

SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

SCHOOLS GROUP:

John Constable (Chair), Ben Bausor, Peter Collins, Gill Denham, Valerie Harffey, Emma Lister, Navroop Mehat, Angela Mellish, Eddie Neighbour, Carol Pearce, Jon Reekie, Jo Rockall, Jamie Rockman, Coral Snowden, Neil Sykes and Maggie Waller

OBSERVERS:

Councillor Christine Hulme

LOCAL AUTHORITY

Neill Butler, Andrew Fraser, Sabi Hothi, Johnny Kyriacou, Tony Madden and Steve Muldoon

MEETING DETAILS

WEDNESDAY 6th JULY 2022 at 9.00am
VIRTUAL MEETING via ZOOM

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84988477487?pwd=1ngMsrNcY3uiPYcpnCGGScJWX90kv6.1&from=addon>

Meeting ID: 849 8847 7487
Passcode: 787307

AGENDA

Apologies

1. Declarations of Interest

The Chair will ask Members to confirm whether they have any declarable interests in relation to any item on the agenda.

All Members who believe they may have such an interest must declare it and may only: (a) remain in the meeting while that matter is discussed at the discretion of the Chair or Vice Chair, and (b) speak on the matter by invitation.

Examples of declarable interests include: where the outcome of a discussion may provide a personal advantage or avoid disadvantage (pecuniary or non-pecuniary), or where the focus of an agenda item and the likely impact of any outcome is wholly or mainly on a school with which the Member is associated.

	<u>Page</u>
2. Notification of Any Other Business	
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 10 th March, 2022	(Pages 1 - 6)
4. Schools Forum Membership Update	(Pages 7 - 8)
5. Update on National/Local Funding Issues	(Verbal Report)
6. Growth Fund Report 2021/22	(Pages 9 - 20)
7. DSG Annual Report 2021/22	(Pages 21 - 32)
8. DSG Management Plan	(Verbal Report)
9. High Needs Budget 2022/23 - Allocation of Centrally Retained Funds	(Pages 33 - 36)
10. Update to the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools	(Pages 37 - 38)
11. Task Group Update	(Verbal Report)
12. Academies Update	(Verbal Report)
13. 2022/23 Forward Agenda Plan	(Pages 39 - 40)
14. Key Decisions Log	(Pages 41 - 42)
15. Any Other Business (notified at start of meeting)	

Slough Schools Forum - Meeting held on Thursday 10th March, 2022

Present: John Constable, Langley Grammar School (Chair)
 Peter Collins, Slough & Eton Church of England Business and Enterprise College
 Gill Denham, Marish Primary School
 Valerie Harffey, Ryvers School
 Emma Lister, Chalvey Nursery
 Navroop Mehat, Wexham Court Primary School
 Angela Mellish, St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School
 Eddie Neighbour, Pioneer Education Trust
 Jon Reekie, Phoenix Infants
 Jo Rockall, Herschel Grammar School
 Jamie Rockman, Haybrook College
 Maggie Waller, Holy Family Primary School(

Observers: Councillor Christine Hulme

Officers: Johnny Kyriacou and Kamaljit Karir Kaur

Apologies: Ben Bausor, Carol Pearce, Coral Snowden, Neil Sykes, Chelsea Barnes, Andrew Fraser, Sabi Hothi and Tony Madden

PART I

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and explained that there was no permanent clerk available for this meeting. Instead, the meeting would be recorded and transcribed afterwards.

889. Notification of Any Other Business

There were none.

890. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

891. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 19th January, 2022

Accepted as an accurate record.

Matters arising from the minutes

Maggie Waller asked if there was any update on that school improvement funding situation that was discussed at the last meeting. Johnny Kyriacou confirmed that there is no plan to ask maintained schools for de-delegation for school improvement functions. The future of school improvement is subject to an ongoing discussion with headteachers.

892. Schools Forum Membership Update

The Chair confirmed that as a result of the lack of a permanent clerk, schools have not yet been formally approached to provide nominations for the remaining school vacancies. This will be actioned as soon as possible.

893. Update on National/Local Funding Issues

Kamaljit Kaur confirmed that there were no updates or changes that Forum needed to be informed of.

894. DSG Monitoring Report 2021/22

Kamaljit Kaur presented the latest DSG monitoring report. There were no significant changes to the Early Years or School block positions. An increased pressure on the High Needs block of £400k was due to additional out of borough placements, leading to a projected overspend of £5.2 million rather than £4.8 million reported last time. The Chair thanks Kamaljit for the report and asked Forum members to note the latest DSG position.

895. DSG Schools Block 2022-23 - Confirmation of APT submission and schools' budgets

Kamaljit Kaur confirmed there were no changes to the schools' block funding formula following the submission of the APT.

Gill Denham raised the issue of non-national domestic rates. At the last meeting it had been stated that these would now be paid directly from SBC so that schools would not have to pay and reclaim. However, the DfE website stated Slough schools should be continuing with previous arrangements. Valerie Harffey made the same point.

KK confirmed that she would follow up with the ESFA and issue a clarification for all schools.

896. CSSB budget 2022-23

Kamaljit Kaur presented the paper outlining the proposed CSSB breakdown for 2022-23. There were few changes from 2021-22, only that the copyright license fee has been increased. The historic misallocation to the High Needs Block still requires Forum to approve a transfer from High Needs back to the CSSB as in previous years. Last year the request was for £220k; for 2022-23 the request is for a balancing figure of £185k.

Johnny Kyriacou pointed out that as part of further due diligence work, some irregularities had been identified within the CSSB, including spending which wasn't allocated to the right block. Potentially the CSSB may need to increase, depending on what services schools want; for example around the attendance service, where some funding for that function comes via the high needs block. Another example is if schools want funding for fair access in some form that benefits all schools, this would need to come from the CSSB as well. It was acknowledged that it is too late to make any changes for the 2022-23 financial year; the intention was to highlight the issues in order that there can be a discussion with schools about what they want, what services the LA can deliver and whether these are appropriately funded. The Chair asked for confirmation that any proposed changes would be for the 2023-24 financial year; this was confirmed by JK.

The chair summarised by confirming that in line with its statutory responsibilities, there were two things for Forum to do; firstly agree the budget allocations within the CSSB, and secondly agree the budget transfer from high needs into the CSSB to correct the historical imbalance. The Chair reiterated that this is request has been

approved for several years in succession, but can only be approved for a year at a time.

Valerie Harffey raised a query about an individual post-holder named in the paper. The Chair confirmed this should have been picked up at proof reading and that the name would be removed from the online version of the paper.

Maggie Waller raised a concern that some items were effectively being funded from the High Needs block when they shouldn't be, because the historical error has caused problems in properly allocating costs to the services provided. MW asked whether there should be further lobbying of the DfE to put this right. KK confirmed that in 2017-18 when the CSSB block was created, it was intended to cover historic costs for services provided. In authorities where there is a majority of maintained schools, any gaps or misallocations can be rectified by de-delegation from schools budgets, but this is not an option in Slough because of the majority of academy schools. KK also confirmed that the overall CSSB funding rate is reducing, so that there is a reduction of about £40k in 2022-23 compared to 2021-22.

The Chair asked whether it's the DfE's intention to eliminate the CSSB. KK confirmed that it was, as it covers historic costs which should be absorbed into other areas, but the timescale for this is unknown.

Peter Collins asked whether the sharper focus on the provision of statutory elements only might lead to some things that are currently in place not happening or being done differently in the future. Are we agreeing to the transfer of funds to support anything which may end up being a service that becomes cut at some point over the life of this budget? What would happen in that situation and is there a role for Forum here? JK confirmed that if a service was reduced or cut then would need to be a discussion as to whether the money is spent on something else, or whether it goes back into the pot.

PC also asked what the role of Forum was in ensuring that there is effectiveness and value for money, so that the public money is being used in the right way to achieve the ambitions for which it is intended. JK responded that these services should be under scrutiny by Forum and that the local authority should be open to feedback; he would be happy to pick this up through the Slough Education Partnership Board.

The Chair thanked JK for his response and pointed out that the annual DSG report, which is on the agenda for the May meeting, is intended to include comment about the impact of spending. More detailed scrutiny could be picked up through other boards.

Forum members approved the budget transfer of £180,815 from High Needs block to the CSSB for 2022-23 and agreed to allocation within the CSSB as proposed by the local authority.

897. EY centrally retained budget 2022-23

Kamaljit Kaur presented the paper setting out the Early Years block centrally retained budget for 2022-23. Essentially the spending pattern is similar to 2021-22 with a £4k increase but overall a similar proportion of the funding being centrally retained.

The Chair noted that the PVI representative was unable to attend this meeting and asked for comment from any other Forum members with an early year's perspective. There were no questions or comments.

Forum members agreed the use of the central retained funding as proposed by the local authority.

898. DSG Management Plan update

The Chair confirmed that there were two papers associated with this item. The first is a covering paper from Johnny Kyriacou which explains the context of the second paper, which is a report for Slough Borough Council Cabinet which has also been circulated to all headteachers. The Chair stated that the purpose of this item was for Forum members to note the council's current position on the management of the DSG deficit and the issues which have been addressed, and to make any comments or ask any.

JK summarised the context of the main report, which had been presented to the Cabinet meeting on 9th March. JK noted that the projected in-year deficit on the High Needs block had been reduced from £7.2 million in 2020-21 to £4.9 million in 2021-22, and commented that this was a significant achievement. To get there, the team had looked at everything from placements to decision making; everything was still driven by the needs of children and where they need to be placed but was being done more robustly. The paper set out what the council intended to do, with a clear and transparent rationale. Separately to that is the safety valve program so the safety valve program is an initiative from the DfE to target LA's is where there is a large overspend such as ours. You can find examples Agreements between LA's and the DfE online if you type safety valve program DfE. You can look at places like Kingston, Hammersmith and Fulham they've got agreements with DfE, you can see those publicly to see what their projected spend was and the things that they've said that they would put in place.

JK commented on the importance of Slough being able to join the DfE's safety valve programme, which would hopefully result in the DfE looking to write off some or all of the historic cumulative overspend if the in-year deficit can be brought under control. DfE are very robust and require clear plans that are achievable. JK also commented on the possibility of looking at preventative which would represent opportunities to invest to save; the DfE were likely to look favourably on such an approach, whereby there is sensible spending on some of high needs funding in the shorter term in order to reduce spend in the long term.

The Chair invited Councillor Hulme to add any comments that she wished to from the council's perspective. Cllr Hulme commented that there is a great anxiety in the Council that if we do not begin to address this, we will end up with a further liability, and that the council is very grateful to all its partners in all the sectors across the town in helping us to try and address these fundamental issues. In terms of the DSG Cllr Hulme confirmed that it is unusual to have a DSG-focused paper at cabinet level, but this is an indication that this has a high profile within the Council and will be monitored closely to make sure that we are making the right decisions for our children in the right way.

The Chair asked for questions and comments from Forum members.

Maggie Waller referred to the SEND panel and asked whether any more had been done to secure health attendance and contribution, particularly in relation to complex

EHCPs. JK confirmed that a more robust approach at panel meant that appropriate funding is being sought where needed, which is one reason why the spend has come down so much this year. CCG colleagues have created a working group to look at the tripartite panel again, which looks at the funding between LA, social care and health. A model of 33% from each sector has been agreed but only as a principle that everybody has an input into it. The actual division of funds would not be 33% if the need was more heavily weighted towards one service than another, so for example if it was 80% health, they would be expected to pick up most of that cost. There is a realisation that all partners need to come together and the local authority is definitely engaging with partners and talking to them about funding to make sure that the right funds are paid by the right people.

Peter Collins commented that the Cabinet paper had been circulated to headteachers in both the primary and secondary phases to enable them to pass comments back through Forum representatives. The general view of secondary heads seemed to be that it's very helpful to have this really clear 'state of the nation' and the stronger sense of direction of travel. There is probably a resigned sense of satisfaction that we've got to this point now, so we can start moving on.

Navroop Mehat commented that there had been a lot of ongoing conversations around this in different groups, and that a lot of views had already been expressed.

Gill Denham commented that in her own recent experience there have been problems very recently in the last month which she has raised with JK. Although the direction of travel seems to be positive like the changes and you need time to bed down, and there are still considerable staffing issues which are impacting on the quality of decisions.

The Chair asked about the reference in the report to the lack of consideration of existing models in other authorities for the SEND banding matrix. It was confirmed that it had been based on a model from Essex, but that there had been relatively little adaptation of the model to the Slough context. Although the model was received positively at the time, it has ended up costing more going forward. The model is being reviewed as soon as possible. The Chair noted that it would be helpful if schools could know the time scale on the review and in particular the potential impact on children in September. JK confirmed he would come back to Forum on this.

Valerie Harffey confirmed that she was on the task and finish group for that banding review and that while the group did look at more than one model, the one that was adopted could well have been more bespoke. VH also questioned whether more money would be expected from schools when budgets are tight.

Peter Collins noted that the banding review which introduced the current matrix had taken place alongside one of the many resource base reviews. The consequence was that decisions about resource base funding and provision were being made at the same time as banding provision. These are completely separate things which clearly need to complement each other, but they shouldn't have been decisions which were made at the same time. It's easy to see now that that was a really bad thing to do, but, at the time it actually seemed to make some sense; there is a lesson here about process.

Maggie Waller picked up a point in the minutes of the previous meeting where it was stated that a report would come saying how the transfer that had been agreed from Schools Block to the High Needs block was being used and what the impact of that

would be. JK stated that additional funding was offsetting the pressure on post-16 placements. The Chair questioned the message that this gives to other headteachers who would want to know how transferred funding from the Schools block, which is for provision for 5-16 year olds, would be used to address high needs for the same age range. JK agreed he would come back to Forum with further information on this.

The Chair confirmed that Forum would note the contents of the report and that the DSG management plan would be a standing item on the agenda for May and for July. JK confirmed that the planned meeting with the DfE to discuss the safety valve programme is in April; presuming that meeting goes ahead, then there would be a written or verbal update at the next Forum meeting.

899. Task group update

The Chair confirmed that none of the three task groups had met since the previous Forum meeting in January. Johnny Kyriacou had referred earlier to some other tasks groups being set up by the local authority; these are not subgroups of Forum but are being set up to look at aspects of the DSG management plan. The Chair requested that the work of these groups be reported back to Forum in the May and July meeting as part of the DSG management plan update.

900. Academies update

Johnny Kyriacou confirmed that there were no changes to school status to report.

901. 2021/22 Revised Forward Agenda Plan/Key Decisions Log

The Chair pointed Forum members to the forward agenda plan and advised that the agendas for the May and July meetings would be confirmed in consultation with the local authority.

The Chair also confirmed that the key decisions log would be updated for the May meeting.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and explained that there was no permanent clerk available for this meeting. Instead, the meeting would be recorded and transcribed afterwards.

902. Any Other Business (notified at start of meeting)

Gill Denham asked that the next meeting could be scheduled to avoid primary school SATS, currently scheduled for the week commencing 9th May. The Chair advised that the remaining meeting dates would be agreed with the local authority, but this would be taken into consideration.

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance.

Meeting closed at 10.30am.

School	Type of school	Name and role	Elected/appointed by	Term of office ends
ACADEMIES (11 members)				
Special schools/PRUs (2 members)				
Arbour Vale School (<i>OHCA</i> T)	Special School	Neil Sykes (Principal)	Academies	31 December 2023
Haybrook College Trust	PRU	Jamie Rockman (CEO)	Academies	31 December 2023
Primary academies (4 members)				
Phoenix Infants Academy (<i>Baylis Court Trust MAT</i>)	Academy	Jon Reekie (Governor)	Academies	31 December 2022
Ryvers School	Academy	Valerie Haffrey (School Business Manager)	Academies	31 August 2023
Western House Academy (<i>Park Federation Academy Trust</i>)	Academy	Coral Snowden (Principal)	Academies	31 August 2022
Marish Primary School (<i>Marish & Willow Trust</i>)	Academy	Gill Denham (Headteacher)	Academies	31 December 2023
Secondary academies (5 members)				
Herschel Grammar School (<i>Schelwood Trust</i>)	Academy	Jo Rockall (Headteacher)	Academies	31 August 2023
Langley Grammar School	Academy	John Constable (Headteacher)	Academies	31 August 2023
Slough & Eton CofE School (<i>SEBMAT</i>)	Academy	Peter Collins (Headteacher)	Academies	31 December 2023
Upton Court Grammar School (<i>Pioneer Education Trust</i>)	Academy	Eddie Neighbour (CEO, Pioneer Education Trust)	Academies	31 March 2023
Vacancy	Academy	Vacancy	Academies	TBC
MAINTAINED SCHOOLS (4 members)				
Primary maintained (3 members)				
Holy Family Primary School	Voluntary Aided	Maggie Waller (Governor)	Maintained schools	31 August 2023
Penn Wood School	Community	Carol Pearce (Governor)	Maintained schools	31 August 2023
Wexham Court Primary School	Community	Navroop Mehat (Headteacher)	Maintained schools	31 August 2023
Secondary maintained (1 member)				
St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School	Voluntary Aided	Angela Mellish (SBM)	Maintained schools	31 August 2023
MAINTAINED NURSERIES (1 member)				
Chalvey Nursery School	Nursery	Emma Lister (H/T)	Maintained Nursery HTs	31 August 2023
NON-SCHOOL MEMBERS (2 members)				
16-19 Provider (1 member)				
Windsor Forest Colleges Group	16-19 Provider	Vacancy	16-19 Providers	TBC
PVI Provider (1 member)				
Always Growing Ltd.	PVI Provider	Ben Bausor	Local Authority	31 st August 2023
TOTAL MEMBERSHIP				16 members

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools' Forum 6 July 2022	
Report from the Executive Director of People (Children)	
Growth Fund 2021-22 and 2022-23	
Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
No. of Appendices:	3
Contact Officer(s):	Tony Madden Development Manger Email: Tony.Madden@slough.gov.uk Susan Woodland Interim Principal Accountant, ECS Email: Susan.Woodland@slough.gov.uk

This report is for information and relates to all Schools' Forum representatives

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide Schools' Forum with the outturn of the Growth Fund for 2021-22 and provide details of the projected outturn for 2022-23.

2 Recommendation

It is recommended that Schools' Forum:

- 2.1 Note the outturn for 2021-22 in Appendix A and note the updated allocations of Growth Funding for 2022-23 as shown in Appendix B.
- 2.2 Note that a higher top slice is required for 2022-23 (the catch-up year in Appendix B) in order that academies can be paid for the full year at the start of the academic year with the extra funding being recouped from the DfE.
- 2.3 Note the estimated figures for 2023-24 shown in Appendix C and the reduced top-slice requirement.

3 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 Slough's birth rate rose by 48% over the period from 2001-2 to 2010-11. The effect of this growth along with inward migration to the town has meant that the primary school estate has been increased in capacity by 50% while the secondary school capacity has been increased by 60%.
- 3.2 Birth numbers have reduced year on year since the peak in 2010-11 and 2011-12. This has created a surplus of places in primary schools overall although this is not spread evenly across Slough's planning areas.
- This **west** planning area has seen the largest fall in birth numbers. A number of schools have already reduced their admission numbers, it is likely that further reductions will be required over the next 3 years as the cohort of pupils will shrink by a further 16% based on birth data.
There are more than 20 surplus places (SBC's target surplus) in all year groups.
 - The **central** planning area will see only a small drop in cohort size over the next 3 years with the Central ward seeing the only significant increase in births across the whole town (+34%).
4 of the 7 current year groups have less than the target of 20 surplus places. Years 1 and 5 have no surplus places and additional places may soon need to be considered.
 - The **east** planning area saw a large cohort apply for places in 2021 otherwise the number of births is holding fairly steady and there will be only a small reduction over the next 3 years.
All 7 years groups have less than the target of 20 surplus places and additional places may be required in some specific year groups depending on where new arrivals live.
- 3.3 There is built capacity in both the central and east planning areas as 3 schools have reduced their PANs in recent years and Grove Academy has yet to increase its PAN to its built number of 120. Therefore new forms of entry are not required and bulge classes and larger classes are the expected solution where local shortages emerge.
- 3.4 The population growth has been impacting secondary schools for some years and 3 new secondary schools and an all-through have opened in recent years. In addition 2 non-selective schools plus one grammar school have undergone expansion funded by the LA. Slough's other three grammar schools have all increased their PANs without capital funding from SBC.
- 3.5 The peak in Slough's birth numbers will reach Year 7 in 2022 and 2023. The increases mentioned above will provide sufficient capacity for this peak and the need for additional places is not expected although Year 9 has a low number of surplus places and will need to be monitored.

- 3.6 The prescribed methodology for calculating revenue funding for expanding schools means that there is a 'lag' in the period from pupils starting until they appear on the school census and funding is allocated. To support schools through this period of lag in funding while they are expanding the LA requests a sum of money through Schools' Forum called the "Growth Fund".
- 3.7 The methodology for qualification and allocation of the Growth Fund is reviewed and agreed by Schools' Forum on an annual basis. Schools' Forum is asked to consider the financial impact on schools of expansion and agree an affordable level of additional revenue support. At a meeting in January 2022 Schools' Forum agreed the methodology to be applied in 2022-23. Appendices B and C are based on these agreed criteria. No variations to the criteria applied in 2021-22 were proposed or agreed.

4 Supporting Information

- 4.1. The Growth Fund is one of the centrally held budget areas that Schools' Forum has decision making powers over. Guidance on how the Growth Fund should be approved and allocated can be found in *Schools operational guide: 2022 to 2023 (updated 16 December 2021)*. Paragraph 258 states:

"The growth fund can only be used to:

- *support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need*
- *support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation*
- *meet the costs of new schools."*

- 4.2 LAs are also able to set up a Falling Rolls Fund but as this only applies where demand is projected to rise in the near future this has previously been discussed and ruled out by Schools' Forum. This would be reviewed if new housing levels were higher than anticipated or birth rates began to rise. Paragraph 273 states

"Local authorities may set aside schools block funding to create a small fund to support good schools with falling rolls, where local planning data shows that the surplus places will be needed within the next three financial years."

Level of Funding – Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)

- 4.3 The agreed methodology for distributing funding is based on an AWPU per pupil, reflecting the proportion of the year which is not funded within the school's budget share.

Summary of Criteria Agreed for 2021-22 and 2022-23

- **Bulge Classes** - These must be requested and agreed in advance by the LA. Schools receive funding as though the class was full from the date of opening until March the following year and academies receive funding until August. Academies also receive a one-off payment in the second year of bulge classes to reflect a lag in funding beyond the first year.
- **Expansion by a Form of Entry** - The Growth Fund provides financial support for all the years a school incurs a shortfall in funding whilst going through a permanent expansion.
- **Larger Classes or Numbers in Excess of PAN** - The Growth Fund will provide financial support for schools that admit pupils in excess of their PAN for each whole term that they make each additional place available at the request of the Local Authority.
- **New Schools** – Variety of support items possible but no new schools are planned.

Financial Outturn 2020-21

- 4.4 The projected outturn for 2021-22 is shown in Appendix A. The unspent funding to be carried forward to 2022-23 is £21,814. A contingency sum has been added for extra places required before year end although this would be a commitment against the 2022-23 Growth Fund.

April to August Payments to Academies

- 4.5 Note that the April to August payments to academies in Appendix A are a commitment against the following year's Growth Fund. 2022-23 shown in Appendix B is a catch up year for the Growth Fund and 2 charges appear against the Growth Fund in this year although the funding is recouped from the DfE.
- 4.6 Having caught up in 2022-23, the full year of payments to academies, both Sep-Mar and Apr-Aug, are shown as a commitment against the same Growth Fund year. This is shown in Appendix C.

5 Financial Implications

- 5.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper.

6 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 6.1 Not applicable

7 Legal Implications

- 7.1 Local Authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in their area, ensure fair access to educational opportunity and promote the fulfilment of every child's educational potential.

8 Equality Implications

- 8.1 Not applicable

This page is intentionally left blank

2021-22 Estimated Growth Fund Outturn (£)

APPENDIX A

Date: June 2022

Primary AWPU (2021-22)	3,458.32
Pupils per Class	30
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	103,749.60
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	60,520.60
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	43,229.00

Secondary AWPU (2021-22 average)	5,186.37
KS3	4,876.86
KS4	5,495.88
Pupils per Class	30
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	155,591.10
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	90,761.48
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	64,829.63

2021-22 BUDGET (excluding funding claimed from the ESFA for academies)		
CARRY FORWARD 2020-21 (confirmed by School's Finance)	65,415	carry forward
TOP SLICE FROM 2021-22 SCHOOL BLOCK	750,000	agreed
TOTAL BUDGET	815,415	

FORECAST EXPENDITURE 2021-22

	School	Status	New Pupils	No. of Classes	Remaining years	Sept 2021 - Mar 2022	April 2022 - August 2022 (recouped)	TOTAL COMMITMENT
PRIMARY	Claycots School	Non-Academy	30	1	1	60,521		60,521
SECONDARY	Langley Grammar	Academy	30	1	1	90,761	64,830	155,591
	The Westgate School	Academy	60	2	2	181,523	129,659	311,182
	Wexham School	Non-Academy	75	2.5	2 / 3	226,904		226,904
CONTINGENCY								
	Primary class (opening after May half-term)	Academy	30	1		0	25,937	25,937
	Total		225	7.5		559,709	220,426	780,135
	Academy commitment for Apr-21 to Aug-21					233,892		
	UNDERSPEND (FINANCIAL YR 21-22)					21,814		

Sum to be paid from 2022-23 Growth Fund

This page is intentionally left blank

2022-23 Estimated Growth Fund Allocations (£)

'Catch-up' year for Apr-Aug academy payments

APPENDIX B

Date: June 2022

Primary AWPU (2022-23)	3,544.58	Rates are based on Option 1
Pupils per Class	30	
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	106,337.40	
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	62,030.15	
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	44,307.25	

Secondary AWPU (2022-23 average)	5,315.94	Rates are based on Option 1
KS3	4,998.70	
KS4	5,633.17	
Pupils per Class	30	
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	159,478.05	
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	93,028.86	
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	66,449.19	

2022-23 BUDGET		
CARRY FORWARD 2021-22 (to be confirmed by School's Finance)		21,814
TOP SLICE FROM 2022-23 SCHOOL BLOCK (to be agreed by Schools' Forum)	including element for inflation	950,000
	recouped element from 2021-22	220,426
TOTAL BUDGET		1,192,241

FORECAST EXPENDITURE 2022-23

School	Status	New Pupils	No. of Classes	Remaining years	Sept 2022 - March 2023	April 2023- August 2023 (recouped)	TOTAL COMMITMENT
The Westgate School	Academy	60	2	1	159,478	132,898	292,376
Wexham School	Non-Academy	75	2.5	1 & 2	232,572		232,572
2nd Year of Academy Bulge Class							
None opened in 2021-22	Academy	0	1	1	0		0
CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS							
2 x primary classes	Academy	60	2	1	124,060	88,615	212,675
Total		195	7.5		516,111	221,513	737,623
Academy commitment for Apr-22 to Aug-22							220,426
UNDERSPEND (FINANCIAL YR 22-23)							234,191

Notes:

This 'catch-up' year sees 2 x Apr-Aug academy payments charged in the same year, as a one off.

This was agreed by Schools' Forum May 21.

The extra payment is compensated by the addition of recouped funding from the year before.

This page is intentionally left blank

2023-24 Estimated Growth Fund Allocations (£)

APPENDIX C

Date: June 2022

Primary AWPU (2022-23)	3,544.58	2023-24 rates will be different
Pupils per Class	30	
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	106,337.40	
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	62,030.15	
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	44,307.25	

Secondary AWPU (2022-23 average)	5,315.94	2023-24 rates will be different
KS3	4,998.70	
KS4	5,633.17	
Pupils per Class	30	
Full Year Growth Funding Per Class	159,478.05	
All schools (Sep 20 - Mar 21)	93,028.86	
Academies (Apr 21 - Aug 21)	66,449.19	

2023-24 BUDGET (excluding funding claimed from the ESFA for academies)		
CARRY FORWARD 2022-23 (to be confirmed by School's Finance)		234,191
TOP SLICE FROM 2023-24 SCHOOL BLOCK (to be agreed by Schools' Forum)	including element for inflation	300,000
	recouped element from 2022-23	221,513
TOTAL BUDGET		755,704

FORECAST EXPENDITURE 2023-24

School	Status	New Pupils	No. of Classes	Remaining years	Sept 2023 - March 2024	April 2024 - August 2024 (recouped)	TOTAL COMMITMENT
Wexham School	Non-Academy	60	2	1	186,058		186,058
2nd Year of Academy Bulge Classes							
May apply if academy bulge class/es opened 2022-23 Growth between Oct-23 and Oct-24 Census	Academy	30	1	1	106,337		106,337
CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS							
2 x primary classes	Academy	60	2	1	124,060	88,615	212,675
Secondary class	Academy	30	1	1	93,029	66,449	159,478
Total		150	5		416,455	88,615	664,548
UNDERSPEND (FINANCIAL YR 23-24)							91,156

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools' Forum 6 July 2022	
Report from the Executive Director of People (Children)	
Provisional DSG Annual Report 2021-22	
Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
No. of Appendices:	N/A
Contact Officer(s):	Neill Butler Interim Finance Business Partner Email: Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk Steve Muldoon Head of Financial Management Email: Steve.Muldoon@slough.gov.uk

This report is for information and relates to all Schools' Forum representatives

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out the use of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2021-22. It explains the main variances, and reports on the amounts carried forward into 2022-23.
- 1.2 The analysis focuses on the four blocks within the DSG and includes details of schools balances.
- Early Years Block (EYB)
 - Schools' Block (SB)
 - High Needs Block (HNB)
 - Central Schools' Service Block (CSSB)
 - Schools' balances

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 Schools' Forum is asked to note the report.

3 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 Local Authorities are obliged to provide Schools' Forum with the annual financial position for each block.

4 Report

4.1. The DSG is a ring-fenced grant and can only be applied to meet expenditure properly included in the Schools' Budget as defined in the Schools Finance Regulations.

4.2 The majority of funding is delegated to schools, using locally determined factor rates, determined by annual consultation and approved by Schools' Forum. A large proportion of the grant is recouped by the DfE to fund Academy schools within the authority. The remainder is used to fund Early Years, High Needs provisions, and central functions.

4.3 Year End Position – Summary 2021/22

Table 1 provides a high level analysis of the financial performance of the DSG, both in year and cumulatively. The main area of concern, from both an in-year performance and a cumulative position, continues to be the High Needs Block.

TABLE 1

DSG Block	2020/21 Cumulative Deficit/(Surplus) Balances as at 31/3/2021 £m	2021/22 In-year Deficit/(Surplus) £m	2021/22 Cumulative Deficit/(Surplus) Balances as at 31/3/2022 £m
EYB	(0.427)	0.317	(0.110)
SB	0.298	(0.179)	0.119
HNB	20.777	4.686	25,463
CSSB	(0.033)	0.031	(0.002)
Total	20.615	4.855	25.470

4.4 The DSG in-year over spend is currently **£4.855 million**, excluding the final adjustment for Early Years. The final funding position for the Early Years block has not yet been confirmed but is expected later this month, once the January 2021 census data has been analysed and any adjustments made.

4.5 The **cumulative deficit** before any adjustments is **£25.470 million**. Any end of year balances must be rolled forward into the next financial year, which has the first call upon the forthcoming budget. The DSG Management Plan is currently being drawn up for DfE submission by 30th June 2022 and will form ongoing discussions with the DfE on

our 'safety valve' intervention programme. It is proposed that the progress on the DSG Management Plan will be a standing item on future Schools' Forum agendas.

4.6 The reported expenditure variances are explored in greater detail further on within the report.

5 Early Years Block

5.1 The **provisional** end of year position is an overspend of **£0.317 million** but a cumulative underspend of **£0.110 million**. This is a demand funded service with providers claiming funding for actual hours of provision at the hourly rate set by the authority for that particular financial year.

5.2 The final funding position within the Early Years Block will not be confirmed until the January census data has been analysed and the budget adjusted accordingly. This is usually completed in July; we are currently awaiting this information from the DfE.

5.3 Table 2 sets out the provisional 2021-22 Early Years DSG revenue budget and outturn position. The current funding allocation is based on the January 2021 census data, and will be updated in July 2022 to reflect 5/12ths of the January 2021 and 7/12ths of the January 2022 censuses. Expenditure is based on actual take up achieved during the financial year, with providers claiming funding for actual hours of provision at the hourly rate set by the authority for that particular financial year.

5.4 There will be variances between actual funding and expenditure incurred because the funding is always an estimate of the potential activity for Early Years users and the demand is not uniform over the year. Both expenditure and funding are therefore variable and challenging to predict.

TABLE 2

	Budget 2021/22 £m	Actual 2021/22 £m	Variance £m
Early Years Block			
Brought Forward from 2020/21		(0.427)	(0.427)
<u>Income</u>			
DSG Settlement	(14.020)	(14.020)	-
Early Years Adjustment July 2022 (TBC)			
Final Total DSG Settlement 2021/22	(14.020)	(14.020)	
<u>Expenditure</u>			

Maintained Nursery Schools			
2 Year Old Funding	0.162	0.162	-
3-4 Year Old Universal Entitlement	1.519	1.476	(0.043)
3-4 Year Old Extended Entitlement	0.271	0.271	-
Deprivation	0.037	0.037	-
EYPP	0.027	0.027	-
Maintained Nursery Supplement	0.722	0.722	-
Subtotal	2.739	2.696	(0.043)
Primary Schools			
2 Year Old Funding	0.155	0.155	-
3-4 Year Old Universal Entitlement	3.456	3.590	0.134
3-4 Year Old Extended Entitlement	0.407	0.407	-
Deprivation	0.056	0.056	-
EYPP	0.042	0.042	-
Subtotal	4.116	4.250	0.134
Special Schools			
2 Year Old Funding	0.001	0.001	-
3-4 Year Old Universal Entitlement	0.008	0.010	0.002
Subtotal	0.009	0.011	0.002
PVI Sector	6.353	6.894	0.541
Central Budgets			
Disability Access Fund	-	0.002	0.002
Early Years Adaptations/ Practical Support	0.050	0.002	(0.048)
Early Years Strategic Financial support	0.079	0.060	(0.019)
Early Years Behaviour Support Services	0.042	-	(0.042)
Central Early Years Expenditure	0.070	0.068	(0.001)
Early Years Team Contribution	0.427	0.220	(0.208)
EYB DSG Non Controllable	0.135	0.135	-
Central Expenditure Total	0.803	0.487	(0.316)
Total Expenditure	14.020	14.337	0.317

Projected Variance		0.317	0.317
Carry Forward to 2022/23			(0.110)

- 5.5 A review of the main variances follows:
- 5.6 Primary and Special Schools: There is an overspend of £0.134m due to increased demand for 3-4 years universal entitlement. This will be reflected in July 2022 DSG adjustments.
- 5.7 PVI Sector and Private: There is an overspend of £0.541m, due to increase demand against funding levels, specifically 2 Year Funding and 3-4 Year Extended Entitlement. This will also be reflected in the DSG adjustment in July 2022
- 5.8 Centrally Retained: There is a large underspend across the centrally retained portion of the EY Block of (£0.316m). £0.48m of this relates to the Adaptations/Practical Support which is a relatively new area of funding and the take up has been slower than expected. This balance is expected to reduce as the Early Years' service have raised awareness and agreed criteria across the sector. There are a number of staff vacancies including the previous Assistant Director that add to the general underspend in 2021-22.

6 Schools' Block

- 6.1 Table 3 provides a more detailed analysis of the Schools' Block for 2021-22. The reported end of year position is an overspend of (£0.119m). This is a reduction to the 2020-21 overspend due to the underspend of Growth fund

TABLE 3

Schools' Block	Budget 2021/22 £m	Actuals 2021/22 £m	Variance £m
Brought Forward from 2020/21		0.298	0.298
<u>Income</u>			
DSG Settlement	(149.703)	(149.703)	-
Academy Recoupment	112.428	112.428	-
CSSB Transfer	0.100	0.100	-
Net Income	(37.175)	(37.175)	-
<u>Expenditure</u>			
Maintained Primary Schools Budget Shares	27.377	27.377	-
Maintained Secondary Schools Budget Shares	8.825	8.825	-
De-delegated Budget: Behavioural Services	-	-	-
Growth Fund: School Block Top Slice	0.739	0.560	(0.179)
Growth Fund: Not Recouped	0.234	0.234	-
Expenditure	37.175	36.995	(0.179)
Variance	-	(0.179)	(0.179)
Carry Forward to 2022/23			0.119

7. High Needs

- 7.1 The DSG 2021-22 High Needs Block final outturn shows an in-year overspend of **£4.686m** and a cumulative overspend of **£25.464m**.
- 7.2 The council received a gross cash settlement of £20.004m which is reflective of in-year import and exports, and place funding recoupment. This settlement has been revised to £19.792m, to reflect the pre-agreed in-year block transfers. Total expenditure incurred was recorded at £24.478m, which can be traced through table 4, beneath.

TABLE 4

High Needs Block	Revised Funding 21.22 £m	Outturn 21.22 £m	Variance £m
Brought Forward from 2020/21			20.777
Income			
High Needs DSG	(20.004)	(20.004)	-
Schools Block Transfer	-	-	-
Central Block Transfer	0.212	0.212	-
Income Total	(19.792)	(19.792)	-
Expenditure			
Planned Place Funding			
HN Place Funding - Nursery	0.100	0.100	-
HN Place Funding - Maintained Schools	0.426	0.426	-
HN Place Funding - Secondary	0.126	0.126	-
Subtotal	0.652	0.652	-
Top-up funding within in-borough settings			
Maintained schools			
HN Mainstream Based Top Ups - Nursery	0.028	0.052	0.024
**Primary	0.982	1.094	0.112
**Secondary	0.092	0.083	(0.009)
HN Resource Based Top Ups - Nursery	0.096	0.084	(0.012)
**Primary	0.762	0.774	0.012
**Secondary	0.176	0.198	0.022
Academies, free schools and colleges			
HN Mainstream Based Top Ups - Academies			
**Primary	1.260	1.416	0.156
**Secondary	0.823	1.127	0.304
HN Resource Base/SEN Unit Top Ups – Academies			
**Primary	1.045	1.156	0.111
**Secondary	0.392	0.380	(0.012)
Subtotal	5.655	6.363	0.708
SS Based Top Ups – Academies			
Arbour Vale	5.105	5.693	0.588

Littledown	0.440	0.544	0.104
Haybrook	1.225	1.444	0.219
Alternative Provision and PRUs			
Littledown AP	0.247	0.236	(0.011)
Haybrook AP	0.650	0.650	-
Subtotal	7.667	8.568	0.901
In-borough Maintained, Resources based and Special schools	13.974	15.583	1.608
Independent Schools	1.249	2.399	1.151
HNB Out-borough placements Special	1.699	2.043	0.344
HNB Out-borough placements Mainstream	0.642	0.540	(0.101)
Post 16 Learners	4.220	1.455	(2.764)
EY Inclusion	0.200	0.169	(0.031)
Out-borough Special, Maintained, Post 16, PVI EY Top ups, EY inclusion & Other	8.009	6.608	(1.402)
SEN Support			
SEND Financial Support	0.105	0.160	0.055
SEN - Assessment Capacity	0.060	0.060	-
Early Years Inclusion	0.070	0.070	-
Hard to Place Pupils	0.120	0.046	(0.074)
Exclusions and Access to Education	0.032	-	(0.032)
Home Education	0.043	0.019	(0.024)
0-5 SEN Transport	0.046	0.046	-
Vulnerable Children Management Incl.	0.030	-	(0.030)
Autism Outreach Team	0.135	0.111	(0.024)
EY SEN advisory Teachers/support Workers EY settings	0.118	0.118	-
EY SEN advisory Teachers/support Workers in Children's Centres	0.063	-	(0.063)
SENCO Network	0.065	-	(0.065)
SEND Teacher Advisor	0.020	0.048	0.028
Education Resource Services (Formerly LACES)	0.107	0.043	(0.063)
Primary Provision Behaviour	0.164	0.164	-
Early Intervention	0.105	0.001	(0.104)
Other Alternative provision services	0.100	0.391	0.291
Hospital Education Services	0.150	0.039	(0.111)
Sensory Consortium Service	0.470	0.543	0.073
Growth for Schools	-	(0.024)	(0.024)
SALT	0.400	0.280	(0.120)
Sub-Total	2.402	2.116	(0.286)
Central Services	0.172	0.172	-
Total	24.558	24.479	(0.079)
Projected End of Year Variance			4.686
Cumulative Surplus/Deficit			25.464

7.2.1 A review of the main variances follows:

- 7.3 **In-Borough Budgets for mainstream, Resource based and Special Schools** have been re-aligned to be fully funded during 2021/22 to account for EHCP. The overspend of £1.608m is due to the increase of the number of placements in-borough, as opposed to out-of-borough and Post 16 which is showing a corresponding underspend. The changes to the bandings have also contributed to the increase of in-borough take up as they have become more attractive. This will have an impact on the other areas such as Independent Special Schools.
- 7.4 **Independent Special Schools** Overspend of **£1.151m**. This is still an overspend but reduced from the 2020-21 outturn which was £1.997m. This budget has been consistently overspending over the past four years, attributable to a mixture of increased demand and an inadequate budget provision.
- 7.5 **Out of Borough Special and Maintained Schools:** Overspend of **£0.243m**. This is still an overspend but greatly reduced from the 2020-21 outturn of £1.706m. We are endeavouring to use more in-borough settings where possible, along with renegotiation of fees
- 7.6 **Post 16:** This service has underspent by **£2.764m**, which is attributable to consistently more in-borough placements and negotiating the price of out-borough placement made above budget.
- 7.7 **Centrally Retained** There has been an underspend of £0.286m in the Centrally Retained for 21-22 for the following reasons:
The council wide re-structure from April 2021
There have been difficulties in staff retention
An efficiency exercise to see if there could be savings made
By re-negotiating existing contracts with external bodies for better value for money

8. **CSSB**

8.1 The underspend reported at end of year is **£0.002m**, which is itemised in the table 5

Table 5

CSSB	Budget 2021/22 £m	Actual 2021/22 £m	Variance £m
Brought Forward from 2020/21		(0.033)	(0.033)
<u>Receipts</u>			
DSG Settlement	(0.708)	(0.708)	-
Block Transfer	(0.312)	(0.312)	-
Income Total	(1.020)	(1.020)	-
<u>Expenditure</u>			
Servicing of Schools' Forum	0.053	0.050	(0.003)
Admissions	0.278	0.279	0.001
Education Welfare (Former ESG)	0.145	0.145	-
Asset Management (Former ESG)	0.013	0.013	-
Statutory & Regulatory (Former ESG)	0.258	0.262	0.004
Licences	0.143	0.143	-
LA Safeguarding Board	0.030	0.030	-
VH	0.100	0.100	-
CSSB overheads	-	0.030	0.030
Expenditure Total	1.020	1.051	0.031
Variance	-	0.031	0.031
Balance C/Fwd to 2022/23			(0.002)

8.2 **Admissions:** This is a staff driven service, and this overspend is owed to agency staffing cover.

8.3 **Statutory and Regulatory:** Internal audit fees for 4 schools have contributed to the overspend.

8.4 **CSSB overheads:** No budget for support charges

9 School Balances

9.1 A list of the actual balances carried forward by maintained schools is listed in table 6 below. This shows three nurseries now in deficit and three primary schools with low balances.

9.2 Schools with low balances or who are in deficit are receiving additional support so that the local authority is satisfied that robust plans are in place to ensure that the school is in good financial health. DfE SRMA (School resource management adviser) have worked with the schools to develop evidence-based recommendations which the schools and LA can take forward. **All** maintained schools are required to submit a three year balanced budget plan. LA officers will be analysing all budget plans and will RAG rate them. Appropriate discussions will then take place with the affected schools and actions will be drawn up.

Table 6

School	Opening Surplus/ (Deficit) Balance At 1.4.21	Closing Surplus/ (Deficit) Balance At 31.3.22	Change in Year
	£m	£m	£m
Baylis Court Nursery School	(0.153)	(0.140)	0.013
Chalvey Nursery School	(0.169)	(0.147)	0.022
Cippenham Nursery School	0.150	0.202	0.052
Lea Nursery School	0.034	0.072	0.038
Slough Centre Nursery	(0.250)	(0.165)	0.085
St Mary's CofE Primary School	0.352	0.385	0.033
Wexham Court Primary School	1.429	1.607	0.178
Claycots School	2.405	3.665	1.260
Holy Family Catholic Primary School	0.081	0.096	0.015
Iqra Slough Islamic Primary School	0.380	0.312	(0.068)
OLOP Catholic Primary & Nursery School	0.167	0.091	(0.075)
Penn Wood Primary and Nursery School	0.218	0.262	0.043
Pippins School	0.090	0.088	(0.002)
Priory School	1.622	1.238	(0.383)
St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School	0.465	0.628	0.162
Wexham School	1.078	1.355	0.277
Total	7.899	9.549	1.650

- 9.3 Three of our maintained nursery schools are in deficit, although their overall deficits reduced in 2021-22, which is encouraging. We will be working with these 3 schools to see how we can agree deficit recovery plans over the coming months to bring them all back into surplus by March 2026 in line with DfE schools in deficit guidance.
- 9.4 Four primary schools had operating deficits (Expenditure higher than income) in 2021-22 which were covered by cumulative surpluses in each of the schools. Priory School had an operating deficit of £383,074 in 2021-22 and will be closely monitored along with the 3 other primary schools to see if any proactive action can be taken to avoid any of them going into deficit in future years.

10 Supporting Information

- 10.1. There is no additional supporting information.

11 Financial Implications

- 11.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper.

12 Alternative Options Considered

- 12.1 Not applicable

13 Supporting Information

- 13.1 Not applicable

14 Legal Implications

- 14.1 There are no legal implications for this report.

15 Equality Implications

- 15.1 Not applicable

Schools' Forum 6 July 2022	
Report from the Executive Director of Resources	
High Needs DSG budget 2022/23 Allocation of Centrally Retained Funds	
Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
No. of Appendices:	N/A
Contact Officer(s):	Johnny Kyriacou Assistant Director, Education and Inclusion Email: Johnny.Kyriacou@slough.gov.uk Neill Butler Interim Finance Business Partner Email: Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk

This report is for information and relates to all Schools' Forum representatives

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 Schools' Forum have requested details of how Centrally Retained Funds within the High Needs DSG Block are being allocated in 2022-23.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 Schools' Forum is asked to note the report.

3 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 The Local Authority is responsible for allocating High Needs DSG budgets each year and it is good practice to inform Schools' Forum of these allocations.

4 Background

- 4.1. There are no background documents.

5 Supporting Information

- 5.1. The High Needs Central Allocations for 2023/24 are listed in Appendix A

6 Financial Implications

- 6.1 The financial implications have been detailed in Appendix A.

7 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

7.1 Not applicable.

8 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

8.1 Not applicable

9 Legal Implications

9.1 Not applicable.

10 Equality Implications

10.1 Not applicable

High Needs Centrally Retained Budgets 2022/23

Cost Centre		Assigned Budget	Description
F460	SEND Financial Support	105,000	Supporting overhead costs for finance support and HNB management for efficiencies
F461	SEND Commissioning	60,000	Recharge to support overheads for commissioning and advice. This supports the commissioning of SEND related services, and finding cost saving initiatives.
F191	Early Years Inclusion	70,000	Funding for Advisory Teachers to cover early years private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sectors in identification, assessment, intervention, prevention support and advice.
F166	Hard to Place Pupils	60,000	This is funding allocated to schools to support entry into school of those hard to place. They are mainly secondary placements and funding is allocated according to the Fair Access Protocol. to be phased out by 2023/24.
F233	Exclusions and Access to Education	31,700	This funding is for the School Access Officer who arranges education for hard to place and excluded pupils. The School Access Officer works with schools to ensure pupils remain in school and acts as a broker to re-engage pupils or facilitate managed moves between schools.
F235	Home Education	42,600	This is to ensure that home educated pupils receive an annual visit to monitor the quality of education being provided. A report is produced following each visit. The visits and reports are arranged by Littledown school under an SLA with the LA. The LA receives the reports and decides on the next steps.
F430	Vulnerable Children Management Incl.	30,000	This funding is to support vulnerable groups via the Attendance Service. This is in addition to the service's enforcement role, issuing penalty notices and taking legal action for non-attendance. Groups supported include teenage parents, gypsies, travellers, Roma pupils and young people with medical needs.
F410	Autism Outreach Team	135,000	This supports one Senior Educational Psychologist and 1.9FTE ASD Teacher Advisors. The team supports CYP aged 0-25 years who have a medical diagnosis of Autism, as well as CYP with identified social communication difficulties. All requests for Autism Outreach support are made via a Request for Involvement form directly to the Senior EP. Members of the Autism Outreach team deliver advisory and support services.
F691	EY SEN advisory Teachers/support Workers EY settings	118,100	This funding is for support, advice and training through the early years advisory service for children with learning difficulties and disabilities. These team members are engaged with assessment provision and also do home visiting.
F692	EY SEN advisory Teachers/support Workers in Children's Centres	63,000	This funding is to provide support for children with learning difficulties and disabilities through the Children's Centres provision, including family support.
F465	SENCO Network	65,000	This funding supports the work of the Education, Standards and Effectiveness Officer SEND and the SENDCo Network Forum. Funding also supports advice and training for schools through advisory teachers.
F463	SEND Teacher Advisor	20,000	The SEND Teacher Advisor is line managed by a Senior EP. All requests for SEND Teacher Advisor support are made via a Request for Involvement from directly to the Senior EP. The SEND Teacher Advisor supports schools with Carrying out assessments, and offering advice and guidance, for cup presenting with Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLD: Dyslexia), Learning Difficulties and Down Syndrome.
F416	Sensory Impairment	470,000	Services to support pupils within schools with sensory needs (HI,VI). Joint arrangements are in place via RMWM (Berkshire consortium)
F417	Speech and Language Therapy	400,000	Services to support pupils within schools with sensory needs (SALT)- BHFT agreement 3 yrs.
F446	Education Resource Services (Formerly LACES)	80,000	Provides direct educational support for Children looked after.
F406	Primary Provision Behaviour	164,300	SEBDOS Service supporting pupils with EHCPs- Littledown PRU- Behaviour support
F409	Early Intervention	237,690	Intervention fund to support new inclusive initiatives within education settings, and invest-to-save initiatives, to support DSG Management Plan.
F449	Other Alternative Provision Services	150,000	Alternative Provision arrangements required by SEN team, for pupils with EHCPs requiring interim education arrangements.
F447	Hospital education services	100,000	Hospital Education Services that support pupils who are deemed medically unfit to attend their normal educational setting.
		2,402,390	

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools' Forum 6 July 2022	
Report from the Executive Director of Resources	
Revision to the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools	
Wards Affected:	All
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
No. of Appendices:	N/A
Contact Officer(s):	<p>Neill Butler Interim Finance Business Partner Email: Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk</p> <p>Steve Muldoon Head of Financial Management Email: Steve.Muldoon@slough.gov.uk</p>

This report is for decision by school forum representatives from maintained schools

1 Purpose of the Report

1.1 Local authorities are required to publish schemes for financing schools, setting out the financial relationship between them and the schools they maintain. This is a requirement of s.48(4) and paragraph 2A(2) of Schedule 14 to the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.

2 Recommendation

2.1 Representatives of Schools' Forum from maintained schools are asked to approve a change to the tendering limit from £10,000 to £25,000 set out in section 3 below.

3 Reasons for Recommendations

3.1 Schools have fed back to the Local Authority that the £10,000 tendering threshold is too low and they felt it burdensome to go out and do a full tender exercise for purchases above this level.

3.2 The Local Authorities tendering threshold is £25,000 and it is proposed to align this threshold in the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools.

4 Background

- 4.1. The Local Authority can amend the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools after consultation with maintained schools.

5 Supporting Information

- 5.1. There is no additional supporting information.

6 Financial Implications

- 6.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper.

7 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 Maintaining the status quo is the alternative but is not deemed appropriate, while the proposed change is acceptable to the council.

8 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 8.1 Not applicable

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 Legal Services have confirmed there are no legal implications for this report.

10 Equality Implications

- 10.1 Not applicable

SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
PROPOSED FORWARD AGENDA PLAN 2022/23

Standing items for all meetings		
Item	Description	Lead
(a)	Apologies/notification of AOB/declaration of interests	Chair
(b)	Minutes of previous meeting	Chair
(c)	Forum membership update	Chair
(d)	Update on national/local funding news or issues	LA
(e)	Academies update	LA
(f)	Forward agenda planning and key decisions log	Chair

Additional Agenda items

Meeting 1 – October 2022		
Item	Description	Notes
	DSG Management Plan update	
	DSG Schools Block – proposed timeline and consultation	5-16 Task group considers options and agrees consultation with schools In November.
	SEND and AP place commissioning	LA confirms places commissioned in academies ahead of submission to ESFA in November
Meeting 1 – December 2022		
Item	Description	Lead
	DSG Management Plan update	
	DSG Schools Block – consultation outcome and task group recommendation	Forum considers outcome of consultation and task group discussion, makes recommendation on the formula, and decides on any block transfer requests
	Scheme for financing schools	Approval of revised scheme by maintained school reps following consultation.
	Central School Services Budget (CSSB)	Line-by-line approval of CSSB budget allocations for 2023/24
	Growth Fund	Review Growth Fund position and agree maximum ‘top slice’ from Schools Block and allocation model for 2023/24
Meeting 1 – January 2023		
Item	Description	Lead
	DSG Management Plan update	
	DSG Schools Block – confirmation of settlement and APT submission	LA confirms final DSG settlement and APT submission.
	DSG High Needs centrally retained budget	LA confirms line-by-line allocation of HNB centrally retained funding.
	DSG Early Years centrally retained budget	LA confirms line-by-line allocation of EY centrally retained funding
Meeting 1 – March 2023		
Item	Description	Lead
	DSG Management Plan update	
	Schools Block – confirmation of individual schools’ budgets	LA confirmation of individual budgets for 2023/24 following APT submission and any subsequent adjustments
	Early Years block	LA confirms funding arrangements for next FY 2023/24
Meeting 1 – May 2023		
<i>Traditionally a reserve meeting to allow for additional monitoring or where there have been unavoidable changes to the timings of other items.</i>		
Item	Description	Lead
	DSG Management Plan update	

Meeting 1 – July 2023		
Item	Description	Lead
	DSG Management Plan update	
	Growth Fund - outturn from previous financial year.	LA confirms outturn from 2022/23 and any consequent update to the allocations for 2023/24
	DSG – annual report	LA confirms deployment of DSG for previous financial year 2022/23

Slough Schools Forum – Key Decisions Log AY 2021/22

Issue and decision	Forum date	Agenda item	Minute ref
School Forum membership update	09/12/21	4	866
Gill Denham confirmed as academies member			
Chair to write to Coral Snowden and Peter Collins to ask if they wish to continue in post from January 2022			
DSG 2021/22 Monitoring report	09/12/21	6	868
Forum NOTED the current DSG position as set out in the monitoring report			
DSG funding update 2022/23	09/12/21	7	869
Forum NOTED the provisional DSG allocation for 2022/23 as set out in the report			
Schools Block 2022/23	09/12/21	9	871
LA to provide scenario modelling with and without requested 0.5% DSG top slice, to inform decision on block transfer in January meeting			
Early Years update	09/12/21	10	872
Forum NOTED the verbal report on EY funding			
Scheme for Financing Schools	09/12/21	11	873
Changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools, required in relation to the UK leaving the European Union, APPROVED by maintained school members, subject to confirmation from maintained secondary member (absent from meeting)			
Schools Forum membership update	19/01/22	5	879
Peter Collins confirmed as academies member for two years until January 2024			
Coral Snowden's term extended until July 2022			
Nominations to be sought for secondary academy member vacancy			
DSG 2021/22 monitoring report	19/01/22	7	880
Forum NOTED current 2021/22 DSG position			
DSG Management Plan update	19/01/22	8	881
Forum NOTED the verbal update from Johnny Kyriacou on the DSG management plan			
SEND Banding	19/01/22	9	882
Forum NOTED the verbal update from Chelsea Barnes on changes to the SEND banding matrix			
Growth Fund update	19/01/22	10	883
Forum APPROVED the Growth Fund criteria for 2022/23			
Forum NOTED the forecast position for the three years 2021/22, 2022/23 and 2023/24			
Schools Block 2022/23	19/01/22	11	883
Forum APPROVED the transfer of £100k from Schools Block to the CSSB			
Forum APPROVED the transfer of the balancing 0.44% figure (£676k) to the High Needs block transfer.			
Report to brought to March Forum meeting describing in detail the difference that this funding has made and how the funds transferred are being allocated.			
Early Years funding 2022/23	19/01/22	12	884
Forum members endorsed the EY Task Group recommendation and APPROVED Option 1 from the 2022/23 funding consultation			
AOB – School Improvement funding	19/01/22	16	888
Discussion to be arranged between LA officers and the chairs of SPHA and SASH to develop proposals for school improvement funding to take to the School Improvement Board and bring back to Forum.			
DSG monitoring report 2021/22	10/03/22	7	894
Forum NOTED the latest DSG position.			

DSG Schools Block 2022-23	10/03/22	8	895
Kamaljit Kaur confirmed she would follow up NNDR payment mechanism and issue clarification for all schools.			
CSSB budget 2022-23	10/03/22	9	896
Forum APPROVED transfer of £180,815 from High Needs block to the CSSB for 2022-23			
Forum AGREED allocation within the CSSB as proposed by the local authority.			
EY centrally retained budget 2022-23	10/03/22	10	897
Forum AGREED the use of the central retained funding as proposed by the local authority.			
DSG Management plan update	10/03/22	11	898
Forum NOTED the Cabinet report on current status of DSG Management Plan and accompanying verbal update			
Written or verbal update to be given at next meeting			
Task group update	10/03/22	12	899
Work of Task groups (Schools Block, High Needs and EY)			
Forward agenda and Key decisions log	10/03/22	14	901
Key decisions log to be updated for May meeting (Chair)			