

# **MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING**

**Held on 2 April 2014**

**At Enfield County School**

## **Schools Members**

Governors: Mr B Grayston (Primary), *Ms N Conway (Primary)*, Cllr I Cranfield (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mr T McGee (Secondary), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary)

Headteachers: *Mrs P Alder (Primary)*, Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Mr G Lefley (Pupil Referral Unit), *Mrs S Moore (Primary)*, Mr P De Rosa (Special), Ms P Rutherford (Secondary), Mr P Smith (Primary), *Mr R Yarwood (Primary)*, Ms S Warrington (Secondary)

Academies: *Mr M Lees, Ms R Stanley-McKenzie*

---

## **Non-Schools Members:**

Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Panel	<i>Cllr R Simbodyal</i>
Early Years Provider	Mrs S Roberts
14-19 Partnership	<i>Mr K Hintz</i>
Teachers' Committee	Mr Stuart McNamara
Assistant Director Education	Ms J Tosh
Head of Behaviour Support	Mr J Carrick

---

## **Observers:**

Member (Observer)	<i>Cllr A Orhan</i>
Assistant Director Customer Services	Mrs K Robertson
Assistant Director Commissioning & Community Engagement	Mrs E Stickler
Finance Business Partner	Mrs J Fitzgerald
Finance Business Partner	Mrs L McNamara
Resources Development Manager	Mrs S Brown
Resources Development Officer	Ms J Bedford

*Italics denotes absence*

As the position of Chair of Schools Forum was vacant, Ms Stickler opened the meeting.

### **1. INTRODUCTIONS and APOLOGIES for ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Orhan, Ms Conway, Mrs Alder, Mr Goddard, Mr Lefley, Mrs Moore, Mr Yarwood, Mr Lees, Ms Stanley-McKenzie, Cllr Simbodyal, and Mr Hintz.

### **2. ITEM FOR DECISION**

#### **(a) Election of Chair of the Schools Forum for the municipal year (2014/15)**

Ms Stickler invited nominations for the position of Chair of the Schools' Forum.

**Received** a nomination for Mr Grayston for the position of Chair of the Schools Forum.

**Resolved** Mr Grayston be elected Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2014/15.

Mr Grayston thanked the Forum and Ms Stickler and took over the Chair.

#### **(b) Election of Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2014/15**

Mr Grayston sought nominations for the position of Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum.

**Received** a nomination for Mrs Sless for the position of Vice Chair of the Schools Forum.

**Resolved** that Mrs Sless be elected as Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2014/15.

**3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Mrs Leach declared an interest in item 5B Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) presentation as being the Chair of the SEND Reform Group

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

**(a) Schools Forum meeting held on 5 March 2014**

**Received** and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum held on 5 March 2014, a copy of which is included in the Minute book.

**(b) Matters arising from these minutes:**

There were no matters arising.

**5. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

**(a) Special Educational Needs and Disability** - Mrs Leach presented this item.

(Note: this item was presented first at the meeting.)

**Received** a presentation providing details on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Reforms, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

Reported a SEND group comprising of Headteachers, SENCOs, key partners and officers had been set up to oversee the implementations of the SEND Reforms.

The Reforms sought to change the approach for supporting children and young people. The Reforms were required to be implemented from September 2014.

**Clerks note: 17:40 Ms Tosh arrived at this point**

**Noted:**

- (i) The DfE had consulted on the Code of Practice supporting the Reforms and were currently in the process of re-drafting the Code of Practice. There was still a requirement to start the implementation of the Reforms from September 2014.
- (ii) The Reforms would replace the Special Educational Needs Statements with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHC Plan). The EHC Plan would be based on outcomes. The EHC Plan would support children and young people in education from birth to the age of 25. The Statements would need to be replaced by the EHC Plan over a three year period. The Reforms enable the consideration of a personal budget where an EHC Plan is in place.

**Clerks note: 17:45 Mr McNamara arrived at this point**

The EHC Plans would be based on outcomes and required to follow the Code of Practice. The aim of the EHC Plan was to have clarity of the needs to be met and an agreed basis on how these will be delivered and who will be responsible for meeting the requirements for particular outcomes.

The Forum also noted that a pilot to trial the draft EHC Plan was being carried out with a number of schools during the Summer term. The aim was to consider and develop a process which would support the change to an EHC Plan based on outcomes for the child / young person.

The categorisation of School Action and School Action+ currently used by schools will be replaced by a single SEN Support in School category.

It was commented that it was important to have consistency in the pro-forma used by schools across the borough. It was stated that templates were being devised for use by schools and parents. A draft pro forma was being piloted with a few schools.

- (iii) The Reforms have placed a duty on local authorities to publish a Local Offer of services and for schools to publish their own 'local offer' for their schools.

The purpose of the Local Offer was to provide clear information of what support would be available to families of children / young people with SEND to meet their needs.

The draft Local Offer for Enfield had been published for consultation. Officers had held meetings with parents and carers. The meetings were aimed at seeking parents and carers' views on the Local Offer. It was stated officers had, to date, met with over 150 parents to discuss the SEND Reforms and seek feedback on the draft Local Offer.

- (iv) The Reforms also affect colleges and they would be named in the EHC Plan together with what they would be required to provide for the young person.
- (v) The Government had provided some initial grant funding to support Council services to build capacity and provide training and support to schools and parents. It was stated the funding would also be used to develop a communication strategy to ensure information was cascaded to key stakeholders and partners quickly and appropriately. The Authority was also commissioning voluntary organisations to provide support and training to parents / carers.
- (vi) It was questioned how the resources would support children in early years settings. It was stated that Early Years Practitioners would be working to identify, record and assess children and then will monitor and review their progress.

The Forum thanked Mrs Leach for her presentation.

### **Clerks note: 18:00 Ms Robertson arrived at this point**

- b) Welfare Benefit Reform - Ms Robertson attended the meeting to present this item.

**Received** a presentation providing an update on the Welfare Benefit Reforms, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

**Reported** the key changes since the previous presentation in April 2013.

#### **Noted:**

- (i) A task force had been set up to work with families who had been most affected by the Reforms to ensure their income was maximised. So far, the task force had supported 120 families to claim the right benefits.
- (ii) The average loss being experienced by families was £71 per week but 193 families experiencing losses of more than £100.
- (iii) As part of the Social Sector under-occupation, if a household was assessed as having more bedrooms than deemed needed for the number of occupants then their Housing Benefit was reduced. The result of this policy had seen an increase in rent arrears.

Some families had lived in their homes for a long time and therefore, for various reasons, found it difficult to consider moving to another property. The consequence of

not moving meant they were unable to bridge the gap between the loss in benefits and their rent.

It was questioned were there any other issues effecting families for moving to an alternative property. It was stated that one issue was the alternative housing option may not be in a location or style of home which met the householder's need. Also, there was the issue of insufficient stock.

It was stated that if there was a child with disabilities living in the home, the family were exempt from the Social Sector under-occupation policy. However, for a married couple where one partner had a disability and needed their own bedroom, they were not exempt. The Council was supporting these families by providing discretionary payments so the loss was minimised. The funding was only available on an annual basis so it was uncertain whether this support would be available in future years.

It was confirmed that foster carers were also exempt from this policy.

- (iv) The Reforms had led to an increase in the number of claimants becoming self-employed but this was creating other problems and issues for the claimants. The issues related to not being able to provide the evidence required by HMRC.
- (v) Personal Independent Payment (PIP) had replaced Disability Living Allowance (DLA). It was stated that the Government had employed private contractor 'Atos' to carry out assessments. Disability Groups had raised concerns with the way Atos were assessing claimants. The issues included the people seeking a PIP were vulnerable and in need and were being asked to attend an assessment without any support. . Due to the concerns raised, the Government had confirmed that Atos would not be doing PIP assessment.

The assessment of new claimants for PIP started in 2013. The reassessment of existing claimants under the new criteria would start from 2015/16.

- (vi) Employment Support Allowance (ESA) had replaced Incapacity Benefit.

It was stated that if a parent's ESA was stopped then they were required to sign onto Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) immediately, even if they were seeking to appeal the withdrawal of the JSA. This was an important requirement because if the parent did not sign up for ESA, then they would not have access to any money through benefits. The Council had found that some vulnerable people had not had access to any money since November 2013.

- (vii) There were long delays in people receiving decisions on PIP / ESA with people waiting on average 6 – 12 months without money. It was confirmed that once the decision had been reached the payments were backdated to the date of the claim
- (viii) Crisis Loans previously issued by the DWP were abolished in March 2013, and the Council had been given funding for a two year period to provide emergency support. This funding was due to cease from April 2015. The Council's Emergency Support Scheme aimed to provide:
  - A one-off crisis issue for a homeowner, in receipt of out of work benefit, without food or fuel (boiler breakdown etc.)
  - A discretionary scheme for resettlement for victims of domestic violence, leaving prison or a move to a place of safety.

It was stated for an individual to access this funding they had to be assessed. The Council had provided support to 600 households at a total cost of £0.5m.

- (ix) Other support was provided by the two Food banks set in the east of the borough. The Food banks had supported over 3000 adults and children.

It was questioned how families accessed the provisions available from the Food Banks. It was stated that families were referred by an agreed named organisation / individual.

- Enfield North foodbank (based on A10)  
Mark Trezise - [mark@jubileechurchlondon.org](mailto:mark@jubileechurchlondon.org)
- Edmonton foodbank  
Jasmine Assamoi - [jassamoi@edmonton.foodbank.org.uk](mailto:jassamoi@edmonton.foodbank.org.uk)

It was questioned who were the agreed named organisation / individual and could this be one of the private, voluntary or independent nursery providers. It was stated that referrals could be made by schools, Councillors, Children's Centres and any other agreed agencies. Information on how to become an agreed agent was available on the Enfield website.

Once agreed, each agent was provided with vouchers to give to their clients. One of the stipulations was that families could only use the Food Bank a maximum of three times in a six month period.

It was questioned whether councillor's were aware they were able to provide vouchers to their most vulnerable constituents. It was commented that it would be helpful if the Councillors were reminded that they could register and have some vouchers during their surgeries with constituents.

It was commented the location of the two Food Banks was not very helpful and would result in difficulties, such as the cost of transport, for the families to actually get to the Food Banks. It was stated that issues had been highlighted about families both travelling to and from the Food Bank. The Council was considering how this issue could be addressed.

**Resolved** information on how to apply to be an agent for Food Bank would be circulated with the minutes

**Clerks note: 18:35 Mr McGee and Cllr Cranfield left at this point**

- (x) The numbers of evictions were rising due to a number of reasons. These included:
- Private landlords were aware that the LA had a duty to provide housing and there had been an increase in number of evictions by private landlords of tenants on benefit. This was because the landlords were looking to sign a temporary contract with the Council which guaranteed rental income whether the property was occupied or vacant and also the Council took responsibility for maintenance.
  - families affected by the Cap and therefore unable to pay their rent also results in evictions.

It was questioned what was the outcome of these evictions. It was stated that the result was an increase in homeless applications which had meant more people placed

into temporary accommodation. Families with children were assisted with advice and options for housing. This included the offer of assistance to secure a property in the privately rented sector. In an emergency, the Council would need to consider temporary accommodation. Due to the shortage of accommodation within the borough, the families had little choice of their accommodation and this could result in multiple moves. It was commented that these multiple moves had a direct impact on the education of the children and young people.

It was questioned whether the Council was considering how the shortage of accommodation could be addressed. It was stated that the Council was in the process of considering various options and assessing each to see which would be the most cost effective, affordable and appropriate over the longer term.

**Clerks note: 18:40 Ms Tosh left at this point**

- (xi) The Council tax benefit scheme was abolished in March 2013. The Council had agreed to provide working age households up to 80.5% support for Council tax.
- (xii) As part of the Universal Credit, there would be a compulsory requirement for claimants to use the online Jobsmatch site and if an individual was identified as not accessing this site then their benefits would be stopped.

This change was part of a shift to extend all claims to a digital format, which would also include access to DWP and HRMC. The Forum raised their concerns as to whether individuals would have the skills and appropriate access to a computer to complete the electronic process.

**Resolved** information on how to apply to be an agent for Food Bank would be circulated with the minutes.

**Action: Mrs Brown**

The Forum thanked Ms Robertson for her presentation.

**Clerks note: 18:50 Ms Robertson left at this point**

**(c) Universal Infant Free School Meals**

**Received** a paper providing details of the Universal Infant Free School Meals, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

**Reported** a letter had been sent to all Headteachers of Primary and Special Schools. The letter provided an update on progress and included information on a report being presented to Cabinet. The report to Cabinet sought to seek approval for use of the Capital Maintenance funding to support the urgent building works required for this initiative. A copy of the letter was tabled at the meeting and is included in the Minute Book.

**Noted:**

- (i) Infant Free School Meals was a new statutory requirement for schools, from September 2014, to provide free school meals to Reception, Years 1 and 2 pupils.
- (ii) For 2014/15, the Government had allocated £150m capital funding nationally, of which £0.818m was for non-voluntary aided schools and £0.231m voluntary aided schools in Enfield. Academies were required to bid for capital funding separately.
- (iii) In terms of revenue funding, the Government had confirmed that £450m will be available. Each school would receive £2.30 per pupil based on actual take up by newly eligible pupils. It was stated the use of newly eligible pupils meant only pupils

not registered for Free School Meals would be eligible for this funding. The level of take up would be measured from the termly Pupil Census submitted by schools.

- (iv) A Headteacher and Local Authority Consultative Group had been set up to support the co-ordination of introducing this initiative in Enfield. It was confirmed that the Consultative Group included Headteacher representatives reflecting the different types of catering provision used by schools.
- (v) From information gathered from the Free School Meals Pilot at Eastfield School and other local authorities where the universal provision was already in place, the Enfield Catering Service had estimated an additional 4000 meals per day would be required.

The Enfield Catering Service was carrying out an assessment on staffing, adequacy of school kitchen equipment and the impact of increased capacity on schools.

It was commented that the Enfield Catering Service estimate did not include those schools either providing meals in house or using an alternative provider. These schools were considering how to manage the implementation of this initiative. The practical issues confronting schools included having sufficient space in the dining hall, furniture & equipment and staff on duty. There was a concern how the full cost of this initiative would be met.

It was stated that schools may also need to consider issues related to timetabling and if there would be any impact on how other provision, such as breakfast clubs, was provided.

It was commented that the principle of providing free school meals was positive and should be seen as an important development. However, the issue with the introduction of this initiative was the additional burden it was creating for schools and the Authority without having the appropriate funding. The Forum noted this initiative should be funded appropriately and not be a cost.

- (vi) It was questioned if funding was based on actual take up when schools would receive the funding if the take up was above 85%. It was stated that the information from January 2015 Pupil Census would be used to make the necessary adjustments and any reduction or increase in funding would be reflected in the funding provided in the Summer 2015 term.
- (vii) There was a need to ensure and encourage all parents of pupils eligible for free school meals to continue to formally apply for free school meals. If parents did not do this then schools will see a reduction in their funding to support pupils from a deprived background.

It was commented schools in their local partnership groups were and had developed procedures to engage with parents and improve registration of free school meal eligibility.

It was suggested to encourage parents to apply that consideration should be given as to what other benefit could be offered parents.

#### **(d) Fairer School Funding – 2015/16: DfE Consultation Document**

**Received** a paper providing details on Fairer School Funding – 2015/16 DfE Consultation Document, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

**Reported** a draft response to the proposals contained in the consultation document had been prepared. A copy of the draft response had been circulated separately to the members of the Forum and a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

The draft response would be the subject of discussion for this meeting and confirmation was sought from the Forum as to whether they would like to submit a joint response with the Authority.

**Noted:**

- (i) The evidence to support the allocation of the additional £350m to some local authorities as underfunded was not sufficiently robust nor how this would support the Government's policy for implementing a national funding formula.
- (ii) The current DSG was provided on a flat cash basis and did not provide funding to meet the pressures being faced by schools. The Forum supported the view that the additional £350m identified for the proposals in the consultation document would be better used to support the cost of the pressures which all schools were facing.
- (iii) It was suggested the response be considered a public response to this consultation document and shared accordingly. It was stated that the final response would form part of the papers for the next Forum meeting and papers for the Forum were published on the Enfield Website.

It was further suggested that it would be helpful if the final response could be circulated, for comment, to all Forum members before it was submitted.

- (iv) The consultation document had not considered the funding arrangements for the Early Years or High Needs Blocks. It was stated that this was a matter of concern because of the increase in the number of pupils with complex needs. The Forum were reminded of the reports presented to the previous meetings of the Forum on the need for additional resources to meet the increase in the number of pupils with autism.

The Forum's view was that the funding arrangements needed to ensure that the funding provided met the cost of educating all children and young people.

**Resolved** to circulate the final response, for comment, to all Forum members before it was submitted.

**ACTION: Mrs Brown**

**Clerks Note: 19:30 Mrs Leach and Mr Carrick left at this point.**

**6. Scheme for Financing Schools 2014-15**

**Received** copy of the Scheme for Financing Schools 2014-15, a copy of which is in the minute book

**Reported** the copy of the Scheme for Financing Schools circulated had been updated to incorporate all the decisions made by the Schools Forum during the past year.

**7. WORKPLAN**

**Received** the Workplan for the Schools Forum meetings, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

Noted the additional items to be included in the workplan.

**ACTION: Mrs Brown**

**8. FUTURE MEETINGS**

(a) Date for the next meeting: 09 July 2014 at Enfield County School

(b) Proposed dates for future meetings:

- 15 October 2014



- 10 December 2014
- 21 January 2015
- 4 March 2015

9. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

None of the above was regarded as confidential.

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/2015 REPORT NO. 5

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**  
Commissioning Group 27 June 2014  
Schools Forum – 9th July 2014

**REPORT OF:**  
Director of Finance, Resources &  
Customer Services

**Contact officer & telephone number:**

Jayne Fitzgerald 020 8379 5571

**Email:** [Jayne.Fitzgerald@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jayne.Fitzgerald@enfield.gov.uk)

	<b>Item:</b> 4a
<b>Subject:</b> Schools' Budget 2014/15 Update	
<b>Wards: All</b>	

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a brief update on the schools' budget position for 2014/15.

At the March meetings it was reported that the initial DSG allocation had been announced and that Enfield estimated an allocation of £293.796m. Schools Forum agreed a draft budget based on these estimated resources.

The draft DSG settlement received on 20th December included a provisional allocation for High Needs. The final High Needs settlement has now been received, resulting in an increase of £662k in resources.

The report summarises the final DSG and budget position and gives an indication of the expected DSG balances at year end.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The contents of this report are noted.

### 3. DSG 2014/15

Following the final settlement of the High Needs block funding at the end of March the estimated DSG for 2014/15 is £295.838m, including an estimate of £665k for growth in the Early Years block. Details of funding received and how this has been allocated to the three funding blocks, as previously approved by Schools Forum, is set out below:

#### Summary of Funding and Draft Budgets by Funding Block

2014/15 DSG (March 2014)	GUF	Pupil Numbers	Total
	£		£000
Schools Block	5,194	46,731	242,722
Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers			71
Early Years Block (based on Jan 2013 census)	3,948	3,176	12,539
Estimated Increase in Early Years Funding (for Jan 14 and Jan 15 adjustments)			665
High Needs Block (includes post 16)			31,024
2 Year Old Funding			7,717
Carbon Reduction Credits			(280)
<b>Total Estimated DSG 2014/15</b>			<b>294,458</b>
Add Allocation of funding from Reserves			1,380
<b>Total DSG plus Reserve allocation</b>			<b>295,838</b>
<b>Summary of Draft Budgets by Funding Block:</b>			
Schools Block			239,818
Early Years			18,722
High Needs			37,298
<b>Total Draft Budget</b>			<b>295,838</b>

#### 4. Schools Budget 2014/15

The main change since the budget was last reported to Schools Forum in March is the addition of £570k for Exceptional Needs in the Schools block. Revised estimates for exceptional needs were received after the draft budget was reported in March and showed a marked increase that had not been reflected in the draft budget. This pressure has been contained within 2014/15 DSG resources due to the receipt of an additional £661k in the final High Needs block settlement.

#### 2014-15 Schools Budget - Split by Funding Block updated April 2014

DSG	Estimated DSG 2014-15 £000	Change from 2013-14 £000
<b>DSG ALLOCATION 2014/15</b>	295,838	3,880

Schools Block	2014-15 £'000	Change from 2013-14 £000
Primary Schools - incl Demographic Changes	135,126	4,378
Secondary Schools - incl Demographic Changes	98,585	-2,251
<b>Total Allocated through Schools Funding Formula</b>	<b>233,711</b>	<b>2,127</b>
Centrally Managed Budgets	4,418	-538
Growth Fund	1,688	-105
<b>TOTAL SCHOOLS BLOCK</b>	<b>239,818</b>	<b>1,483</b>

Early Years Block	2014-15 £'000	Change from 2013-14 £000
EY Maintained	5,703	214
EY PVI	6,609	232
EY 2 year olds	5,846	905
Central Functions	565	0
<b>TOTAL EARLY YEARS BLOCK</b>	<b>18,723</b>	<b>1,351</b>

<b>High Needs Block</b>	<b>2014-15 £'000</b>	<b>Change from 2013-14 £000</b>
Special Schools	13,214	469
Secondary Tuition Centre	2,141	0
Nurture Groups	1,015	0
ARPs & Language Units	2,320	455
SEN exceptional needs	4,048	570
Central Functions & Contingencies	13,166	-1,533
Hospital Provision	308	0
Post 16 FE/ISPs	1,005	1,005
Autism Advisory Service	80	80
<b>TOTAL HIGH NEEDS BLOCK</b>	<b>37,297</b>	<b>1045</b>

<b>TOTAL BLOCKS</b>	<b>295,838</b>	<b>3,880</b>
---------------------	----------------	--------------

## 5. DSG balances

As part of the budget setting process an allocation of £1.380m was made from DSG balances. The report on the demand for autism places elsewhere on the agenda is requesting an additional £0.800m to be allocated from balances. This is not currently reflected in the budgets shown above. If approved this will give a total allocation from balances of £2.180m, increasing the total 2014/15 budget to £296.638m and the High Needs block to £38.097m.

The draft outturn for 2013/14 indicates that general balances at the year end will be approximately £5.5m, and this will reduce to £3.3m after the recommended allocations are made.

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/2015 REPORT NO. 6

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**  
Commissioning Group 27 June 2014  
Schools Forum – 16 July 2014

**REPORT OF:**  
Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:  
Sangeeta Brown – 0208 379 3109  
E-mail: [sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

	Item: 4b
<b>Subject:</b> School Funding Review: 2014/15	
<b>Wards: All</b>	

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a brief comparison of the changes in funding delegated to schools between 2013/14 and 2014/15.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The contents of this report are noted.

### 3 BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 This report compares the funding delegated to individual schools for 2014/15 with the funding delegated in 2013/14. The information refers solely to the revenue funding provided through the Schools Block and includes allocation of the pupil premium grant funding distributed through the Local Authority.

The report includes details of academies where their funding forms part of the Schools Block.

- 3.2 The information 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.
- 3.3 Members will aware as part of the School Funding Reforms, the data used to allocate to fund the individual budget schools is informed by the October Pupil Census as supplied by the Education Funding Agency. This may mean that the data may not match the local dataset held by either individual schools or the Local Authority.

### 4 Analysis

- 4.1 The analysis for this report has been derived from information included in the attached appendices.

The appendices are in three parts with information on changes in:

- per pupil funding for individual schools

- total and pupil premium funding for individual schools
- pupil numbers, numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals

4.2 The information has been analysed to assess the impact of the changes required for 2014/15 as part of the Government's School Funding Reforms. Please note, for comparison purposes, the figures include the minimum funding guarantee. The table below shows the range of changes in per pupil funding between 2013/14 and 2014/15 excluding pupil premium

Sector		2013/14 Per Pupil Funding £	2014/15 Per Pupil Funding £
Primary	Lowest	3,823	3,841
	Average	4,521	4,553
	Highest	5,600	6,348
Secondary	Lowest	4,936	4,930
	Average	5,740	5,767
	Highest	6,649	6,690

The numbers of schools above and below the average per pupil funding for their delegated budget from the Schools Block 2014/15 are:

Sector	No of schools above average per pupil funding £	No of schools below average per pupil funding £
Primary	32	33
Secondary	8	11

4.3 The analysis has shown that across both sectors there has been a significant reduction in the number of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM). The table below summarises the change:

Sector	No of Pupils for FSM 2013/14	No of Pupils for FSM 2014/15	Variance	Variance %
Primary	8,257	6,944	(1,312)	-15.9%
Secondary	4,395	3,839	(557)	-12.7%
Total	12,652	10,783	(1,869)	-28.6%

Officers are working on identifying the reasons for the large reduction in pupils eligible for free school meals. The findings from this review will be the subject of a separate report.

Members will be aware in order to ameliorate the drop in pupils eligible for FSM, the overall funding allocated through the Schools Block for this funding factor was maintained. This was done by increasing the unit rate from £1,191 to £1,514 for primary schools and from £1,458 to £1,971 for secondary schools.

4.4 Detail analysis was carried out for a sample of schools to further understand the

increase / decrease in the per pupil funding at these schools:

(a) Primary

(i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Hazelwood Junior - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2013/14 and 2014/15 was minus 4.3%. The investigation into the factors affecting this change found the School had a decrease by two for number of pupils on roll. The School also experienced a significant decrease in the number of pupils eligible for free school meals, number of pupils identified as requiring additional educational needs and with English as an additional language. The overall effect of these decreases meant that the School attracted less funding across all the main pupil led factors which form the funding formula.

(ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

St John's - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2013/14 and 2014/15 was 13.4%. The investigation into the factors affecting this change found that St Johns being a very small primary school with less than 100 pupils and any significant variation in pupil numbers has a considerable impact on the apportionment of the fixed lump sum allocation, i.e. non age weighted pupil units (AWPU). This is because the costs are apportioned across a fewer or larger number of pupils. St Johns School had a decrease of 5 pupils (5%) between 2013/14 and 2014/15 and this meant the non AWPU funding was allocated over a smaller number of pupils then the previous year and thus leading to an overall increase in the per pupil funding.

(b) Secondary

(i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Enfield County - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2013/14 and 2014/15 was minus 0.8%. The investigation into the factors affecting this change found that the School experienced a decrease in per pupil funding due to a significant reduction in the number of pupils eligible for FSM. The slight increase in the number of pupils on roll may have had a slight impact on the allocation of the lump sum at per pupil level because of the need to include more pupils.

(ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

The high percentage increase was investigated for two schools.

St Anne's - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2013/14 and 2014/15 was 2.9%. The investigation into the factors affecting this change found that the higher than average increase in per pupil funding was due to a 2.2% decrease in the number of pupils on roll. This decrease has resulted in a higher per pupil apportionment



for the lump sum. The School also experienced a significant increase in the number of pupils attracting funding through the additional educational needs and English as an Additional Language factors used for the funding formula.

- 4.5 This report provides a very brief and top level analysis and further work will continue to understand the full impact of the funding formula.

# MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/2015 REPORT NO. 7

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**  
Schools Forum – 9 July 2014

**REPORT OF:**  
Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:  
Jenny Tosh  
E-mail: [jenny.tosh@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jenny.tosh@enfield.gov.uk)

	Item: 5a
<b>Subject:</b> Autism Update	
<b>Wards: All</b>	

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides an update on progress on developing autism provision.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Schools Forum is asked to consider and confirm acceptance of the developments detailed in this report and to agree the additional allocation of £255k for autism provision as detailed in paragraph 4.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At the Forum's meeting on 5 March 2014, members were given an update on the action plan which the Autism Development Group (ADG) had produced to develop autism provision in Enfield. The action plan has three key strands.

This report provides an update on progress and seeks the Forum view and acceptance of the proposals for delivering on the three strands.

This report outlines the areas which need to be considered for implementing this initiative and provides update on progress to date.

### 3.2 Update

- 3.2.1 Strand 1 – Increasing the support to mainstream schools to meet the needs of pupils with Autism

To support this strand, the actions which have been carried out to date and planned include:

- Training group has planned CPD programme for teachers and support staff;
- Training for leading teacher qualification in process. It is intended for a pilot to be set up in Autumn 2014;
- Russet House (RH) has agreed to line manage and co-ordinate the proposed advisory service. The Headteacher of RH has taken the lead in the recruitment process for the new service lead. The interviews are planned for 2 July.

### 3.2.2 Strand 2 – Addressing the numbers of pupils who are not having their needs met

The Authority is working with special and mainstream school to put arrangements in place for these vulnerable pupils. The actions which have been carried out to date and planned include:

- All primary pupils identified have been assessed in terms of priority needs (40 plus)
- RH has admitted 2 additional pupils this term. Plans are in place for RH to work with Carterhatch Infants to admit 14 (2 bulge classes) in September 2014.
- Years 6 /7 transition arrangements to Durants have been agreed. The process has aimed to prioritise those at most risk of losing their place, not being placed or supported
- Between 5 – 10 pupils will still need to be referred to out of borough schools to avoid tribunal cases
- Advisory service is expected to be in place for Sept 2014 to offer support to pupils still in mainstream and provide advice for staff

### 3.2.3 Strand 3 - Meeting the long term need for more specialist provision for pupils with Autism in Enfield

This strand aims to consider how the growing number of pupils with autism can be met through more specialist provision. The options which have been or are being considered include:

- Preferred option which has been identified is to permanently expand both existing special schools by 50 pupils;
- RH be expanded on the existing site and develop links with Carterhatch Schools and Children's centre (CC). The CC would be developed as a specialist early years centre. The issues effecting this options include planning , traffic and use of playing fields and are being considered.
- Meeting the increasing needs of older pupils in severity. If Durants were to expand to support this increasing need then the school will need to move to a completely new site or develop as split site provision. The Authority is continuing to explore options for both possibilities.
- West Lea has agreed to offer 14 additional places for Sept 14. The increasing needs of children and young people with autism have been identified as a key priority.

## 4 **FUNDING UPDATE**

- 4.1 The Schools Forum agreed to support the development of the autism provision by an allocation of one-off funding of £800k in 2014/15 from DSG balances. At the meeting on 5 March, the Forum agreed to fund £250k for a Specialist Advisory Service, of which £80k has been included in the 2014/15 budget and the balance to be spent over next couple of years. It is now recommended that further allocations totalling £255k be made to fund items identified in the table below, which shows the financial implications for delivering the three strands.. There is also a requirement to equip and fund temporary classroom provision at Durants which has not yet been

quantified, and a further report will be brought to Schools Forum to agree funding for this once identified.

Strands	Service	Funding Requirements	When from
Strand 1	Specialist Advisory Service	£250k over two - three years (already agreed)	Summer 2014
Strand 1	Lead Teacher Training Accreditation Programme	£50k over two years	Autumn 2014
Strand 2	To support additional pupils at Russet House	£55k	Autumn 2014
Strand 3	Early Years Centre at Carterhatch	£100k for staffing & refurbishment works	Autumn 2014
Across all Strands	Parent Support Service	£50k	

Areas for future agreement with:

Strands	Service	Funding Requirements	When from
Strand 3	Durants - Temp & then development of a new site, temp for Durants	Not known at this time	

## 5 Conclusion

- 5.1 A further update including a final strategy to meet the longer term needs of pupils with autism will be presented to the Forum in Autumn 2014.

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/2015 REPORT NO. 8

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**  
Schools Forum 9 July 2014

**REPORT OF:**  
Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:  
Sangeeta Brown – 0208 379 3109  
E-mail: [sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

	Item: 5b
<b>Subject:</b> <b>Support for Schools in Financial Difficulties:</b> <b>2014/15</b>	

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides information on the schools currently experiencing financial difficulties and includes proposals on how to support maintained schools in this position.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Maintained schools representatives on the Schools Forum are asked to consider and agree the proposals contained in this report.

### 3 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

- 3.1 For 2014/15, the DfE introduced a new factor for providing financial supporting in exceptional circumstances to schools with falling rolls. The use of this factor was restricted to use for schools deemed to be good or outstanding following an Ofsted inspection. The exceptional circumstances under which the criteria could be used would be to provide temporary support for a drop in the pupil population. Unlike the other factors in the funding formula, this factor is specifically for maintained schools and not academies.
- 3.2 The position for Enfield is that there are a few schools experiencing financial difficulties due to a change in their particular circumstances, or contextual challenges has resulted in a significant fall in the number of pupils on roll at these schools. These schools are currently not judged to be good or outstanding from the Ofsted inspection and therefore would not be eligible the new factor allowed as part of the funding formula could not be considered for these schools.
- 3.3 The Schools Forum agreed to set up a contingency of £800k from the balances carried forward to support schools in financial difficulties due to a significant fall in the number of pupils on roll. The reason for establishing this contingency was because it was considered important to support these schools through the current drop in their pupil numbers and ensure there were sufficient pupil places to support the increase in pupil numbers forecasted from 2017 / 18.
- 3.2 This report considers ways in which this funding could be used to support schools in financial difficulties under these circumstances. Members are asked to consider and agree the proposals contained in this report.

#### 4. PUPIL NUMBER ANALYSIS

- 4.1 The Authority as part of its pupil place planning is continuously examining, reviewing and updating pupil numbers' forecasts. A wide variety of both national and local data is used to inform the pupil projections for short, medium and long term. This can lead to some variation between the projection and the in-year position. The current position is showing that there is a plateauing this year of the number of primary pupils and a slight decrease in the number of secondary pupils.
- 4.2 Following the budget setting process, the pupil number information has been looked at in detail at individual school level. The information showed that there were some primary and secondary schools with a significant drop in pupil numbers. The reduction in numbers was not due to reasons which were known and could have been included by the schools in their planning in previous years.
- 4.3 Information on the initial acceptance of a school place from September 2014 for Reception and Year 7 pupils has now been received. This information indicates a few primary and secondary schools have experienced a significant drop in pupil numbers.

The table below shows the percentage reductions being faced by these schools:

	Planned Admission Number	Acceptance @ 1 June 14	Variance No	Variance %
Bush Hill Park	90	62	-28	69%
Eldon Infant	150	128	-22	85%
De Bohun	60	39	-21	65%
Broomfield	230	83	-147	36%
Bishop Stopford's	186	82	-104	44%
Lea Valley High	240	175	-65	73%
St Ignatius College	186	159	-27	85%

- 4.4 From knowledge of movement following acceptance, it can be assumed the position on pupil numbers at individual schools will change between now and September 2014 and be more positive. However, there will be two primary and three secondary schools where this is unlikely to be the case. All these schools have experienced a decline or stagnation in pupil numbers.

There are many and varied reasons for the drop in pupil numbers being experienced by these schools. The key ones include:

- (a) School Expansion: the Impact of new class opening in surrounding schools where the pupil numbers are projected to increase during the year.
- (b) New Academies and Free Schools: the opening of new academies and free schools both within the Borough and Enfield's boundary. The reason this is an issue for Enfield and also other authorities is that these academies and free schools have been approved by the DfE to be developed and opened. There has been no discussion with the Local Authority on whether this new provision is required or not as part of the basic need assessment.

It is forecasted that an increase in capacity is not be required until 2018 and is definitely not required at this point in time. The effect of this increase capacity, through the opening of new or refurbished academies and free schools, has

meant surplus places in existing mainstream schools and also existing academies.

- (c) Pupils from Other Local Authorities: there has been a drop in the number of pupils living in other local authorities, such as Haringey, Barnet and Hertfordshire, choosing not to come to an Enfield school. Again, this is because the schools being chosen are existing schools that have been rebuilt or new academies / free schools. Another factor, in some cases, has been the improvement in standards in the schools in the other local authorities.
- (d) Parental Preferences: there are a number of factors which will influence parental preferences. The result of previous poor performance either due to the outcomes of an Ofsted inspection or the results from national tests. Other factors which may also influence the choice of school include:
- schools attended by siblings, especially if the family have moved from another area;
  - ease of travel to a particular school;
  - feedback / observation from other parents;
  - facilities and resources at individual schools;

All these factors build up a perception of individual schools and inform the choice of school.

## **5. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

5.1 Based on the pupil projection information, it is considered important that existing schools are supported through the short term drop in pupil numbers. This is to ensure that the progress and improvements in standards these schools are making continues for the pupils currently at these schools. The support which needs to be provided includes financial, educational and marketing.

5.2 The Authority has been meetings with the schools affected by the drop in pupil numbers and the areas of support detailed above have been the key areas of concern and discussion. The following paragraphs will discuss the three areas individually and outline some possible options for consideration going forward.

### **5.3 Financial Support**

The Audit Commission carried out some research a number of years ago on school places. The research considered issues around capacity including demand and supply for places. The research found:

- (a) Primary Schools: are required to have a teacher for each class irrespective of the number of pupils. The two schools identified in paragraph 4.3 above have raised some concerns as to whether they will have sufficient resources to meet the cost of a teacher.
- (b) Secondary Schools with a pupil roll of less than 600 are likely to experience difficulties both educationally and financially. One of the reasons cited is that secondary schools have to deliver a wide curriculum to give pupils a breadth of choice. This would require a sufficient number of teachers with specialist knowledge in their chosen subjects. Ofsted in their research have commented whilst small secondary schools of 600 pupils or less may continue to operate;

they may not meet with success.

Information gathered from a few other local authorities on how they are supporting schools with falling rolls would seem to be in line with the Audit Commission findings. The view is that schools with a pupil roll of 600 would find it very tight financially and may struggle to meet Ofsted's judgement of meeting with success. However, a drop below 600 is likely to lead the school into a deficit position. Other local authorities are considering or have developed formulaic allocation for secondary schools with pupil roll below 600.

The Authority could consider two possible approaches to a formulaic approach. These are where the pupil numbers drop below:

- an agreed number, or
- an agreed percentage

Both these approaches have their advantages and drawbacks. If used in isolation, the main disadvantage would be some schools would attract funding when they do not require it. These could be schools where there is an agreed reduction in pupil numbers due to the loss of a bulge class, excessive balances.

#### 5.4 Educational and Building Support

The Authority has a process for working with the schools in educational and financial difficulties. The School Improvement Service has been working with schools to ensure that the 'Requires Improvement' schools are 'Good' for the next inspection. This has included providing additional leadership support and intensive teaching and learning support. These schools will need to continue to receive additional support to ensure that the 'Requires Improvement' schools get to good as quickly as possible.

Separately meetings have been held with the schools with a significant fall in rolls to discuss and identify the issues facing the schools and the development of an agreed financial recovery plan. Through the discussions, the areas which the school have been asked to consider are:

- timetabling including the level of non-contact time allowed with the timetable beyond the requirements of the Planning, Preparation and Assessment time;
- a review of staffing and organisational structures;
- impact of any changes for the areas of improvements identified to raise standards;
- benchmarking of pupil teacher ratio, unit costs for staffing and resources and assessment of whether value for money is being achieved;
- alternative use of the vacant areas of the building to raise income
- investigating other external funding.

This work has been and continues to be very intensive and also sensitive for the schools concerned. It is uncertain if the schools will have sufficient resources to support this work as well as deliver on the timetable. Therefore, an option which could be considered would be to provide funding for a particular project / need identify by the school to consider and address any of the above areas.



## 5.5 Marketing Support

The secondary schools with falling rolls have been asked to and are developing transition links with main feeder primary schools to encourage parents to choose the secondary feeder school. One of the primary schools is also building links with its local secondary school.

However, this work requires further support. One of the key to success for schools with falling rolls and increase the number on roll is the development of a marketing strategy which would promote the schools to parents within Enfield and on the borough boundary.

The Authority is working on developing a market strategy which will encompass the marketing of all schools but in particular secondary. The strategy is currently being developed.

## 5.6 Collaborative / Mentoring Support

In meetings with the schools, one thing which has become apparent is that each school is working in isolation to address the issues they are facing. It has been suggested that it would be helpful for schools in these position to seek support from other schools that may have been in a similar position or are known to have strength in a relevant area.

6. The Authority initial proposal for funding for schools in financial difficulties be allocated on an individual basis following the receipt of a detailed business case from the school seeking financial support. The aim of the business case would be for the schools to provide information and evidence of the need for support, outcomes to be achieved, timeline for the activities identified and the impact these will have on the outcomes.

The business case would be considered and assessed by the Authority using some of the factors highlighted in paragraph 4 above. If there is a justification for funding and supporting the school then an allocation will be made and reported back to the Schools Forum. If the Authority decides not to allocate any funding then this will also be reported to the Schools Forum. In this instance, the school may want to make a direct appeal to the Schools Forum for consideration of their business case. It is further recommended then an Appeal's Panel is formed from the maintained schools representatives on the Schools Forum.

Before developing a template for the business case, the Authority sought some feedback from the Commissioning Group and Headteacher colleagues.

The Commissioning Group at their meeting on 27 June were asked to comment on this proposal. Comments were also received from Secondary Headteachers to support the discussion at the Commissioning Group. The proposal for a template was supported and it was suggested the template seeks information on:

- Pupil numbers
- Financial breakdown of previous expenditure and future forecasts
- Staffing including details of any reviews / reductions to reflect changes in pupil numbers

- Marketing plans
- Curriculum delivery including details of any reviews / reductions to reflect changes in pupil
- The support required and the how this will be used.

It was further commented that School to school support could be considered and facilitated by:

- schools sharing staff;
- deploying an NLE or colleague to provide particular support;

7. The maintained school's representatives on the Forum are asked to consider this report and confirm if they agree with the proposal to:

- seek a business case, as outlined in paragraph 6, from schools seeking financial support;
- form an Appeal Panel where a school's business case is not supported by the Authority.



Department  
for Education

Report No 9

**Consultation Response Form**

**Consultation closing date: 30 April 2014**  
**Your comments must reach us by that date**

## **Fairer schools funding in 2015-16**

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

<b>Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	
Name: <b>Sangeeta Brown</b>	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Organisation (if applicable): London Borough of Enfield	
Address: <b>Schools &amp; Children's Services, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Civic Centre, PO Box 56, Enfield EN1 3XQ</b>	

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: [consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk) or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's '[Contact Us](#)' page.

Please mark the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained school	<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Governor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bursar	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Trade union organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

**This is a joint response from the Schools Forum and the Local Authority.**

1 Do you agree that the existing distribution of schools funding is unfair?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Comments:**

**Yes.**

**We are disappointed that the promised progression towards a National Fair Funding Formula will not now commence until the new spending review period.**

**We do not consider that the proposed allocation of the £350m additional funding in 2014/15 fulfils the DfE's stated intention of "making the distribution of funding to local areas fairer".**

**We believe that a fundamental review of the existing base funding levels across all three funding blocks would be necessary to achieve this aim and to truly identify the "least fairly funded" authorities. This is because decisions made by individual authorities when baselining their Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2012 may have distorted the relative values of the three funding blocks so that potentially local authorities considered to be "least fairly funded" and receiving a share of the £350m due to low Schools Block GUFs may have compensatory higher High Needs Block (HNB) funding or higher Early Years GUFs (or both).**

**Ignoring this and targeting funding only at the Schools block effectively means that the DfE is now ring-fencing the Schools Block, despite it being categorically stated at the time of baselining in 2012 that the blocks would not be ring fenced and that we could move funding between blocks as required. It also ignores an important stream of funding for schools which comes from the HNB and does nothing to address the increasing pressures on funding requirements from this block (see below).**

**We would comment that the proposal to introduce the minimum funding levels will perpetuate this situation. The basis of our comments is as follows:**

**Methodology for allocation of DSG to Local Authorities**

**From the introduction of the DSG in 2006, it was recognised that the distribution**

methodology was flawed and there was a need for a fundamental review of the overall funding allocated to each authority. This review should assess how this funding is calculated and updated. Issues which the review would need to address include the use of an east / west split for London authorities and the continued differential of inner and outer authorities. We would assert the costs facing all London authorities are similar but outer London authorities and schools have to manage with a lower level of funding and in some cases greater need.

### **Local Flexibility**

In the context of the move to a national funding formula, we are concerned at the lack of local flexibility. The proposed funding arrangements are creating an inherent inability to reflect changing local needs and allow authorities to exercise local discretion. Again, we assert that focussing only on per pupil funding in the Schools block does not address all the issues being encountered at a local level.

### **Cost Pressures**

Our schools are facing significant financial pressures, notably salary awards and increased employers' superannuation contributions, together with the additional costs associated with pupil growth as outlined below. This situation is becoming more acute because the inflationary pressures and costs of pay awards are not recognised through the 'flat cash' settlement. As one of the authorities that will not receive a share of the additional funding we will have to contain these cost pressures for the second year. We would like to suggest that a better use of the additional £350m would be to support these pay pressures in all authorities.

### **Deprivation**

The issues facing Enfield are similar to those faced by Inner London authorities traditionally identified as having high levels of deprivation. Enfield has some of the most deprived areas nationally, with deprivation continuing to rise. In a recent survey on poverty, it was found that Enfield is ranked 11<sup>th</sup> nationally and 8<sup>th</sup> for the percentage of children in low income families (Source: Enfield Child Family Poverty Strategy 2012 and DWP National Statistics).

### **Pupil Growth**

Enfield has one of the highest pupil numbers in London and has experienced annual growth of the school-aged population of an average of 1.1% for each of the last ten years, or total growth of 11.6% over the period. The arrangements for supporting this level of growth are putting a considerable strain on the resources provided from the current allocation of DSG, especially at Primary level where we've experienced the most growth but in coming years that will pass through to pressure at the Secondary level. Over the next five years we expect growth continuing at 1.4%.

We are concerned that going forward the DSG will not adequately support the needs of all the pupils in the borough. A disproportionate time is being spent by the Authority and schools in supporting the increase in pupil numbers within diminishing resources.

### **Area Cost Adjustments**

Enfield Schools face the challenge of attracting good quality teaching staff whilst disadvantaged by the salary differential with neighbouring authorities designated as

**Inner London.**

**It is important that as part of the fundamental review the inequalities created by the salary differentials are addressed.**

**In terms of the proposed methodology, we are advised by London Councils that this methodology is flawed: the notional average basic pay calculated in the consultation is much lower than actual pay. This would further exacerbate the difficulties of attracting good quality teaching staff.**

### **High Needs and Early Years Blocks**

**As highlighted above, we are concerned that the proposals in the document only consider the funding provided through the Schools Block and not the funding provided for all blocks making up the Dedicated Schools Grant. An area of particular concern to us is the funding arrangements for supporting pupils with high needs. If the document purports to address school funding then how can the funding arrangements for a proportion of the school population be excluded?**

**We would like to outline some of the issues we are facing with the current arrangements for supporting pupils with special educational needs and disabilities:**

#### **Population Growth**

**As with the growth in the Primary age group, Enfield has seen a growth in the number and needs for pupils special educational needs and disabilities. Our growth over the last few years has been substantial and the projections indicate a continued increase with Autism and Behavioural difficulties being the predominant needs. These needs are prevalent across the whole school population and we envisage a need to increase the level of specialist provision and resources.**

#### **Place Plus Funding**

**Some of the issues with the current funding arrangements supporting vulnerable pupils with high needs are:**

- The funding provided for High Needs does not fully meet the cost of the pupils in specialist provision outside mainstream schools. A basic provision of £10k per place is provided and then is restricted to places which have to be agreed in advance. The local authorities then have to find the top up funding from the limited resources remaining in the high needs block.**
- The costs have to meet all needs to support the child or young person. The costs include: placement, transport and additional resources. The cost of transport is not funded from the DSG. This means the total cost is not reflected in the allocation provided through the DSG.**
- The system does not lead to transparency regarding the application of funding; for example where places have been identified by a particular authority but the provider is not required to retain this place. The place could be offered to any authority on a first come first served basis. This does not support local planning and can lead to additional unbudgeted costs.**

#### **Statutory Requirements**

**With the imminent implementation of the Children and Families Act 2014, which incorporates those pupils with high levels of need from 0-25 years, the resources available from within the local authority will be under increased strain. At this point,**

there seems to be no permanent increase in funding from central government to meet the challenges that this legislation presents. The fact that the Code of Practice to date is still in draft compounds the difficulties that local authorities are facing.

The Local Authority now has statutory obligations towards the most vulnerable members of its community ranging from 0-25, which again puts huge strain on the limited resources available. This impacts on appropriate placements, which are already under pressure with regard to numbers, provision of travel assistance to a much wider cross section of the population and other resources that are identified in the new Education Health and Care Plans ie therapies, equipment, additional support for specific needs.

### Conclusion

We would contend that instead of making the distribution of funding fair, transparent and simple the proposed arrangements are likely to add a layer of complexity and perpetuate arbitrary and unsubstantiated differentials between authorities. Our view would be that schools funding methodology needs to be continually assessed to ensure that it is having maximum impact to meet the educational outcomes and needs of all pupils equitably.

This can only be achieved, as stated above, by firstly carrying out a fundamental review to address the baseline funding each authority receives and then continuing to review the distribution methodology regularly to ensure it is continuing to address the educational needs of pupils.

2 Do you agree with our proposed choice of characteristics to which to attach minimum funding levels?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

It could be viewed that the minimum funding levels will even out the levels of funding but it is not reflective of the decisions which have to be made at a local level to address the pressures facing individual authorities. It is assumed that these authorities have been underfunded without clear evidence to support this view.

As stated above, this proposal will continue to perpetuate the unfairness in the use of the historic DSG levels to inform future arrangements. It also fails to recognize that there were differences in the choices local authorities made when baselining their DSG blocks in 2012.

Whilst the minimum funding levels do not need to be reflected in the local funding formulas for 2015/16, it is unclear how authorities would fund this requirement without reductions elsewhere, should it become a requirement in the future.

For the reasons stated above, we do not feel it appropriate to comment further on the proposed areas to be covered by the minimum funding levels.



Given our proposal to set minimum funding levels such that we can afford to fund all local authorities at those levels or above in 2015-16, do you agree with the proposed values of the minimum funding levels?

3 a) Age Weighted Pupil Unit

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 b) Deprivation

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 c) Looked-after children

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 d) English as an additional language

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 e) Low prior attainment

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 f) Lump sum

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

3 g) Sparsity

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

Comments:
-----------

4 Do you agree that labour market cost differences should be taken into account as we allocate the £350m?

Agree  Disagree  Not sure

Comments:

5 Do you agree this should be calculated using the hybrid approach we have set out?

Agree  Disagree  Not sure

Comments:

6 If you do not agree that we should use a hybrid approach, what would you prefer we used?

Use teacher pay bands only  Use a general labour market measure only  Use an alternative method

Comments:

### **Sparsity Review**

7 We introduced a sparsity factor for the first time in 2015-16. How helpful has this factor been in ensuring that sufficient funding is targeted at small schools serving sparsely populated areas?

Useful  Not useful  Not sure

**Comments:**

**It would be helpful to understand why this has been identified as a national factor above others previously used when it affects less 0.2% of schools nationally.**

8 Do you think it would be useful to revise the criteria for the sparsity factor to take into account the average number of pupils in each year group, rather than the number of pupils in the school? If so, how?

<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:
-----------

9 Are there any other changes you would like to suggest to improve the operation of this factor, and why?

Comments:
-----------

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

<b>Please acknowledge this reply.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E-mail address for acknowledgement: <a href="mailto:Sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk">Sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk</a>	

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Aileen Shaw, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: [aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk)

**Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.**

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 30 April 2014

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education,  
Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, DARLINGTON DL3 9BG

Send by e-mail to:

[SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk)

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/2015 – REPORT NO. 10

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 9 July 2014

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Schools & Children’s Services

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

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

**Recommendation**

To note the workplan.

<b>Agenda – Part:</b>	<b>Item: 7</b>
<b>Subject:</b> <b>Schools Forum: Workplan</b>	
<b>Wards: All</b>	

<b><u>Meetings</u></b>		<b><u>Officer</u></b>
January 2014	Schools Budget: 2014/15: Update	JF
March 2014	School Budget 2014/15: Update Additionally Resourced Provision Autism Scheme for Financing Enfield Traded Services to Schools	JF JT JT SB SB
April 2014	Fairer School Funding – 2015/16: DfE Consultation Universal Free School Meals Welfare Benefit – Update SEND Reforms Scheme for Financing Schools	SB SB KR JL SB
July 2014	Schools Budget – Update (2014/15) School Funding Review (2014/15) Response DfE Consultation on School Funding Arrangements (2015/16) Autism Update Support for Schools in Financial Difficulties	JF SB SB JT SB
October 2014	Schools Budget: 2015/16: Update Responses to consultation on School Funding Arrangements (2015/16) SEND Reforms - Update Final DSG Notification Outturn Report 2013/14 Schools Balances 2013/14	JF SB JT JF JF SB
December 2014	Schools Budget: 2015/16: Update, Inc. De-delegation Central Budgets: Annual Report Local Authority Budget (2014/15) Pupil Places strategy	JF JT ES JT
January 2015	Schools Budget: 2015/16: Update	JF
March 2015	School Budget 2015/16: Update Enfield Traded Services to Schools Scheme for Financing	JF SB SB

**Dates of Meetings**

Date	Time	Venue	Comment
22 January 2014	5.30pm – 7.30pm	Enfield County School	
5 March 2014	5.30pm – 7.30pm	Enfield County School	
2 April 2014	5.30pm – 7.30pm	Enfield County School	
9 July 2014	5.30pm – 7.30pm	Enfield County School	
15 October 2014	5.30pm – 7.30pm		

10 December 2015	5.30pm – 7.30pm	
21 January 2015	5.30pm – 7.30pm	
4 March 2015	5.30pm – 7.30pm	