been carried out. A summary is attached at Appendix A.

Table 1 below provides a top level comparison between 2015/16 and 2016/17 as reported on the S251 Statement.

**Table 1**

| Item                     | 2015/16        | 2015/16     | 2016/17        | 2016/17     |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
|                          | £m             | %           | £m             | %           |
| <b>Delegated Funding</b> | £272.7m        | 87.5%       | £273.2m        | 88.0%       |
| <b>De-delegation</b>     | £0.6m          | 0.2%        | £0.6m          | 0.2%        |
| <b>Pupil Led</b>         | £24.3m         | 7.8%        | £25.8m         | 8.3%        |
| <b>Centrally Held</b>    | £13.9m         | 4.5%        | £11.0m         | 3.5%        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>£311.5m</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>£310.6m</b> | <b>100%</b> |

- 4.3 Unlike previous years, the DfE have not as yet published the Statements they have received from all local authorities. This has meant a comparison of Enfield's Section 251 with our statistical neighbours and outer London has not been possible. This will be carried out when the information becomes available.

## 5. PART 2: FUNDING DELEGATED TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS FROM THE DSG

- 5.1 The funding delegated, inclusive of the minimum funding guarantee, to individual mainstream schools, academies and free schools in Enfield through the DSG in 2016/17 has been compared with funding delegated in 2015/16. The aim of the comparison was to assess the impact of any requirements as part of the Government's School Funding Reforms and also any contextual changes at individual school level.

It should be noted that the information:

- used for the comparison refers solely to the revenue funding provided through the DSG and also the pupil premium grant funding distributed through the Local Authority to each school;
- for academies and free schools was included in the DSG for the first time last financial year. This was because the responsibility for calculating transferred from the Education Funding Agency to local authorities. The pupil numbers for academies and free schools is based on estimates and therefore not totally reliable, so it has not been possible to do a full comparison, which includes academies and free schools.
- for special schools has not been included. This is because special schools are funded on a place plus approach and the funding is agreed separately as part of the arrangements for the High Needs block.

Members are reminded that data used to allocate funding to individual schools is informed by the October Pupil Census as supplied by the Education Funding Agency. For this reason, the data may not necessarily match the local dataset held by either individual schools or the Local Authority.

The comparison was analysed to assess the impact of any contextual changes at individual school level. The attached Appendix B is in three parts and includes school level information on:

- per pupil funding;
- total funding from each of the blocks that forms the DSG and pupil premium funding delegated;
- data such as pupil numbers, numbers of pupils identified for free school meals, IDACI, prior attainment, English as an additional language and mobility funding.

This section of the report highlights the key areas from the analysis carried out.

- 5.3 Table 2 below shows the range of changes in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17, excluding pupil premium and also academies and free schools. In line with the school funding regulations, it can be seen there is very little variation in the per-pupil funding between the two years. This is due to the effect of the minimum funding guarantee and lack of local flexibility to interrogate and inform any change.

| Sector    |         | 2015/16                | 2016/17                |
|-----------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|
|           |         | Per Pupil Funding<br>£ | Per Pupil Funding<br>£ |
| Primary   | Lowest  | 3,852                  | 3,851                  |
|           | Average | 4,554                  | 4,498                  |
|           | Highest | 6,279                  | 6,101                  |
| Secondary | Lowest  | 4,924                  | 4,907                  |
|           | Average | 5,655                  | 5,607                  |
|           | Highest | 6,676                  | 6,615                  |

Table 3 below summaries the numbers of schools, excluding academies and free schools, above and below the average per pupil funding for their delegated budget from the Schools Block 2016/17.

**Table 3**

| <b>Sector</b> | No of schools above average per pupil funding | No of schools below average per pupil funding |
|---------------|---|---|
| Primary       | 30  | 32  |
| Secondary     | 4   | 8   |

- 5.4 Members will note, at individual school level, there are variations in funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17. There are different reasons for these variations and could include changes in pupil numbers, contextual changes, such as free school meal eligibility or a school not continuing to host an ARP or Nurture Group.

Detailed below is an analysis carried out for a sample of schools to further understand any significant increases / decreases in the per-pupil funding:

(a) Primary

(i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Firs Farm: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was -4.0%. It was found the School:

- As part of the expansion programme, had an increase of 31 pupils. With the admission of the additional pupils
  - the School was not eligible to continue to receive the growth fund protection;
  - the non-pupil led funding was distributed across a greater number of pupils;
- Experienced a 3% drop in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- Received IDACI funding for 1 pupil in 2016/17 as opposed to 119 in 2015/16.

(ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

Raglan Junior: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was 1.9%. It was found the School:

- Saw little change in pupil numbers;
- No change in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- A reduction in numbers attracting IDACI and EAL funding;
- An increase in the number of pupils eligible for low prior attainment funding;
- As the unit rate for low prior attainment is higher than that for IDACI and EAL, this may have contributed to the slight increase in funding.

(b) Secondary

(i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Edmonton County: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was -2.6%. It was found the School:

- As part of the expansion programme, had an increase of 82 pupils. With the admission of the additional pupils
  - the School was not eligible to continue to receive the growth fund protection;
  - the non-pupil led funding was distributed across a greater number of pupils;
- Received no funding through the IDACI factor.

(ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

Highlands - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was 0.4%. It was found the School:

- Saw little change in pupil numbers;
- No change in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- A reduction in numbers receiving IDACI;
- An increase in the number of pupils eligible for low prior attainment;
- As the unit rate for low prior attainment is higher than that for IDACI, this may have contributed to the slight increase in funding.



**Section 251 Budget Statement - Analysis**

| Line Items  | 2015/16            |                |              |                | 2016/17            |                |              |                |  |
|---|--------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--|
|   | Total              | % of Total DSG | Pupil Led    | Centrally Held | Total              | % of Total DSG | Pupil Led    | Centrally Held |  |
| 1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget (before Academy recoupment)     | 287,261,089        | 92.21%         | 92.21%       |                | 286,906,041        | 92.36%         | 92.36%       |                | Funding delegated to all schools and academies   |
| 1.1.1 Contingencies: Long service awards                        | 4,521              | 0.00%          | 0.00%        |                | 5,501              | 0.00%          | 0.00%        |                | De-delegation item agreed by the Schools Forum for maintained schools                        |
| 1.1.4 Free school meals eligibility                             | 53,016             | 0.02%          | 0.02%        |                | 59,909             | 0.02%          | 0.02%        |                | De-delegation item agreed by the Schools Forum for maintained schools                        |
| 1.1.6 Museum and Library services                               | 20,446             | 0.01%          | 0.01%        |                |                    |                |              |                | Removed for 2016/17  |
| 1.1.7 Licences/subscriptions: CLEAPSS                           | 119,602            | 0.04%          | 0.04%        |                | 6,001              | 0.00%          | 0.00%        |                | De-delegation item agreed by the Schools Forum for maintained schools                        |
| 1.1.8 Staff costs – supply cover exc cover for facility time    | 336,905            | 0.11%          | 0.11%        |                | 394,521            | 0.13%          | 0.13%        |                | De-delegation item agreed by the Schools Forum for maintained schools                        |
| 1.1.9 Staff costs – supply cover for facility time              | 89,599             | 0.03%          | 0.03%        |                | 143,521            | 0.05%          | 0.05%        |                | De-delegation item agreed by the Schools Forum for maintained schools                        |
| 1.2.1 Top up funding - maintained schools                       | 15,613,968         | 5.01%          | 5.01%        |                | 15,876,374         | 5.11%          | 5.11%        |                | Excep Needs: Top-up for Enfield special & mainstream schools, PRU, ARPs & Outborough support |
| 1.2.2 Top-up funding – academies, free schools and colleges     | 1,393,761          | 0.45%          | 0.45%        |                | 2,071,331          | 0.67%          | 0.67%        |                | Outborough SEN Placements  |
| 1.2.3 Top-up & other funding: non-maintained & indept providers | 5,581,720          | 1.79%          | 1.79%        |                | 6,184,161          | 1.99%          | 1.99%        |                | Outborough SEN Placements  |
| 1.2.5 SEN support service                                       | 2,427,896          | 0.78%          |              | 0.78%          | 1,952,319          | 0.63%          |              | 0.63%          | Central Support for SEN Pupils   |
| 1.2.6 Hospital education services                               | 307,540            | 0.10%          | 0.10%        |                | 308,850            | 0.10%          | 0.10%        |                | Commissioned support for educating pupils in hospital  |
| 1.2.7 Other alternative provision services                      | 2,859,859          | 0.92%          |              | 0.92%          | 2,623,998          | 0.84%          |              | 0.84%          | Support for SEN Pupils   |
| 1.2.8 Support for inclusion                                     | 3,335,089          | 1.07%          |              | 1.07%          | 2,721,219          | 0.88%          |              | 0.88%          | Central Support for SEN Pupils   |
| 1.3.1 Central expenditure on children under 5                   | 630,377            | 0.20%          |              | 0.20%          | 599,713            | 0.19%          |              | 0.19%          | Central support for early years  |
| 1.4.1 Contribution to combined budgets                          | 1,982,400          | 0.64%          |              | 0.64%          | 1,595,629          | 0.51%          |              | 0.51%          | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.2 School admissions   | 880,670            | 0.28%          |              | 0.28%          | 882,640            | 0.28%          |              | 0.28%          | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.3 Servicing of schools forums                               | 7,400              | 0.00%          |              | 0.00%          | 7,400              | 0.00%          |              | 0.00%          | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.6 Capital expenditure from revenue (CERA)                   | 1,548,000          | 0.50%          |              | 0.50%          | 275,522            | 0.09%          |              | 0.09%          | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.7 Prudential borrowing costs                                | 315,490            | 0.10%          |              | 0.10%          | 302,870            | 0.10%          |              | 0.10%          | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.10 Pupil growth/Infant class sizes                          | 1,367,466          | 0.44%          | 0.44%        |                | 1,162,661          | 0.37%          | 0.37%        |                | Items agreed by the Schools Forum  |
| 1.4.13 Other Items: DfE Purchased Licenses                      | -                  |                |              |                | 226,150            | 0.07%          | 0.07%        |                | -  |
| 1.7.4 EFA funding - Sixth form funding                          | (14,595,816)       | (4.69%)        | (4.69%)      |                | (13,681,324)       | (4.40%)        | (4.40%)      |                | -  |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>311,540,998</b> | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>95.5%</b> | <b>4.5%</b>    | <b>310,625,007</b> | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>96.5%</b> | <b>3.5%</b>    |  |

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 5****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Education Resources Group – 16 June 2016  
Schools Forum – 6 July 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Chief Education Officer

Contact officer – name & email:

Sangeeta Brown: [sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

|  |          |
|--|----------|
|  | Item: 5b |
| <b>Subject:</b><br><b>Central Services Funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant &amp; Education Services Grant – Update</b> |          |
|  |          |

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report provides an update on the review of central services funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and also information on the Government's proposed changes to the Education Services Grant (ESG).

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members are asked to note and comment on this report.

**3. BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION**

- 3.1 Following the budget setting process for 2016/17, the Authority has begun to review the central services funded from the DSG.
- 3.2 The Government's consultation document on reforms to the methodology used to fund the Schools and High Needs blocks included proposals to change the current arrangements for funding the Education Services Grant (ESG) and also the central services funded from the DSG.
- 3.3 This report provides an update on the review of the central services and also outlines the Government's proposals for the central services funded from the DSG and the ESG.

**4. REVIEW OF CENTRAL SERVICES**

- 4.1 The review of central services has been incorporated into the work the Authority is currently doing on early help and intervention. The first phase of this work has been to identify the services and to collect as much information as possible. The information will then be used to carry out a mapping exercise. Appendix A details the information collected to date for central services funded from the DSG.
- 4.2 Separately, the DfE are, currently, undertaking a review of historical and combined services commitments funded from the Schools Block to ensure that these predate April 2013, i.e. the point, at which, the school funding reforms were introduced. The aim of the review is to consider whether these the commitments need to cease, reduce or can be maintained because they meet the qualifying definition detailed in the regulations. Table 1 below lists the services included in this review.

**Table 1****Services**

|  |
|--|
| Parents Support Service<br>Joint Services for Disabled Children<br>Educational Support for Looked After Children<br>Prudential Borrowing<br>School Improvement Support<br>School Improvement Support |
|--|

## 5. EDUCATION SERVICES GRANT (ESG)

- 5.1 To support the introduction of the academies programme in 2010, the Government initially created the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG). The aim was to transfer appropriate funding for services, local authorities provided to maintained schools, to academies because as part of the regulations, academies were required to secure these independently. The methodology used for calculating the LACSEG was flawed because the funding was based on historical spends by each local authority. This created a wide variation in both the funding taken from local authorities and then provided to academies.
- 5.2 In 2013/14, the ESG was introduced to replace the LACSEG. The aim was to provide a simpler and more transparent methodology to transfer funding from local authorities to the increasing number of academies.

The ESG is provided as a non-ring fenced grant to both local authorities and academies. For local authorities, the ESG grant has two elements. These are a general element and a retained duties element. Academies only receive the general element. Both local authorities and academies receive £77 per pupil for the general element.

The retained duties element was introduced to provide additional funding for obligations local authorities are required to fulfil for both academies & maintained schools.

- 5.3 For 2016/17, the Enfield's ESG totalled £4.457m and is split between the two elements as follows:

| Elements of Grant | Amount         | Comment  |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| General           | £3.61m         | Funded at £77 per pupil in maintained schools only. Academies receive £77 per pupil directly from the EFA. |
| Retained Duties   | £0.84m         | Funded at £15 per pupil, for all pupils including those in academies                                       |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>£4.457m</b> |  |

Current spending against ESG relevant items for both the general and retained element is over £5m.

### 5.4 Proposed Changes for 2017/18

The Government's School Funding consultation includes proposals, from 2017/18, to reduce and change how the retained duties element is funded and discontinue the general element.

#### (a) ESG - Retained Duties Element

The DfE have proposed that the retained duties element of the ESG and the central services currently resourced from the Schools block within DSG be amalgamated to form a new central block within the DSG. There is no information on the overall funding for this new block, other than that new block would be calculated based on an amount per pupil. There is no information on the rate which would be used for calculation.

#### (b) General Element

As part of their proposals, the DfE have stated that the general element of ESG will be discontinued. It is being proposed that:

- a reduced rate for the general element will be provided for the first 5 months of the 2017/18 financial year;
- from September 2017, the general element funding would totally cease for local authorities and academies.
- Academies would be provided with financial protection arrangements for this change.

(c) Impact of the loss of ESG – General Element

The potential loss for Enfield could be £3.61m by 2018-19.

In their proposals, the DfE have acknowledged that the cessation of this funding within one year would have a major impact for local authorities and suggests this could be managed as follows:

(i) School improvement

As part of the Government's drive for a school-led system, reforms to school improvement policy were announced. As part of this policy, the premise is, at the end of academic year 2016/17, local authorities will not be required to provide school improvement and therefore, in the school funding consultation, it is assumed funding for this function will not be required.

(ii) Charging maintained schools

The DfE have suggested that local authorities should charge maintained schools for the statutory duties carried out for maintained schools, in a similar way to the percentage top slice that multi academy trusts (MATs) often take from the budget shares of their academies.

Unlike MATs, it is proposed that the level of top slice to be retained by local authorities would need to be agreed by the maintained schools members of the Schools Forum, with recourse to the Secretary of State for resolution of any disagreement. In addition, it is unclear how the retention would work and if it will be limited to items as determined by the DfE and therefore restrict any local arrangements / discretion to retain school improvement or any other service.

6. The Authority is currently assessing the impact of the changes being proposed to the ESG, but a full assessment cannot be carried out until the Government have published their proposals for introducing a new fourth block within the DSG.

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 – REPORT NO. 6****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 06 July 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Children's Services &amp; Chief Education Officer

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

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

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>Agenda – Part:</b>                             | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Subject:</b><br><b>Schools Forum: Workplan</b> |          |
| <b>Wards: All</b>                                 |          |

**Recommendation**

To note the workplan.

| <b><u>Meetings</u></b> |  | <b><u>Officer</u></b>      |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| April 2016             | DfE Consultation – National Funding Formula<br>Post 16 High Needs - Briefing   | SB<br>AJ                   |
| July 2016              | School Funding Review (2016/17)<br>School Funding Arrangements (2017/18)<br>Central Services Budgets: Review<br>School Places – Update   | SB<br>SB<br>JT<br>JT       |
| October 2016           | Schools Budget – Update (2016/17)<br>Schools Budget: 2017/18: Update<br>Outturn Report 2015/16<br>Schools Balances 2015/16<br>Central Services Budgets: Decision<br>Schools in Financial Difficulties - Update | LM<br>LM<br>LM<br>SB<br>JT |
| December 2016          | Schools Budget: 2017/18: Update, Inc. De-delegation<br>School Funding Arrangements (2017/18)<br>Central Budgets: Annual Report<br>Local Authority Budget (2016/17)   | LM<br>SB<br>JT<br>ES       |
| January 2017           | Schools Budget: 2015/16: Update<br>Scheme for Financing<br>SEND & High Needs – Update  | JF<br>SB<br>JC             |
| March 2017             | School Budget 2015/16: Update<br>Enfield Traded Services to Schools<br>Scheme for Financing  | LM<br>SB<br>SB             |
| April / May 2016       |  |                            |
| July 2017              | Schools Budget – Update (2017/18)<br>School Funding Review (2017/18)<br>Funding Arrangements (2018/19)   | LM<br>SB<br>SB             |

Please note the individual papers will include any implications arising from the White Paper

**Dates of Meetings**

| <b>Date</b>      | <b>Time</b>    | <b>Venue</b>           | <b>Comment</b> |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 12 October 2016  | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | Chace Community School |                |
| 08 December 2016 | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | Chace Community School |                |
| 18 January 2017  | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | Chace Community School |                |
| 01 March 2017    | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | Chace Community School |                |
| 19 April 2017    | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | TBC                    |                |
| 05 July 2017     | 5:30 - 7:30 PM | Chace Community School |                |

This page is intentionally left blank